



**GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND**

GEF ID:	9281		
Country/Region:	Tanzania		
Project Title:	Promotion of Bio-Ethanol as Alternative Clean Fuel for Cooking in the United Republic of Tanzania		
GEF Agency:	UNIDO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-1 Program 1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$2,457,078
Co-financing:	\$10,450,500	Total Project Cost:	\$12,907,578
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	October 01, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ming Yang	Agency Contact Person:	Mr. Jossy Thomas

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	MY 8/10/2015 Yes. The project is aligned with Program 1 of Objective 1: To promote low carbon technologies and mitigation options.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MY 8/10/2015 Not completed yet. It is partially sated on pages 21 and 22. Please justify if this project is	The project is consistent with the National Portfolio Formulation Exercise of Tanzania (August 2011). The project will contribute to achieving the goals of all the three focal areas namely, Climate change, biodiversity conservation and sustainable land management. One of

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>consistent with the National Portfolio Formulation Exercise of Tanzania.</p> <p>MY 8/19/2015</p> <p>Yes. Comments were addressed and the PIF was revised.</p>	<p>the national priorities under Climate change focal area is to promote low-carbon technologies. Another national priority under sustainable land management focal area is to generate alternative income generating activities for the farmers. The proposed project will use underutilized agro feedstock such as molasses (from the existing sugar industries), cashew apple, sisal waste and other seasonal fruit/agro wastes for bio-ethanol generation. This will boost up the agriculture sector, as they will get additional revenues from their by-products/wastes. The above statement is included in sub-section National Portfolio Formulation Exercise under Section 6 on page no. 21 of the revised PIF document.</p>
Project Design	<p>3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>MY 8/10/2015</p> <p>Not completed at this time.</p> <p>1. The data was dated in 2011. Please consider using updated data, say in 2014 or 2013 in the PIF to justify the project.</p> <p>2. The PIF addressed the Global Environmental Problems and Barriers on pages 5 and 6, but it does not address the Root Causes or drivers of the Problems. Please address them.</p> <p>3. Please write one paragraph for each of the following topics:</p> <p>a). innovation;</p> <p>b). sustainability;</p> <p>c). market transformation; and</p> <p>d). scaling-up.</p>	<p>The recent primary energy consumption data of Tanzania available in open source is the year 2012 (http://www.iea.org/stats/WebGraphs/TANZANIA4.pdf). The data has been updated under sub-section Global Environmental problems, Root Causes and Barrier on page no. 4 of the revised PIF document.</p> <p>The prevailing poverty level and over-dependence on biomass based fuels are the root causes of the identified environmental problems. Lack of access to modern energy services creates a vicious cycle of poverty for rural communities due to continued limited production opportunities and social facilities. Deforestation due to biomass consumption, on the other hand, poses a severe threat to biodiversity. Lack of alternative energy technology and absence of any project demonstrations on alternate fuels only lead to the acceleration of environmental degradation.</p>

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>MY 8/19/2015</p> <p>Yes. Comments were addressed and the PIF was revised.</p>	<p>The above statement is included in paragraph 6 of subsection Global Environmental Problems, Root Causes and Barriers on page no. 5 of the revised PIF document.</p> <p>The following topics: innovation, sustainability, and scaling-up have been indicated in separate paragraphs on pages 15 and 16 of the revised PIF document.</p> <p>The proposed project envisages a significant market transformation from biomass-based cooking to bio-ethanol based cooking. The project will also focus on rural markets through the installation of micro-distilleries for bio-ethanol production. This will also lead to associated positive impacts on agriculture markets as well through added value to its by-products and wastes. Energy efficient and quality bio-ethanol cook stoves will be introduced to Tanzania markets for the first time through this project.</p> <p>The above statement is included in paragraph 2 (market transformation) on page no. 16 of the revised PIF document.</p>
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>MY 8/10/2015</p> <p>Yes. It is stated on page 16. The project seeks to retail around 28,000 bio-ethanol cook stoves in urban, peri-urban and rural areas. Annual charcoal usage of around 16.4 million kg can be avoided resulting in the reduction of 58,234 tCO₂ each year, or 582,340 tCO₂ in 10 year of lifetime directly.</p> <p>However, detailed calculation for the emission reduction numbers is</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		needed in the CEO ER stage.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>MY 8/10/2015 Yes. It is clear, but it seems that the Project Management Cost (PMC) \$817,004 is over-budgeted. If it is, please reduce it accordingly.</p> <p>MY 8/19/2015 Yes. Comments were addressed and the PIF was revised.</p>	The PMC has been reduced from 700,000 USD to 400,000 USD. The total PMC is now 517,004 USD (117,004 + 400,000). Please refer to Table B under Part I on pages 1 and 2 of the revised PIF document.
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>MY 8/10/2015 Not completed.</p> <p>Please indicate how this project will benefit indigenous peoples, if the project is relevant to them.</p> <p>MY 8/19/2015 Yes. Comments were addressed and the PIF was revised.</p>	<p>The proposed project will boost up selected agriculture sector, as farmers will get additional revenues from their by-products/wastes. Indigenous people who depend on relevant agriculture sector will benefit from the additional revenues through the project. This will also create local employment in rural communities and restrict their migrations. They may also benefit from improved lifestyle by the use of ethanol cook stoves. The benefits for the indigenous people depend on the relevant sector to which they are associated.</p> <p>However, there will not be any negative impacts on the indigenous peoples as the project does not involve any land conversions, crop replacement, etc. The above statement is included in paragraph 6 of section 2. Stakeholders on page no. 17 of the revised PIF document.</p>
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	MY 8/10/2015 Yes. As of 8/10/2015, this country has a remainder of \$19,091,728 in STAR.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	MY 8/10/2015 Yes. As of 8/10/2015, this country has a remainder of \$5,325,943 in the CCM focal area.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	MY 8/10/2015 N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	MY 8/10/2015 N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	MY 8/10/2015 N/A	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	MY 8/10/2015 Not at this time. Please address comments in Boxes: 2, 3 and 6. Please fill Table D on page 3. MY 8/19/2015 Yes. Comments were addressed and the PIF was revised. The Program Manager recommends CEO PIF clearance.	
Review Date	Review	August 10, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.