



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

GEF ID:	9393		
Country/Region:	Togo		
Project Title:	Hybridization of Diesel Engines of Multifunctional Platforms with Solar Systems		
GEF Agency:	BOAD	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:	\$79,388	Project Grant:	\$2,624,000
Co-financing:	\$16,768,000	Total Project Cost:	\$19,471,388
PIF Approval:	May 04, 2016	Council Approval/Expected:	June 09, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ming Yang	Agency Contact Person:	Fatoumata Sangare

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	MY 2/24/2016 Yes. It is aligned with Program-1 of CCM Objective 1.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MY 2/24/2016 Yes. The project is consistent with Togo's commitment on a low-carbon development path that was confirmed in the country's Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs) under the United Nation Framework Convention on Climate Change.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	MY 2/24/2016	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>drivers<sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>Not at this time. Please address the drivers or root causes of global environmental degradation that is relevant to this project. For example, high cost of installation for solar power might be the root cause for the lack of use of solar systems. Then, justify how this project will overcome the root problem and make sure this project will be sustainable and have a transformational impact on the market in renewable energy investment in Togo. (Some of relevant information is shown on page 11. The PIF needs to be re-arranged and modified to meet the requirement).</p> <p>Please re-write the paragraph on page 12 that is addressing sustainability. Please focus on how the GEF project will continue operation after the project implementation period is over. Please answer specifically how the operation and maintainable costs of the 1 MW solar PV equipment will be covered, and how the regulatory framework and financial mechanisms for solar PV investment will be continually effective in the country.</p>	

<sup>1</sup> 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)?

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>MY 4/4/2016 Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>MY 2/24/2016 Not completed at this time. While estimating GHG emission reduction of the project, please consider using the GEF recommended GHG emission accounting methodologies. Please see <a href="https://www.thegef.org/gef/ghg-accounting">https://www.thegef.org/gef/ghg-accounting</a></p> <p>MY 4/4/2016 Yes, comments were addressed. But detailed GHG calculations with GEF recommended methodologies need to be presented in CEO ER document.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>MY 2/24/2016</p> <p>Not at this time. In Component 2, please clearly indicate the number of workshops to be conducted, the number of programs and materials to be developed, and the number of agri-food/artisanal products to be generated from this project. Please also allocate some co-financing resources to Component 1. Component 2 in Table B is budgeted a total of \$13.4 million for 1 MW solar PV equipment and 50 kits of solar water pumps. The average cost</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>of the solar PV system seems very high: over \$13 per watt. Please provide detailed information on the costs of the solar PV system and justify them.</p> <p>The GEF finance figures in Tables A (\$2,534,000) &amp; B (\$2,660,700) do not match. Please fix them.</p> <p>MY 4/4/2016 Not completed at this time. Please check all the numbers carefully in Table B. The sum of sub-co-financing amounts does not match the total amount (\$16,768,000). Please double check every number in every Table in the PIF to make sure there is no mistake.</p> <p>MY 4/7/2016 Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>MY 2/24/2016 Yes, it is shown on pages 12-13.</p>	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>MY 2/24/2016 Yes. Togo has a STAR allocation of \$7.2 million. As of 2/24/2016, the country has not used any STAR</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		allocation resources.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	MY 2/24/2016 Yes. Togo has a STAR allocation of \$3 million in CCM. As of 2/24/2016, the country has not used any CCM allocation resources.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	MY 2/24/2016 Not applicable (N/A)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	MY 2/24/2016 Not applicable (N/A)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	MY 2/24/2016 Not applicable (N/A)	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	MY 2/24/2016 Not at this time. Please address comments in Boxes 3, 4, and 5.  MY 4/4/2016 Not completed at this time. Please address the comment in Box 5.  MY 4/7/2016 Yes, all comments were addressed and issues were cleared.  At CEO ER stage, please present detailed calculation of GHG emission reductions by using GEF recommended methodologies.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	February 24, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 04, 2016	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 07, 2016	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	5/1/2017 MY: There is little change from the PIF stage to the CEO ER stage.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	5/1/2017 MY: Not completed at this time. Output 2.2.1 on page 3 in Tale B is missing. Please revise it.  7/10/2017 MY: Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	5/1/2017 MY: Yes.	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response	5/1/2017 MY: Yes, on page 39-30.	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	<p>5/1/2017 MY: Not at this time. Please submit the co-financing letters.</p> <p>7/10/2017 MY: Not at this time. The co-financing letter from the OBAD is fine. But other letters do not support the co-financing amounts that are indicated in Table C on page 7 of the project document. Please have the letters revised or Table C revised, so that the amounts of co-financing in the letters and in Table C will be consistent.</p> <p>8/14/2017 MY: Yes. Comments were addressed. However, in the future, please have co-financing letters addressed to Dr. Naoko Ishii, the Chairperson and the CEO of the GEF, rather than individual program managers.</p>	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	<p>5/1/2017 MY: Not at this time. Please submit the TT.</p> <p>7/10/2017 MY: Not at this time. The GHG reduction numbers in the TTC and in the Table on Page 8 of the project document are not consistent. Please double check the numbers and</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		revise them.  8/14/2017 MY: Yes. Comments were addressed.	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	5/1/2017 MY: Not applicable.	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	5/1/2017 MY: Yes, on page 30.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	5/1/2017 MY: Yes, on page 50.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	5/1/2017 MY: Yes, on pages 42-43.	
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEFSEC</li> </ul>	5/1/2017 MY: Not completed at this time.  From page 18 of the document, it seems that the agency did not use GEF recommended methodology to quantify GHG emission reduction from this project.  Please clearly show the baseline scenario and the GEF project scenario	

<sup>3</sup> 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.



## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		and demonstrate net GHG emission reduction benefits from this project.  7/10/2017 MY: Yes, issues were cleared.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP</li> </ul>	5/1/2017 MY: Not applicable.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEF Council</li> </ul>	5/1/2017 MY: Not at this time. Please address the comments of the Council.  7/10/2017 MY: Not at this time. Please address the comments of the German Council.  8/14/2017 MY: Not completed at this time. Please use the Table on page 61 at Annex B to put the comments of German Council, fill the "Responses" and indicate "Changes in the full project".	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat</li> </ul>	5/1/2017 MY: Not applicable.	
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	5/1/2017 MY: Not at this time. Please address the above comments.  Please also correct the errors before resubmission:  ERROR in CEO - FASF and Project Objective Cofin Amounts by Trust Funds Differ.	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>ERROR in CEO - Fee in Finance Breakdown record(s) exceed(s) 9% (limit for this project)</p> <p>ERROR in CEO - Finance Breakdown and FASF GEF Project Grants differ</p> <p>ERROR in CEO - Finance Breakdown and FASF GEF Project Grants per Trust Fund differ</p> <p>ERROR in CEO - Finance Breakdown and Finance Overview GEF Project Grants / Fees differ</p> <p>ERROR in CEO - Finance Breakdown and Project Framework GEF Project Grants differ</p> <p>ERROR in CEO - Finance Breakdown and Project Framework GEF Project Grants per Trust Fund differ</p> <p>ERROR in CEO - The sum of the cofinance as given per source differs from FASF's total cofinance</p> <p>ERROR in CEO - Total Fee exceeds 9 percent (limit for this type of project)</p> <p>7/10/2017 MY: Not at this time. Please address comments in Boxes: 5, 6 and 11.</p> <p>Please also correct the errors before submission:</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>ERROR in CEO - FASF and Project Objective Cofin Amounts by Trust Funds Differ.</p> <p>ERROR in CEO - Fee in Finance Breakdown record(s) exceed(s) 9% (limit for this project)</p> <p>ERROR in CEO - Finance Breakdown and FASF GEF Project Grants differ</p> <p>ERROR in CEO - Finance Breakdown and FASF GEF Project Grants per Trust Fund differ</p> <p>ERROR in CEO - Finance Breakdown and Finance Overview GEF Project Grants / Fees differ</p> <p>ERROR in CEO - The sum of the cofinance as given per source differs from FASF's total cofinance</p> <p>Please be aware that 9% fee is calculated on the bases of subtotal, not including project management costs (\$131,200). The Agency needs to add one row of sub-total in Table A.</p> <p>8/14/2017 MY: Not at this time. Please address the comments in Box 11.</p> <p>Please also correct the following</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>errors before submission:</p> <p>ERROR in CEO - FASF and Project Objective Cofin Amounts by Trust Funds Differ.            ERROR in CEO - Finance Breakdown and FASF GEF Project Grants differ            ERROR in CEO - Finance Breakdown and FASF GEF Project Grants per Trust Fund differ            ERROR in CEO - The sum of the cofinance as given per source differs from FASF's total cofinance</p> <p>In Table A, please delete the row of "agency fee". Before the row of "project management", please sum all the above costs to get sub-total. Then, the Project Management costs are calculated at 9% of the Sub-Total.</p> <p>8/28/2017 MY:</p> <p>Not at this time.            Please fix the following errors in the CEO ER document:</p> <p>ERROR in CEO - FASF and Project Objective Cofin Amounts by Trust Funds Differ.            ERROR in CEO - Finance Breakdown and FASF GEF Project Grants differ</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>ERROR in CEO - Finance Breakdown and FASF GEF Project Grants per Trust Fund differ</p> <p>ERROR in CEO - The sum of the cofinance as given per source differs from FASF's total cofinance</p> <p>The above errors come from two places in Table A on pages 1 and 2. In Table B, there is a missing row. All these issues come from a wrong format of the document. Please use the GEF recommended CEO ER document template to present the data. The template can be downloaded from the following site: <a href="https://www.thegef.org/documents/ceo-endorsement-approval-template-august-2016">https://www.thegef.org/documents/ceo-endorsement-approval-template-august-2016</a></p> <p>Also, in Table A, it shows "CCM-1 Program 3". In the GEF 6 CCM programming directions, there is no such program. Please check the document and revise it accordingly.</p> <p>MY 8/31/2017</p> <p>Not at this time. Please fix the following errors in the CEO ER document:</p> <p>ERROR in CEO - FASF and Project Objective Cofin Amounts by Trust</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>Funds Differ.            ERROR in CEO - Finance Breakdown and FASF GEF Project Grants differ            ERROR in CEO - Finance Breakdown and FASF GEF Project Grants per Trust Fund differ            ERROR in CEO - The sum of the cofinance as given per source differs from FASF's total cofinance</p> <p>The above errors come from two places in Table A on pages 1 and 2.</p> <p>Please use the GEF required CEO ER document template to present the data. The template can be downloaded from the following site:  <a href="https://www.thegef.org/documents/ceo-endorsement-approval-template-august-2016">https://www.thegef.org/documents/ceo-endorsement-approval-template-august-2016</a></p> <p>MY 9/18/2017</p> <p>Not at this time.            Please fix the following errors in the CEO ER document:</p> <p>ERROR in CEO – FASF (Table A on page 1 (\$16,598,000)) and Project Objective Cofin Amounts (Table B (\$16,768,000) and Table C on page 5</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>(\$16,768,000) by Trust Funds Differ.                      ERROR in CEO - Finance Breakdown (Table B on page 5 (\$2,624,000) and FASF GEF Project Grants (Table A on page 2 (\$1,492,000) differ                      ERROR in CEO - Finance Breakdown and FASF GEF Project Grants per Trust Fund differ                      ERROR in CEO - The sum of the cofinance as given per source differs from FASF's total cofinance</p> <p>The above errors come from two places in Table A, Table B, and Table C on pages 1 and 2.</p> <p>When the first two errors are cleared, the third and the forth errors will be automatically removed.</p> <p>Again, please use GEF required Template that can be downloaded from  <a href="https://www.thegef.org/documents/ceo-endorsement-approval-template-august-2016">https://www.thegef.org/documents/ceo-endorsement-approval-template-august-2016</a></p> <p>The template has been sent by Shakil to the BOAD.                      With the Template, in Table A, please only enter one row as follows:</p> <p>Focal Area Objective/Program: CCM</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>-1 Program 1: Promote timely development, demonstration and financing of low-carbon technologies and mitigation options. The GEF Project Finance and Co-financing should include Project Management Costs in Table A.</p> <p>MY 9/19/2017 Yes, call comments were cleared. The PM recommends the CEO to endorse this project.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	May 01, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	July 10, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 14, 2017	