



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

GEF ID:	9355		
Country/Region:	Tonga		
Project Title:	Outer Island Renewable Energy Project		
GEF Agency:	ADB	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:		Project Grant:	\$2,639,269
Co-financing:	\$25,070,731	Total Project Cost:	\$27,710,000
PIF Approval:	March 15, 2016	Council Approval/Expected:	April 19, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ming Yang	Agency Contact Person:	Woo Yul Lee, Energy Specialist

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 12/14/2015 Yes. It is aligned with Program 1 of Objective 1 of the GEF6 CCM strategy directions.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MY 12/14/2015 Yes. The project is consistent with (i) The Tonga Energy Road Map, 2010–2020; (ii) Renewable Energy Act. Nuku'alofa; (iii) Tonga Strategic Development Framework (2015 – 2025); and (iv) Tonga National Infrastructure Investment Plan (2)	

<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)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		2015 – 2025.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	MY 12/14/2015 Yes. The issues were addressed on pages 4, 7, and 8 of the PIF.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	MY 12/14/2015 Yes. The issue is addressed on page 7.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	MY 12/14/2015 Yes. The ADB does not ask any project management cost from the GEF, which is welcome.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MY 12/14/2015 Yes. Issues are addressed on page 8 of the PIF.	
<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>	MY 12/14/2015 Yes. Tonga has a total of \$4,587,650 in GEF6 STAR allocation. As of December 14, 2015, this country had not used any GEF6 allocation. The country is flexible in using STAR resources.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	MY 12/14/2015 Yes. Tonga has a total of \$2,000,000 in GEF6 CCM STAR allocation. As of December 14, 2015, this country had not used any GEF6 CCM allocation. The country is flexible in using STAR resources. On August 4,	

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

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		2015, the OFP of the country endorsed \$2,890,000 for the project which is acceptable.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	MY 12/14/2015 N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	MY 12/14/2015 N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	MY 12/14/2015 N/A	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>MY 12/14/2015 Yes. The PM reviewed the PIF twice, met with the TTL of the ADB in Manila in July 2015, reviewed the draft PIF, and commented on the first informal submission of the PIF. Email communications were saved into a PDF document and loaded onto the folder of the project documents in the PMIS.</p> <p>The Program Manager recommends CEO PIF clearance.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	December 14, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	December 16, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

## 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?	MY 10/26/2017 There is not any significant change in project objective and components. The ADB enlarged its grant co-financing by more than \$10 million for a component, which is welcome!	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	MY 10/26/2017 Yes	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	MY 10/26/2017 Yes	
	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)	MY 10/26/2017 Yes. The ADB used its own budget to set up a contingency fund (\$1.28 million) to deal with the risks.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	MY 10/26/2017 Yes.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	MY 10/26/2017 Not at this time. Please use the GEF-6 CC Mitigation Tracking Tool (2014) template to submit the targeted GHG emission reduction amounts. The template is available at the GEF web: <a href="https://www.thegef.org/documents/gef-climate-change-mitigation-tracking-tool">https://www.thegef.org/documents/gef-climate-change-mitigation-tracking-tool</a>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		MY 10/31/2017 Yes, the TT was submitted.	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	MY 10/26/2017 N/A	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	MY 10/26/2017 Yes.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	MY 10/26/2017 Yes.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	MY 10/26/2017 Yes.	
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	MY 10/26/2017 Yes.	
	• STAP	MY 10/26/2017 Yes.	
	• GEF Council	MY 10/26/2017 N/A	
	• Convention Secretariat	MY 10/26/2017 N/A	
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	MY 10/26/2017 Not at this time. Please address the comments in Box 6.	

<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
		<p>MY 10/31/2017</p> <p>Yes, all comments were addressed. The Program Manager recommends CEO Endorsement clearance.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	October 26, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	October 31, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		