



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

GEF ID:	9220		
Country/Region:	Tuvalu		
Project Title:	Facilitation of the Achievement of Sustainable National Energy Targets of Tuvalu (FASNETT)		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5613 (UNDP)
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:	\$2,639,725
Co-financing:	\$15,900,000	Total Project Cost:	\$18,639,725
PIF Approval:	September 14, 2015	Council Approval/Expected:	October 21, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Masako Ogawa	Agency Contact Person:	Manuel L Soriano

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	MO July 31, 2015 Yes. Yes the project is aligned with GEF-6, CCM Objective 1, Program 2. MO August 10, 2015 Please add Program 1 in Table A, as many components of the project also aim technology transfer.	Per guidance provided by GEFSec on CC1 programs, this proposed project is under CC1: Program 1. This is now reflected in the PIF.
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MO July 31, 2015 Yes. Tuvalu has developed National Energy plan, and has the targets (1) 10% renewable energy for power	

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
		generation by 2020, and (2) 30% energy efficiency improvement in Funatuti.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>MO July 31, 2015</p> <p>There are many renewable projects are on-going, but Tuvalu still relies on fossil fuels, and has not developed detail plan to achieve the above mentioned goals.</p> <p>On innovation, this project will implement community based pilot and biomass technology, and will develop financial scheme.</p> <p>On sustainability and market transformation, this project will develop and implement policy and financial tools provided by the local bank. However it is not clear whether the capacity of business and commercial actors will be strengthened so that the low carbon technologies are introduced and maintained properly.</p> <p>1)Please include activities for these business and commercial actors in relevant component and as stakeholders to reduce the technical barriers discussed in page 6.</p> <p>2)Please revise footnote. There are</p>	<p>In the original PIF, Component 1 includes Activity 5, which is on the design and conduct of a capacity development program for the energy sector on the energy efficient operation and maintenance of RE based power generation systems. Currently, there are a number of business entities that provide small scale engineering, repair and maintenance services to the energy sector, and mainly to the commercial/residential sector. These are also among the intended beneficiaries of the capacity development program. This has been revised (Component 1, Activity 3c) to include these business entities in the capacity development program on energy services business model and technical capacity for the provision of services in the design, engineering, installation, energy efficient operation and maintenance of RE systems for electricity and nonelectricity applications.</p> <p>It is not clear what footnote is being referred to. It is assumed that these are footnotes (which are mainly supplementary information) on the</p>

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>many discussion of barriers and issues in the footnote, but some are very important information for this project and should be discussed in the main body.</p> <p>MO August 10, 2015 Comments cleared.</p>	<p>paragraphs on barriers. Nonetheless, the sub section on barriers have been revised to incorporate accordingly these footnotes.</p>
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>MO July 31, 2015 Yes. The project will enhance deployment of renewable and energy efficiency technologies.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>MO July 31, 2015</p> <p>1) Please revise the activities of component 1. We understand that any awareness raising activity should result in the change of behavior, and it should be supported by practical tools and schemes available for the public. This project will develop policy and test technology pilots and financial schemes. Once they are operationalized and can be replicated in nationwide, then the information should become available for the public to encourage their behavior change. However, current component 1 describe very general information, which will not result in fruitful outcome.</p> <p>2) Please merge component 2, 3 and activities (1) and (2) of component 4). Policy and institution cannot be developed separately. The</p>	<p>The items shown in Table B for all project components are outputs, not activities. The indicative activities for each component are presented in Part II, Sec. 1.3. For Component 1, the project proponents agree to the comment that awareness raising activities should result in the change of behavior. To avoid falling into the same unsuccessful results of previous capacity development efforts, the proposed program will focus on specific stakeholders that will play key roles in developing, implementing, operating and sustaining low carbon initiatives (e.g., EE and/or RE) in the country. The Component 1 outputs and activities have been revised in line with the reviewer's suggestion to ensure the realization of improved awareness and attitude towards renewable energy and energy efficiency applications in the energy and energy end use sectors in the</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>issue of "who do what and how" should be developed in the integrated manner. The activities (1) and (2) of component 4 seems to cover nationwide technologies, and if so, they also should be discussed in relation to national policies, plans and institutions.</p> <p>3) Please clarify the current project target of 273,300 tons CO2 reduced will be directly and/or indirectly achieved.</p> <p>4) Please include knowledge management activity to learn from other relevant projects in other SIDS.</p> <p>MO August 10, 2015 Comments 1), 2) and 4) are cleared. On GEBs, 273,300 tons CO2 reduction is calculated according to the national target, and is indirectly achieved, as it includes both contribution of this proposal as well as other initiatives. Please estimate the GEBs directly achieved by the investment planned in this project.</p> <p>MO August 13 2015 Comment cleared.</p>	<p>country.</p> <p>Trivial as it may, but the reason for grouping the activities addressing institutional barriers and policy/regulatory barriers into 2 separate components is mainly for ease of implementation. Nonetheless, it makes sense that the 2 components be merge since the resolution of these 2 types of barriers go hand in hand. Hence, following the reviewer's suggestion Components 2 and 3 have been merge to address policy/regulatory and institutional barriers in an integrated manner.</p> <p>It is however not clear why Activities 1 & 2 of the original Component 4 have to be included in the now combined Components 2 & 3. These 2 activities are mainly for identification and selection of applicable low carbon development technologies (EE/RE) that will be demonstrated under the project; and for the design and planning of the application demonstrations of the selected EE/RE technologies. While the results and data/information generated from these 2 activities, and the results of the implementation of the selected EE/RE technology demonstrations can definitely be used as references for energy technology policy making, these 2 activities are not specifically designed</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>for energy policy and planning work. These 2 activities are among the activities that are meant to address technical barriers, in general, and for the design of the EE/RE technology demonstrations, in particular.</p> <p>The estimated CO2 emission reductions are mainly based on achieving the country's target of 100% RE electricity generation by 2020, and sustaining that target level throughout the lifetime of the installed RE systems during the GEF project implementation. Based on the forecast annual % RE electricity in the country, and the current energy performance of diesel based power generation, it is expected that by 2020, the cumulative CO2 emission reduction (due to the annual reduction in dieselbased power generation) would be about 13,665 tons. Considering the average lifetime of the installed RE based power generation systems (mainly solar PV, with some biogas/biomass energy based, and wind energy based) the estimated lifetime CO2 emission reduction would 273,300 tons. This conservative amount does not include indirect CO2 emission reductions from EE initiatives in the energy end use sectors that not only save electricity and fossil fuel, but also reduce the grid electricity demand.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>Part II, Sec. 7 has been revised to include uptake of lessons learned and best practices on low carbon development and EE/RE technologies from other Pacific Island Countries (PICs) and SIDS, as well as sharing of project results to other PICs and SIDS.</p> <p>As previously described, by 2020, the cumulative CO2 emission reduction (due to the annual reduction in diesel-based power generation) would be about 13,665 tons. Considering the anticipated baseline activities that can be subsumed into the proposed project and the estimated incremental activities that will be funded by the project, it is estimated that about 40% of the cumulative CO2 emission reductions can be attributable to the project. This would be about 5,446 tons. Considering the average lifetime of the RE-based power generation systems that will be installed with the support of the GEF project, the estimated lifetime CO2 emission reduction would be about 109,300 tons.</p>
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MO July 31, 2015 Yes.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	MO July 31, 2015	In regards to the table in Part I, Sec. D,

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Yes. STAR allocation of \$3 million is available for climate change focal area.</p> <p>Please clarify Agency Fee, and please produce appropriate Table D. The endorsement letter shows agency fee of \$260, 275, but PIF shows only \$9,500 in the table E.</p> <p>MO August 10 2015. Agency fee is \$250,774 in the first section of PIF, and \$250,775 in the Table D. Project cost is \$2,639,725 (as in the letter from OFP) and maximum agency fee is \$250,773.875 (= \$250,774, up to 9.5%). Please revise.</p> <p>MO August 13 2015 Comment cleared.</p>	<p>there was this note "No need to fill this table if it is a single Agency, single Trust Fund, single focal area and single country project." in the PIF template. Since the project is only for Tuvalu, with UNDP as GEF Agency, and is only seeking for GEFTF funds for a Climate Change project, we don't fill up the table. Anyway, the filled-in table has now been included in the revised PIF. The Agency Fee for the project proper is US\$ 250,775 (Part I: Project Information; Part I, Sec. D), while for the PPG, it is US\$ 9,500 (Part I, Sec. E). Hence, the total Agency Fee is US\$ 260,275.</p> <p>The stated Agency Fee in the table in Part I, Sec. D has been changed to US\$ 250,774.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 	NA	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	MO July 31, 2015 Not at this time. Please address comments in box 3, 5 and 7.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		MO August 10, 2015 Not at this time. Please address comments in box 1, 5 and 7. MO August 13 2015 All comments cleared. The program manager recommends CEO PIF clearance.	
Review Date	Review	July 31, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 10, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 13, 2015	

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?	MO April 20 2017 Output 3.1.3 and 4.2.2 are newly added. Please provide justification. MO June 7, 2017 Comment cleared.	Output 3.1.3 (Successful demonstration of approved EE and RE technologies that promote and support LC development in the country and comparative evaluation report from monitoring of other existing RE/EE installations) was added in view of the need to showcase practical RE and EE technologies and experiences learned in similar small island developing states (SIDS) that could be

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>applicable to Tuvalu. This is based on the results of the study on possible RE/EE projects that was done during the PPG exercise (see Annex L of ProDoc). Since the selected RE/EE technologies that will be demonstrated under the proposed GEF project have been applied and found feasible elsewhere, the activities that are designed to deliver Output 3.1.3 focus mainly on ensuring the successful demonstration through systematic M&E on performance, maintenance and energy production. Output 3.1.3 will feed primarily into the activities that will deliver Outputs 2.5 and 2.6 on support policy development and enforcement, and in the preparation of plans (Output 2.7) for the follow-up actions, i.e., replication and/or scale-up) for the featured demonstrations.</p> <p>Output 4.2.2 (Developed and recommended financing schemes for implementation and capitalization by the GoT and/or private sector financial institutions) was included among the outputs under Component 4 to ensure the realization of Outcome 4.2, which expects that the GoT, the financial sector and donor agencies providing accessible financing for climate resilient renewable energy and energy efficiency projects. Although there are already existing financing programs that are under implementation in the country, there are none that caters to the provision of financial support to consumers in implementing RE/EE projects, such as for the purchase and installation of</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			RET equipment (e.g., solar home systems) and EE appliances (e.g., refrigerators/freezers).
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>MO April 20 2017</p> <p>(1) Page 19 discusses that some of implemented RE system are non-operational and lack real private sector participation. Please explain if the lessons of these consequences will be used in this project.</p> <p>(2) Activity 1.3.2: Please explain why secondary school students are key stakeholder. If not please delete this activity and use financing for other outputs.</p> <p>(3) Output 1.1 and 1.2: it is understood that gap analysis ("areas lacking to achieve the goal" under i.1) will be implemented in 1.2. Please avoid overlap.</p> <p>(4) Output 1.5 and 1,7: as RE and EE activities are expected to growth, updating information and data system should be continued after the closure of the project, otherwise old data will become quickly useless. Please explain how it will be institutionalized and operated by which institution.</p> <p>(5) Activity 2.1 and 2.4.1: Please explain the relation of these studies.</p> <p>(6) Output 2.2 and 2.5: please explain the relation between these two outputs.</p>	<p>(1)</p> <p>The lessons learned and experiences gained in the installation and operation of previous RE-based energy system projects in the country are regarded very important and were used in the design of the relevant project activities. The reasons behind these problems have been evaluated and were taken into account in the design of the relevant project activities particularly those that address the technical, financial and institutional barriers. The identification, selection and preliminary design of the demonstrations also took into account these lessons learned to avoid running into the same problems. Best practices from the previous projects were also considered in the project interventions to ensure that these are adequately applied and promoted. The continuous knowledge management of lessons learned from the ongoing RE-based energy system projects will be done under the project through Activity 1.5.2: Updating of information on EE & RE technology applications in island communities and results of project activities. As stated in the ProDoc, this will involve gathering lessons learned and best practices from these projects in Tuvalu and compare them with similar RE/EE projects in other PICs. The information gathered and analyzed will be considered in the final design of the demonstrations and replication projects.</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>(7) Output 2.7: please explain what is the Energy Act, or if this means the Energy Bill.</p> <p>(8) Activity 3.1.5 and 3.1.6.2: Please explain how these two activities on technical aspects will be coordinated.</p> <p>(9) Component 4: In the PIF it is understood that output 4.2 will operationalize the financial scheme developed under 4.2, however proposed activity 4.2.1 will develop different scheme. Please explain the strategy of Component 4.</p> <p>(10) Output 4.1.2: page 41 discusses that there are many financial mechanisms available. Please explain why still capacity building for financing sectors are needed.</p> <p>(11) Output 3.1.3: it will implement activities on monitoring and evaluation, but it is not reflected in the output title. Please revise.</p> <p>MO June 7, 2017 Comments cleared.</p>	<p>(2) As stated in the ProDoc, in Activity 1.3.2, the secondary school students will be mobilized, in recognition of the important role of the schools in realizing the information dissemination and awareness enhancement aims of the project. This activity will: (a) provide high school students with a variety of projects to broaden their knowledge of science, in particular renewable energy, and the scientific method; (b) facilitate development of applicable renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies and practices; and, (c) disseminate information about advances related science and engineering, and transfers knowledge and innovations to address the nation's energy and environmental goals.</p> <p>(3) Output 1.1: Report on impact analysis of previous EE/RE capacity development activities is a completed analysis of the impacts or effects (short, medium, long-term) to the country (people, government, sectors, etc.) of previous EE/RE capacity development activities in Tuvalu. This reports on what happened, which can be gleaned now, and the forecast of what will happen in the next 3 to 5 years, from the previous related activities. Output 1.2: Completed capacity needs assessment in the area of EE/RE applications is a completed analysis of the present and future capacity (technical, financial, human, etc.)</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>needs of the country in the application of EE/RE technologies. Hence the two outputs are closely linked and but each have specific coverage. Hence, there is no overlap. Output 1.1 is based on results of past activities while Output 1.2 focuses on things that are yet to be done and anticipates that the lessons learned in past capacity development activities are captured and made as basis for the assessment of capacity of program participants that will be useful for the facilitative work of FASNETT regarding RE/EE technology applications.</p> <p>(4) With the increase in information and awareness on RE/EE technologies in line with activities to produce Output 1.5 and 1.7 and need for them in support of the program, these initiatives will be continued to be operated and maintained even after the completion of the FASNETT Project. This is precisely the purpose of Output 1.6: Establishment and operationalization of an information exchange network and website on RE/EE within and outside Tuvalu, which will be operated and maintained by ED/MPUI as part of sustainability plan and post-project arrangement which will be further reinforced in Component 2, particularly by Output 2.7 which looks beyond the project as part of regular government function.</p> <p>(5) The studies in Activity 2.1 (research, analysis and assessment) are on policies on low carbon</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>community development, as well as institutional mechanisms applicable to Tuvalu. These are studies considering experiences in successful implementation and lessons learned in other similar small island developing states (SIDS) and their impacts (social, economic and environmental). Those in Activity 2.4.1 are on the improvement of the institutional working arrangements and implementing guidelines for NEAC. These 2 activities have different scopes. Institutional mechanisms referred to in Activity 2.1 are from other countries (particularly SIDS) that may be applicable to Tuvalu. Based on the findings, specific recommendations will then be adopted as applicable to the National Energy Advisory Council (NEAC) needs and dealt with at the working level.</p> <p>(6) Output 2.2 are recommended standards, policies and implementing rules and regulations (IRRs) while Output 2.5 are on the adopted and enforced standards, policies and IRRs. The former will require activities involving the formulation of policies, standards and IRRs; while the latter will require activities that are aimed towards promotion, lobbying and advocacy to have the recommended standards, policies and IRRs approved and enforced. Hence, the two outputs are step-wise and closely linked.</p> <p>(7)</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>Output 2.7 is the Energy Act. It is hoped that the Energy Bill will have been approved and enacted as the Energy Act by the Parliament within the first two years of the FASNETT Project. The Energy Act, which is the basis of the organizational structure, implementing rules and policies, is one of the major outputs of FASNETT. It is crucial to the facilitation work that will be done by FASNETT to achieve the 100% RE electricity generation by 2025.</p> <p>(8) The technical information packages and guidelines based on RE/EE project implementation experience that will be used in the capacity development program as inputs to the implementation of training workshops on strategic planning and execution of plans In Component 2 for national government authorities and local leaders for Activity 3.1.5 at the project level. Coordination mechanisms will be established in producing and sharing such information and training materials that will incorporate technical data and experience in the operation and maintenance of the RE/EE project demonstrations in collaboration with the demo hosts, technology suppliers, technical consultants and end-users involved with the duration of the project implementation. The PMO will lead and coordinate the gathering of technical data through the approved M&E procedures and related technical energy performance evaluation and operational</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>matters. On the other hand, in Activity 3.1.6.2, the technical data and operation experience gathered by the project will be further analyzed and consolidated to be treated at the program level for longer term policy development, sustainability and replication purposes. For this, the coordination will be led by the ED/MPUI in collaboration with representatives from the other relevant institutions, agencies and stakeholders.</p> <p>(9) In line with the strategy of enhanced utilization of feasible RE resources and optimal and efficient utilization of energy for supporting of socio-economic development, the new Output 4.2.1: Established and operational low carbon technology application support program, will provide an active technology support program for low carbon (LC) investments of financing scheme applicants. Among the financial barriers are the very limited initiatives by the general public and the private sector to implement RE and EE projects; and, limited knowledge of planning, designing, financing and implementing the development and implementation of RE and EE (or even the practice of EE) among the general public." The general public is faced with challenges in the identification and development of RE/EE projects particularly in making them bankable. If ever submitted, they could hardly or not pass at all the scrutiny of the financial institutions of the country (primarily the DBT) that have</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>natural risk-averse attitude for capital intensive, generally small scale and unattractive proposals. This is the reason for a technology support program such as Output 4.2.1. This output is primarily linked and feed into Output 4.2.2: Developed and recommended financing schemes for implementation and capitalization by the GoT and/or private sector financial institutions. The developed financing scheme may not be different from what are already in-place and operational in the financial sector of the country but can also be improvements/expansions of existing schemes. This will depend on the findings from the comprehensive needs assessment and considering the breadth and length of experience for example by the DBT from its own past and ongoing financing windows. The new or enhanced schemes will be formulated in the light of the new situation being addressed by FASNETT as the funding of RE/EE projects in the country transforms from the usual donor-financing to other more sustainable market-based financing of RE/EE projects.</p> <p>In a nutshell, the strategy in Component 4 to address the barriers related to the lack of access and available financing for low carbon development initiatives in Tuvalu is to enhance the availability of, and access to, financing for climate resilient RE and EE projects in the country, and for the government, financial sector, and to some extent, the donor agencies in providing accessible financing for such</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>projects.</p> <p>(10) Output 4.1.2 is dependent on the technology support program (Output 4.2.1) and the financial scheme to be adopted and promoted by the project (Output 4.2.2). Output 4.1.2 is the completed capacity development for the financial sector specific to the introduction and operationalization of the adopted and promoted financial scheme as suited to the promotion and replication of RE/EE technology applications in Tuvalu. This is to ensure that the promoted financing scheme is properly and correctly implemented to contribute to the realization of Outcome 4.</p> <p>(11) The title of the new added Output 3.1.3 (as per the responses to comments under Question 1) is: Successful demonstration of approved EE and RE technologies that promote and support LC development in the country and comparative evaluation report from monitoring of other existing RE/EE installations. This mentions "monitoring" and "evaluation".</p>
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	<p>MO April 20 2017 Please provide response to the following comments on the Project Results framework: (1) Please explain why Outcome 1 expects increase of only 14 houses, schools etc. comparing with the baseline which will use low carbon</p>	<p>(1) The above target value provided is based on conservative estimates since the country does not have yet any policy or regulation for household, schools and commercial establishments to use low carbon technologies. Among the major outputs of the project are developed, recommended, approved and</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>technologies. (2) Please explain why only 2 companies will adopt the established standard under Outcome 3. (3) Please explain which 2 private sectors are expected to be financed by commercial banks under Outcome 4.</p> <p>MO June 7, 2017 Comments cleared.</p>	<p>enforced policies and incentives; as well as necessary legislation and implementing rules and regulations.</p> <p>(2) At present, there are only two registered electrical contractors in the country and it may take some time to convert these two contractors to take on and comply with RE & EE system equipment standards. Based on conservative estimates, the PDT considered these two companies as potential targets. The target 2 companies by end-of-project can be one of these existing electrical contractors and an anticipated RE & EE company that will be established under the new Energy Act.</p> <p>(3) The two private sector companies targeted by the project's financing are also the two companies targeted for adopting the RE & EE standards as mentioned above in Comment 3-2. Nevertheless, the PDT anticipates that more RE/EE projects by private sector companies will be financed by commercial banks, because of new incentives provided by the new energy policies and regulations.</p>
	<p>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)</p>	<p>MO April 20 2017 The project will demonstrate biomass energy. Please explain if increase demand of biomass may cause perverse incentive and if appropriate measures will be taken.</p>	<p>As discussed in Part III: Strategy, there is no proposed demonstration on biomass energy to be funded by the FASNETT project. Nevertheless, biomass, biogas, improved cook stoves, bio-diesel and other bio-energy systems that have already been demonstrated and found practical for PICs and also for Tuvalu and</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		MO June 7, 2017 Comment cleared.	<p>which offer fuel substitution possibilities in heating applications and electricity generation to bring down petroleum-based electricity demand are encouraged by the project for commercial adoption. Hence, based on the results of the PPG study summarized in Annex L of the ProDoc, the proposed energy mix will be composed of the following: solar PV Installations, wind energy farms, battery storage and back-up biodiesel generators (which are already being used in TEC plants). Some of the project funds have been allotted for the demonstration of floating solar PV generation and off-grid solar box. Electricity from biomass combustion would have possibly been a preferred option, since it is a relatively easy technology to scale up or down and it is a reliable controllable electricity generation technology. However, the limited land area of Funafuti, where about 85% of the electricity is consumed, makes difficult to cultivate most of the fast-growing trees on a scale sufficient to meet their needs. The likelihood of using selected waste such as landscaping, kitchen and manure in any possible combination has also been explored. But Tuvalu seems to be already in a vicious cycle where kitchen waste is fed to pigs, while pig waste is used as fertilizer. The lack of large amounts of waste only allows some small biogas applications.</p>
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	MO April 20 2017 Yes.	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	MO April 20 2017 Yes.	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	MO April 20 2017 Yes.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	MO April 20 2017 Yes.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	MO April 20 2017 Yes.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	MO April 20 2017 Yes.	
	• STAP	MO April 20 2017 Yes.	
	• GEF Council	MO April 20 2017 (1) On INDC, we understand that Tuvalu already submitted INDC. Please explain what is the meaning to discuss that "Tuvalu is in the process of preparing its INDC". Also the response discuss that PPG exercise will identify and design	The statement "Tuvalu is in the process of preparing its INDC" is part of the Responses to GEF Council Member (Germany) Comments on 13 October 2015. At that time, the country's INDC was not yet submitted to the UNFCCC. The INDC was submitted in November 2015. The country signed and ratified the Paris Agreement on 22 April 2016, and in that regard

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.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>activities to realize the %RE target. Please explain what is the result of PPG to respond this comment.</p> <p>MO June 6, 2017 (1) Comment cleared. (2) Please add "After PPG stage" responses, if any, for other two comments in the project document to clarify that preparation works have considered and responded the comments.</p> <p>MO June 15, 2017 Comment cleared.</p>	<p>the INDC is now the country's NDC. During the PPG exercise, the activities that will facilitate the achievement of the country's %RE electricity target were designed. The detailed description of the project components (inclusive of the activities that will be carried out to deliver the outputs that will contribute to the realization of the component outcome) represent the results of the PPG activities that developed the FASNETT project, with the overall objective of developing and using feasible renewable energy resources and application of energy efficiency technologies for achieving realistic energy targets in Tuvalu, inclusive of the %RE electricity target. In addition, Annex L in the ProDoc presents the results of the PPG Study on possible RE/EE projects to be covered by the FASNETT Project for commercial adoption or for demonstration.</p> <p>It appears that the comment refers to those in the Responses to GEF Council Member (Germany) Comments (dated 13 October 2015). This is in the CEO Endorsement Request (Annex B) not in the Project Document. The responses without "After PPG Stage" are responses to the council member comments/questions that seek clarification. Only those responses to comments/questions that state that follow-up work will be done during the PPG stage, have "After PPG Stage" responses.</p> <p>Nonetheless, per the reviewer's suggestion,</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			"After PPG Stage" response have been added to each previous response to the clarification comments/questions. Refer to CEO Endorsement Request (Annex B pp. 21-22).
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat 	NA	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	<p>MO April 20 2017 Not at this time. Please address comments in box 1-4 and 11.</p> <p>MO June 7, 2017 Not at this time. Please address comment in box 11.</p> <p>MO June 15, 2017 All comments cleared. Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement.</p>	
Review Date	Review	April 20, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	June 07, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	June 15, 2017	