

GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS¹

Country/Region: Sierra Leone
 Project Title: Sierra Leone: SPWA-CC Promoting Mini Grids Based on Small Hydropower for Productive Uses in Sierra Leone
 GEFSEC Project ID: **3937**
 GEF Agency Project ID: _____ GEF Agency: UNIDO
 GEF Focal Area (s): Climate Change
 GEF-4 Strategic Program (s): CC-3;
 Anticipated Project Financing (\$): PPG:\$0 GEF Project Allocation:\$1,758,182 Co-financing:\$3,940,000 Total Project Cost:\$5,698,182
 PIF Approval Date: April 24, 2009 Anticipated Work Program Inclusion: June 30, 2009
 Program Manager: Dimitrios Zevgolis GEF Agency Contact Person: Mr. Dmitri Piskounov

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion ²	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes, Sierra Leone signed the Climate Change Convention on 11 February 1993.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, by letter on 9 February 2009.	
	3. Which GEF Strategic Objective/ Program does the project fit into?	It fits into the Strategic Program in Promoting Market Approaches for Renewable Energy.	
	4. Does the Agency have a comparative advantage for the project?	This is a TA/investment project and UNIDO has a comparative advantage for TA/Capacity Building interventions for market approaches for renewable energy.	
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed GEF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available for (if appropriate):		
	• The RAF allocation?	Yes, Sierra Leone is a country in the group and cannot access more than US\$3.50m in GEF4. So far no other CC project in the country during GEF4 has been approved.	
	• The focal areas?	Yes.	
	• Strategic objectives?	N/A	

¹ Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. Please do not answer if the field is blocked with gray.

² Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of PIF of FSPs will simultaneously be considered for WPI. For MSPs, once the PIF is approved by CEO, next step will be to continue project preparation until the project is ready for CEO approval.

	• Strategic program?	N/A	
Project Design	6. Will the project deliver tangible global environmental benefits?	The project will deliver direct benefits linked with the implementation of a 2MW small-hydro plant. Also it will have indirect benefits due to its replication effect.	
	7. Is the global environmental benefit measurable?		
	8. Is the project design sound, its framework consistent & sufficiently clear (in particular for the outputs)?	The project consists of an investment component and 3 TA components. The outputs of these components concern the building of capacity in the country for the development of SHP mini-grids and the demonstration of an application of this technology.	Please take care that the GEF funding is linked to investments with global environment benefits.
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national priorities and policies?	Yes, it is consistent with medium-term energy plan drawn by the government.	
	10. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, the project is consistent with other RE-based mini-grids projects proposed for other countries in West Africa, and it will liaise with these specific activities under the coordination mechanism of the GEF Programmatic Approach for West Africa led by UNIDO.	
	11. Is the proposed project likely to be cost-effective?	As long as the project will catalyze the development of SHP plants in the country, then it will be cost-effective.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated in project design?		
	13. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF?		
	14. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and includes sufficient risk mitigation measures?	Yes, major risks are identified and the project design is adapted to them.	
Justification for GEF Grant	15. Is the value-added of GEF involvement in the project clearly demonstrated through incremental	GEF involvement will facilitate the demonstration of the small hydropower technology in the rural areas of the country	

	reasoning?	and it will address the barriers to more widespread use of it.	
	16.How would the proposed project outcomes and global environmental benefits be affected if GEF does not invest?		
	17.Is the GEF funding level of project management budget appropriate?	PM GEF funding is equal to 8.5% of the total GEF funding, and 30% of the total PM budget.	
	18.Is the GEF funding level of other cost items (consultants, travel, etc.) appropriate?		
	19.Is the indicative co-financing adequate for the project?	It seems adequate for a 2MW small-hydro plant and mini-grid. A detailed financial plan with confirmed co-financing from all sources is expected at the CEO endorsement stage.	
	20.Are the confirmed co-financing amounts adequate for each project component?		
	21.Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Secretariat's Response to various comments from:	STAP		
	Convention Secretariat		
	Agencies' response to GEFSEC comments		
	Agencies' response to Council comments		
Secretariat Decisions			
Recommendations at PIF	22. Is PIF clearance being recommended?	PIF clearance is recommended.	
	23.Items worth noting at CEO Endorsement.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement	24. Is CEO Endorsement being recommended?		

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	Yes.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	The budget per activity is rational.
	3. Is the consultant cost reasonable?	Yes.
Recommendation	4. Is PPG being recommended?	PPG is recommended.
Other comments		