



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5431		
Country/Region:	Benin		
Project Title:	Strengthening the Resilience of the Energy Sector in Benin to the Impacts of Climate Change		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4979 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-2; CCA-1; CCA-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$8,000,000
Co-financing:	\$30,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$38,200,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Saliha Dobardzic	Agency Contact Person:	Henry Rene Diouf

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	Yes, Benin is eligible.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, the letter from the OFP, dated 02/05/13 is on file.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Yes, the amount requested is available to Benin under the equitable access principle for the LDCF.	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Update 7/18: The amount requested now exceeds the funding remaining for Benin under the equitable access principle.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	Yes, it is aligned with the results framework, namely objectives CCA-1, CCA-2, and CCA-3.	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	Yes, the project is consistent with the NAPA, which refers to the energy sector as a top priority.	
	<p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>Yes, the baseline projects include</p> <p>They are adequately described, including the problems that they seek to address.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>Yes, the components, outcomes and outputs are clear. The components include mainstreaming adaptation to climate change into energy policies, management, planning, strategies, and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		tools; sustainable land and forest management practices for strengthening the climate resilience of the zones supplying wood for energy; and energy use and production technology transfer to strengthen the resilience of vulnerable communities.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes, the adaptation benefits include tools to better assess and manage the policy side of the energy sector concerning its current vulnerabilities to climate change; sustainable land and forest management for wood fuel-producing areas which are under additional stress, such as bushfires, exacerbated by climate change; transfer of technologies that would reduce the pressure on the wood energy sources, and thus decrease dependency on this vulnerable resource, by improving efficiency of its use through improved charcoal and wood cooking stoves, installation of agricultural waste digesters in pilot areas (5 villages), and livestock wastes digester for production of biogas for cooking and lighting.	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		The description of the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions is very clear. However, it is unclear how and whether the delivery of such benefits would support the achievement of additional benefits. For instance, improving livelihoods, including incomes for the vulnerable communities is a desired result. However, what mechanisms are there in place to ensure that the increase in the welfare will not result in an increase in unsustainable consumption (for example, leading to

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>deforestation for energy or non-energy uses), thus undermining the additional benefits gained.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please clarify what measures will be put in place to ensure that an improvement in livelihoods will not have the undesired effect of undermining the additional benefits, particularly in forest management.</p>
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes, the stakeholders and their expected roles are identified, sufficiently for this stage.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Yes, the risks are well-defined.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, the project is well coordinated with a number of related initiatives.	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this 	<p>The project looks at the resilience of the energy sector in an energy-insecure country, and pilots technology transfer in a highly vulnerable region, which is also a producer of biomass. Complementing the baseline initiatives, this project aims to increase resiliency through:</p> <p>(a) Mainstreaming climate change into energy policies and management and planning strategies and tools (Outcome 1), (b) introducing sustainable land and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>based on GEF and Agency experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>forest management practices for strengthening the climate resilience of wood energy supplying areas (Outcome 2), and (c) promoting the transfer of efficient technologies of production and use of wood energy and alternative forms of energy (Outcome 3). The scaling up potential is significant, however, will also depend on access to resilient technology by the vulnerable community which faces a number of barriers.</p>	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	Yes, at \$30 million, of which \$7 million is directly from UNDP, the cofinancing is adequate.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes, at below 5% of the the project component cost, this is acceptable.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>19. <u>At PIF</u>, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u>, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?</p>	<p>Yes, the standard amount is requested and no further justifications are needed at this point.</p>	
	<p>20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>	<p>n/a</p>	
<p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		
	<p>22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		
<p>Agency Responses</p>	<p>23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council? • Other GEF Agencies? 		
<p>Secretariat Recommendation</p>			
<p>Recommendation at PIF Stage</p>	<p>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</p>	<p>Not yet. Please see comment under #9.</p> <p>Update 7/24/2013: No. Please see #3. The project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		CL Update, 2/4/2014: YES, additional resources are now available to process this project for clearance.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*		
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	July 24, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 04, 2014	

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**