

Updated 11th September 2018

Panel of Expert considerations on the applications in the seventh cycle

IRENA carries out its project screening and recommendation process through two bodies: a strategic Advisory Committee, appointed annually by the IRENA Assembly, and an independent Panel of Experts established by the Committee.

This document provides the evaluation criteria for both the Executive Project Summary stage and the Full Project Proposal stage that are used by the Panel of Experts when reviewing the applicant submissions.

Overall helpful hints

- ✓ **Clear and simple presentation** of your project proposal. Explain in as simple terms as possible exactly what your project is, its objective and structure. For example, provide relevant technical details, energy produced, grid-connection, engagement of end-users and potential sustainable development impacts. **Ensure consistency** in your application on figures and structure of your project.
- ✓ **Tried and tested technologies are supported** through the Facility. Therefore, there needs to be a certain technical maturity to the project. The Facility is focused to facilitate the implementation of projects with an impact on energy access, CO₂ emissions, social and environmental factors.
- ✓ **Management team needs to indicate relevant experience/track record/references** and identification of important stakeholders and approaches to ensure the project will be taken to implementation. There needs to be institutional support and a commitment from the local authorities, for example, beforehand to maximize the chances of completion. (Note that as ADFD requires a government guarantee be provided by the entity involved in international borrowing affairs for the host country, the profile of applicants tends to mostly be public or semi-public institutions that are looking for funds. The private sector can apply but must be able to obtain a government guarantee.)
- ✓ **The structuring of the rest of the co-funding needs to be clarified.** It is important to raise the co-funding for the total project costs not covered by the ADFD loan i.e. the other 50% or more before or during the application process. Evidence of co-financing efforts needs to be provided in the application. (If this funding is not secured from national government funding, applicants could reach out to the local offices of development institutions in the country.)
- ✓ **Important to have well-defined feasibility study particularly at the second Full Project Proposal stage but this can also be provided at the Executive Project Summary stage.** Projects need to be sufficiently technically and financially feasible. The project needs to be extremely well elaborated and very concrete – location, technology, prices, business model, potential partners, expected results, management of the implementation in all phases, key milestones. Experienced consultants/institutions can be approached. Experts recommend to have first discussions with the private sector to extract as much information as possible on costs etc., having in mind that anyway there will be a tender to select the consultant and companies responsible to provide the equipment or to provide a turnkey solution. (ADFD [post selection](#) stages and [feasibility study requirements](#) are available on the website.)

Updated 11th September 2018

Expert evaluation rubric

A. On each expert consideration **statement** corresponding to the questions posed in the Executive Project Summary and Full Project Proposal application forms, the experts agree or disagree according to the following likert scale and comment on and justify their decision.

Strongly disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

B. On the **OVERALL** section at the end of each of three sections of the application forms (Technical merit, Economic/financial viability, Socio-economic and environmental impacts), the experts use the scoring guidelines below and justify this scoring. This is multiplied by the weighting for each section to derive the overall score for each project.

Score	Description
5	Excellent and thorough understanding of issues, experience and capability to deliver effectively.
4	Understanding of issues, good level of experience, capability to deliver.
3	Understanding of issues but limited experience and capability to meet all delivery requirements.
2	Insufficient understanding of issues, low level of relevant experience and capability to deliver.
1	Poor understanding of issues, inadequate demonstrations of relevant experience and capability to deliver.
0	Complete failure to understand issues or demonstrate capability to deliver.

Executive Project Summary stage statements made

Technical merit (40% weighting)

1. Project objectives and structure are well articulated, identified and appropriate.
2. Technology used is applicable and suitable for location and market.
3. The output (e.g. MWh/year) for the technology type in this project is reasonable given the amount of loan requested.
4. Technical design is the best setup to utilize the renewable resources available.
 Technical design provides most benefit to the local community.
 Technical design is potentially replicable or scalable. (Note: replicable or scalable means the project shows an effective, efficient model for the given technologies that can be replicated or scaled up, and/or involves a solid and tested approach.)
5. Management approach is suitable to ensure project success. (Note: management approach includes level of experience of management, monitoring and evaluation plan for successful operations.)
6. Technical and management risks adequately taken into account.

Updated 11th September 2018

OVERALL: The project is technically feasible.

Explain the main strengths and weaknesses of the project from a technical perspective.

Economic/financial viability (30% weighting)

7. Project costs estimated and broken down appropriately.
Project is cost-effective in relation to the projected outputs and benefits.
8. Revenue plan is adequate to ensure the economic sustainability of the project.
9. Economic/financial risks adequately taken into account.
10. Business model is innovative.
Business model is potentially transformative, replicable or scalable. (Note: transformative means is expected to have a significant positive impact beyond the project itself on the energy landscape, society, environment and/or business situation. Replicable or scalable means the project shows an effective, efficient business model for the given technologies that can be replicated or scaled up, and/or involves a solid and tested approach.)

OVERALL: The project is economically/financially feasible.

Explain the main strengths and weaknesses of the project from an economic and/or financial perspective.

Socio-economic and environmental impacts (30% weighting)

11. The project is aligned with national socio-economic development priorities.
12. Stakeholder engagement is appropriate to ensure success of project and sustainable development.
13. Socio-economic and environmental risks adequately taken into account.
14. Project improves access to energy.
Project reduces reliance on non-renewable energy resources.
Project provides economic benefits. (Note: economic benefits include savings on fossil fuel costs, job creation, income generation.)
Project is environmentally beneficial. (Note: reduced deforestation and emissions, reduction in particulates, waste management, water conservation.)
Project provides social benefits. (Note: social benefits include improvements in health, education and gender empowerment.)
Socio-economic and environmental impacts are potentially transformative. (Note: transformative means is expected to have a significant positive impact beyond project itself on the energy landscape, society, environment and/or business situation.)

OVERALL: The project has provided a clear brief on socio-economic and environmental impacts and improves energy access and energy security.

Explain the main strengths and weaknesses of the project from a socio-economic and environmental perspective.

Full Project Proposal stage statements made

Technical merit (40% weighting)

1. The technology is appropriately defined and is suitable for the project location and market.
2. The list of components for the technology in this project is adequate.
The specifications for the list of components in this project are adequate.
3. The specific project site location coordinates appear appropriate.
4. Land acquisition plans and/or other plans are adequate for this type of project.
5. The estimated amount of renewable resource available in this project is reasonable and is adequately measured.
6. The project implementation plan is adequate (reasonable planned start and finish dates for project activities).
7. The risks reported are all the risks that can be expected in this project. The mitigation measures for the reported risks in this project are adequate.
8. The technical KPI's given are adequate for this project (all significant KPI's are listed). The target values for the given technical KPI's are suitable for this project.
9. The full feasibility study provided meets the ADFD requirements.
10. The capability and/or experience reported for this organisation is adequate to deliver on this project effectively.
11. The management capabilities reported for this project are adequate to ensure project success. (Level of experience/qualifications for the project management team and capability to successfully complete the project.)
12. The monitoring, reporting and evaluation plan for this project is adequate.

OVERALL: The project is technically feasible.
--

Explain the main strengths and weaknesses of the project from a technical perspective. (Does it have appropriate technology specifications? Is there a reasonable resource assessment? Is it managed by competent project managers and team for successful project completion? Is it potentially transformative or replicable?)

(Note: transformative means is expected to have a significant positive impact beyond the project itself on the energy landscape, society, environment and/or business situation. Replicable or scalable means the project shows an effective, efficient business model for the given technologies that can be replicated or scaled up, and/or involves a solid and tested approach.)
--

Economic/financial viability (30% weighting)

13. The levelised cost of energy in this project is reasonable and the full details of the cost items included in the calculation are defined. The method of calculation has been appropriately outlined.
14. The detailed technology costs for this project are adequate.
15. The detailed other project costs are appropriate.
16. The percentage of the total project costs that will be sourced locally for this project is adequate.
17. The economic/financial model for this project is detailed and suitable enough.

Updated 11th September 2018

18. The EIRR or IRR for this type of project is reasonable.
19. The offtake agreement/revenue sources for this project are adequate.
20. The status of co-finance for this project is reasonable.
21. The debt to equity ratio in this project is adequate.
22. The cost of the debt portion of the leveraged finance in this project is reasonable.

OVERALL: The project is economically/financially feasible.

Explain the main strengths and weaknesses of the project from an economic and/or financial feasibility perspective. (Is it an adequate economic model? Are the project costs too high and does the business model provide enough revenues for the sustainability of the project? Does the project have an innovative business model?)

Socio-economic and environmental impacts (30% weighting)

23. The level of stakeholder engagement in this project in sustainability aspects (i.e. economic, environmental and social) is appropriate. This point may be captured in the KPI table in the following sections.
24. The socio-economic and environmental KPIs given are adequate for this project (all significant KPIs are listed). The target values for the given socio-economic and environmental KPIs are suitable for this project. Monitoring methods used are appropriate for this project.

OVERALL: The project has very positive socio-economic and environmental impacts and improves energy access and energy security.

Explain the main strengths and weaknesses of the project from a socio-economic and environmental perspective. (Are there environmental issues with the design? Will the project significantly improve well-being? Is the project potentially transformative, replicable and/or scalable and will it also improve energy access and address energy security?)

Any questions email adfd@irena.org

END