### B4 Liberia

#### B4 Liberia – Strategic orientation

EnDev Mano River is covering the small, poor and disaster-stricken countries Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Guinea with very weak energy sectors and pioneering-stage energy markets. EnDev is well aligned with sector policies and focusses on capacity building, sector coordination, policy advice. It has a strong component on energy access monitoring and mapping to inform policy making and planning.

In a context in which the main market segments can be characterised as BoP and vulnerable households, most market interventions are rather early stage, while EnDev is actively testing a number of innovative services, products and business models, but still needs to develop specific strategies to reach scale and increase leverage, while reaching also BoP customers.

Productive use has been targeted so far rather indirectly, as part of ICS or mini-grid support activities and might play a larger role for the TUP. Over 1,000 social institutions have been reached with solar systems so far with plans to double this number for the next project phase. Strong emphasis is given to sustainable operation following a structured approach for clinics and hospitals, which includes standardized maintenance manuals, using the ICT4Renewables App and a hotline for monitoring, maintenance, and repair.

The TUP aims to offer coaching, technical/business/IT training, and networks for so called ‘Power Women’ to boost women participation and careers in the energy sector. An annual business plan competition will identify and support innovative commercial activities especially for rural areas; Power Women are supported at job applications and with internships, while large employers are sensitized on gender biases and discriminating hiring practices.

In sum, EnDev Mano River is testing innovative, even though in terms of quantitative target achievement rather indirect, approaches on sustainability, sector capacity development, and women empowerment, that ask for a qualitative, results-oriented monitoring beyond numbers[[1]](#footnote-1), while the project should look for strategic priorities and entry points to boost market growth and partner leverage.

#### B4 Liberia – General / economic feasibility

**Overall**

* The Proposal is very focused on supporting innovation, training and capacity building for both private and public sector and proposes a BP on clean cooking and electricity and TUP on increasing the employment of women in the energy sector. It will be implemented by GIZ between 2019-2021 for a proposed amount of approx. EUR 4.12 million.
* ROGEP covers 15 ECOWAS and 4 Sahelian Countries. With ROGEP’s board date in April 2019 and likely effectiveness still this year, we recommend that EnDev closely collaborate with the ROGEP team in order to explore synergies. We think that regional collaboration between overlapping EnDev countries and ROGEP countries will become very important.
* It was useful to see how each of the three target markets have similarities but are in very different stages of development. Hopefully, lessons learned will be systematically shared across country teams to help all markets constantly improve.

**General**

* **Broad range of private, donor, and government partners.** We appreciate the broad range of partners EnDev is already working with and will continue to collaborate with in each market and the emphasis on awareness raising and capacity building consistently. We are especially impressed with the role EnDev has played supporting the private sector development in Sierra Leone and the positive outlook on potential in Guinea.

**BP Electricity and ICS:**

* **Focus on increased local expertise**. This proposal does an excellent job of modelling a sustainable approach to the RE sector, whereby EnDev is a trainer of trainers focused on skill building of local professionals and institutionalizing RE curriculum in technical and vocational schools to help jumpstart the RE market. Perhaps this program could lean on best practices from EDF pilots in Mali and Burkina Faso. Also, will course be certified?
* **Support of Existing SI Installations**. Maintaining the SHS’s in social institutions is key for social and economic development of the respective communities. We echo the importance of developing an effective and sustainable Operations and Maintenance approach, especially models that leverage the local community, and we are excited to see the commitment to monitoring and fixing existing systems and maintaining a national hotline to allow for easy reporting.
* **Information Sharing through open source tools.** The commitment to information sharing across stakeholders in nascent markets and cultivation of an open, inclusive culture of data is a fantastic use of EnDev’s experience and reach. This will be an especially powerful tool for sharing information with the government so that they can more effectively leverage their time and resources. The information sharing across the region and not just within each country will also hopefully encourage successful market players to work regionally and across other EnDev countries.
* **Formal connection to financing partners.** It is completely appropriate that given EnDev’s small budget, that the team is focused on training, information sharing, and knowledge management. However, financing will still be an imperative to grow the sector and create an enabling environment for RE. It would be helpful to understand the formal partnerships EnDev has created with financiers to ensure that RE actors are well capitalized to grow the sector.
* **Incubating RE Innovation.** It is exciting that EnDev is testing, promoting, and advising on new RE technologies like e-transport. However, this section is a little unclear on how EnDev funding will be used to support business models – just through advisory services or also through financing to new ideas.

**TUP Power Women:**

* **Focus on increasing women’s employment in RE.** We are very excited to see an entire program component focused on mainstreaming women into the power sector through skill building, scholarship assistance, paid internships, and curriculum and course development.
* **Focus on higher income opportunities.** As the proposal implies, it is not enough just to provide education to women but also to provide mentorship and peer support. We are excited to see this mechanism emphasized along with a focus on helping women into higher earning careers in the RE sector. We are also happy to see that this project will have its own full time EnDev staff to support it.

**Budget:**

* Given the focus of the project on information sharing, knowledge management, and training, costs for program delivery should be relatively low. The recommended budget seems very much in line with the components listed, and, as expected, the majority of spending is on human resources and travel.
* EUR spent per person/SI/SME: EUR 15.48

#### B4 Liberia – Review of gender strategy

**Description**

1. Summary of gender actions, in the context of the overall intervention

This concerns a basic proposal (BP) and a top up proposal (TUP).

The TUP, the Power Women (PW) supports 400 women to pursue careers in RE technologies, through training, education and other support (mentoring, coaching and placing women in companies). Some (100?) female entrepreneurs with will be supported in establishing or expanding a business (the PW award). Other PW women will be placed in 100 mini-grids. There are also interventions to sensitize companies and educational institutions, including the promotion of female role models.

The BP consist of general support (technical support and training, information brokering and networking, advocacy, incubating innovation) to the RE sector in Liberia, Sierra Leone and Guinea. There are no clear gender actions developed within the BP.

EnDev has developed a gender strategy and intends to: 1) understand gender inequalities; 2) mainstream gender; and 3) include women in the RE/ICS workforce. Activities mentioned under this third strategy include featuring women on web portals, encouraging women installers, actively inviting female participants for trainings, paying fees for 50 women in the “Alternative Energies” 3-year vocational training, coordinating internships and placing women in private sector companies. It is not clear whether these activities fall under any of the two proposals submitted.

**Conclusion**

1. Overall conclusion on the gender actions, indicating clearly whether or not to support the proposal

The WP project is highly relevant since women are supported in their strategic interests to get meaningful employment, skills and income, in a sector with a scarcity of women and in need of qualified professionals. The project will also strengthen educational institutions and curricula, sensitize companies and thereby may contribute to strengthening the supportive environment for future female professionals as well.

The BP project although it (vaguely) aims to be gender inclusive, does not have specific interventions to ensure women participate and benefit, thereby having a high risk of not achieving equal benefits for women.

The proposal is written in rather vague terms and it is not easy to analyze the attention to gender issues.

C. Suggested improvements to the proposal to ensure the project is gender responsive

The BP project should mainstream gender and develop specific interventions to ensure women are included as beneficiaries. Most importantly is to conduct gender analysis and to develop interventions based on gaps identified.

**Detailed analysis**

D. Gender analysis of the proposal:

1. Do gender-specific **risks**, sexual and gender-based violence or harmful traditional practices exist that could be reinforced and/or exacerbated by the planned measure? Are measures taken to assess and mitigate risks?

The “Safeguards & Gender Guidelines screening has been thoroughly filled out” but is not shared, therefore risks are not known. No gender risks are described in the proposal and they are not foreseen.

1. How men and women are likely to participate in and **benefit** from proposed interventions?

The TUP, the Power Women (PW) project is focused on women’s empowerment through education / training and other support (mentoring, coaching and placing women in companies) to women so that they can pursue a career in solar or ICS technologies. Women will participate in this project and they will benefit in particular in terms of income, skills, and jobs (as employee or entrepreneur).

As for the other (BP) project, half of the 1450 jobs created will be for women. Social institutions such as hospitals and schools are targeted, which benefit women, as well as street lighting that benefit women in particular. The training and advocacy interventions aim to be gender inclusive (training will be for women and men and advocacy includes gender equality messages).

Beyond this, it is not clear how women participate and benefit. For example, it is stated that (under incubating innovation), “we support business models to generate income with RE, especially for women and young people” but this is a vague intention. EnDev supports market development for cookstoves but aside from including gender messages in sensitization, no interventions are developed to ensure women participate in and benefit from the cookstove supply chain or as consumers.

1. To what extent has gender been included in the project? Does the context and stakeholder **analysis** include attention to gender issues and is the project informed by this analysis? Please suggest improvement to guide the country teams.

The proposal mentions an IRENA survey 2018 that shows that barriers for women in the RE sector include perceived gender roles, cultural / social norms, hiring practices, lack of (awareness of) opportunities and financial constraints to get credit, security. A gender mainstreaming strategy has been developed but is not shared. Other gender analyses are not mentioned.

It is unclear what the current situation is for women in the different RE and ICS sectors, for example, what are women’s and men’s needs and preferences for products and services, what are their current roles in the different value chains or the RE markets, what are constraints and opportunities for women to benefit. A gender sensitive value chain study and market study of the stoves and solar sector would be very useful as it will inform the project to mainstream gender effectively.

1. Are the gender **goals & strategies** transformative/strategic or practical? What can be done to increase the ambition level of the gender goals and interventions?

The PW project particularly aims to empower women to earn substantial income within the RE sector.

The goals of this PW project are strategic and transformative; since women are supported in their strategic interests to get meaningful employment, skills and income, in a sector with a scarcity of women and in need of qualified professionals. The jobs (solar technician, energy business management) are non stereotypical which is gender transformative.

2 of the other 4 objectives are gender inclusive: technical and non-technical trainings for RE professionals include women and advocating measures towards gender equality. It is not very clear what is meant by this and how gender inclusion is achieved (no strategy).

It is recommended to develop one overall gender objective based on the gender strategy: e.g. ensure that gender issues are considered in all interventions resulting in equal benefits for women and men. Having an overall gender mainstreaming objective helps to orient all interventions towards inclusiveness and to ensure that the gender strategy is integrated and not sidelined.

1. Has gender been integrated into the project **interventions**? Please suggest improvement to guide the country teams?

The PW project has some straightforward interventions focused on women as well as interventions to strengthen the supportive environment for female professionals in a sustainable way.

The other project intends to be gender inclusive, but there are no specific interventions to ensure that women benefit. Gender is not mainstreamed in the general interventions, such as the marketing activities of several products (solar, ICS), strengthening technology suppliers, etc. These interventions are gender blind and it is not clear how women will benefit from products or as suppliers.

It is highly recommended to develop specific interventions that ensure women and men benefit equally from all interventions and thus from the overall project, for example:

* develop and promote innovative technologies and approaches that cater to women’s and men’s needs and preferences
* ensure women and men can access innovative technologies by developing inclusive payment options and other interventions
* ensure women and men benefit equally from educational, employment and entrepreneurial opportunities offered, by setting targets, lowering entry level for women, providing extra support to women, etc
* ensure women and men benefit equally from information brokering and networking by ensuring messages are gender responsive, specific attention to women and their needs, etc
1. Does the project have sufficient **capacities** (internal or external - collaborations/partnerships) to work with gender? Can you suggest what they could be based on what has been proposed?

For the PW project, EnDev will collaborate with the Ministries of Mines and Gender in line with Technical and Vocational Training (TVET) programs, NGOs as well as with private and public-sector entities to qualify and support POWER WOMEN to earn substantial income with RE. There is also a collaboration with the association of rural women in Sierra Leone.

The organisation will need further capacity development to ensure that gender is mainstreamed throughout all projects.

1. Is the **M&E** plan and methodology gender responsive?  Have sex disaggregated **indicators** and gender responsive indicators being included in the results?  Please suggest improvement to guide the country teams?

The proposal does not mention a M&E plan and methodology. There is a table with results (see #8).

The project has developed gender-disaggregated indicators for training, employment and companies created. The TUP project (Power Women) will lead to 120 jobs in stoves (100 for women), 240 jobs in electrification (200 for women) and 110 SME jobs (100 for women). The other projects will lead to 1450 jobs, more than half (750) for women.

The PW project will use “methods of participative problem-driven iterative adaptation (PDIA) towards better understanding aspects of the problem” and the project explicitly aims to understand gender inequalities by cooperation with women’s organizations to include their perspectives and to assess the project activities. An additional narrative monitoring report will describe, analyse and reflect activities, results, failures, success about the PDIA learning and prototyping cycles as well as women newly working and trained in the sector.

For the other BP project, M&E methods are not mentioned and it is recommended to ensure that this project monitors results for women and men at the levels of participation and benefits.

A recommendation is to develop gender responsive indicators at outcome level, e.g. the higher level results the projects aim to achieve. For example:

* business performance (e.g. income, profit) of male and female RE entrepreneurs
* income of male and female employees in the RE sector
* % of women and men using RE technologies productively
* % of payment options and loans taken by women
1. Please provide an overview of the gender interventions that need to be reflected in the **budget**?

The PW project is budgeted separately. The other project should develop and budget gender interventions.

1. The project proposed rather quantitative output indicators. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)