

Strengthening the institutional and technical capacities of the Alliance of Small Island States

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
12347
Countries
Global
Project Name
Strengthening the institutional and technical capacities of the Alliance of Small Island States
Agencies
UNIDO
Date received by PM
5/20/2026
Review completed by PM
6/17/2026
Program Manager
Rawleston Moore
Focal Area
Multi Focal Area
Project Type
MSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

- a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?
- b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes the project meets the criteria for eligibility for SCCF-B funding.

There are some issues with the project tables which need to be updated. The formatting needs to be revised. There is a repetition of Component 2 and Component 3 as well as the respective outcomes 2.1 and 3.1. The funding for these components should be presented at the aggregate Component level, not by outcome.

Agency's CommentsThe component, outcome and output descriptions were updated in the table and body text.

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's CommentsYes the summary describes the problem and strategies to deliver the results.

Agency's CommentsN/A

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes the project objective is clear to the enhance the institutional, technical, and fiduciary capacities of AOSIS and transform it into a center of excellence.

A SIDS center of excellence has already been established through the Antigua and Barbuda Agenda for SIDS (ABAS), and the mandate from the United Nations General Assembly's adoption of Resolution A/RES/78/317. Please clarify why AOSIS needs to become another center of excellence and not just focus on enhancing the institutional, technical, and fiduciary capacities. Please also make clear that there are no duplication of roles.

Yes the components are sound except component 2 which needs to be reformulated.

Update 17th June

Cleared

Agency's CommentsThis was made clear now. There is no duplication. Component 2 was reformulated.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's CommentsYes, gender dimensions are appropriately funded and included in the project.

Agency's CommentsN/A

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

a) Yes.

b) Yes

c) Yes

The project components table has a number of duplications and needs some editing

Update June 17th

Cleared

Agency's Commentsdone.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

a) yes

b) yes

Agency's CommentsN/A

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

a) Not clear. There is no clear explanation of why this approach has been taken. Please provide a clearer articulation of why this approach was taken. Other institutions can functions as hubs, as opposed to AOSIS setting up hubs

b) Yes by enhancing the capacity of AOSIS , this will assist in ensuring resilience to future changes in the drivers

c) yes

d) The relevant role of the stakeholders has been adequately described

Update 17th June

Cleared

Agency's Comments The approach is now better described in the transformational scenario section.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

There is a concise theory of change and the key outputs are defined, however there is some need for further work on the components.

Component 1- Please clarify why there is a need for AOSIS to function as an effective, permanent entity. Maybe include a reference that it is to facilitate the implementation of climate change and international waters action on the ground. Please clarify on the role of the institution to facilitate the implementation of climate adaptation and international waters action on the ground. The narrative of component 1 needs to be grounded in the climate adaptation and international waters space.

Component 2- Component 2 needs to be reformulated to have real adaptation and international water benefits. Please redo component to focus on activities which can provide global and adaptation benefits, such as regional training workshops on climate change adaptation, IW activities or BBNJ. Please remove all references to loss and damage as they are not eligible for SCCF resources. The project is using SCCF resources which are for adaptation, thus elements related to just transition are not eligible. The proposed various hubs do not seem sustainable and there are other regional institutions which work on SIDS issues which can function as hubs.

The GEF can assist with the implementation of NAPs or adaptation elements of NDCs. As a regional/global program under SCCF-B, the proposed intervention needs to explain how the analytics, capacity building and advisory can contribute towards adaptation technology transfer, blended finance and private sector engagement.

The proposed development of a trans-regional Strategic Action Programme (SAP) is welcomed. However, please note the SAP is formulated through a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA), a process of bringing countries together to identify common transboundary issues (See here: <https://iwlearn.net/documents/22298> and <https://iwlearn.net/learning/courses/gef-iwlearn-transboundary-diagnostic-analysis-strategic-action-programme-course>).

The UNIDO GEF IW team can also advise. Thus, if the project wishes to undertake these activities, then a TDA should be conducted before a SAP is developed. Otherwise, the project may wish to consider drafting another type of strategy better suited for AOSIS needs. Please revise accordingly.

Update June 17th

Cleared

Agency's Comments This was addressed. Components, outcomes and outputs reformulated; Co-funding can cover other thematic areas not covered by GEF SCCF/IWF funding. SAP removed.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments

For the most part.

Please revise this statement to align with the scope of SCCF B**the project primarily contributes to global climate change adaptation and resilience by strengthening the capacity of AOSIS and its member states to engage effectively in UNFCCC processes and to support the implementation of adaptation and loss and damage priorities across all SIDS.**

The project notes that AOSIS will support at least 50 private sector enterprises (SCCF Indicator 5) to engage in the implementation of multilateral commitments in the climate, environment and ocean governance space, yet there is no reference to private sector in component 2.

Update June 17th

Cleared

Agency's Comments This was reformulated.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

For the most part the institutional setting is clear.

The execution agency and modalities will be determined during the PPG phase. There is a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area.

The proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication are adequately described

UNIDO is participating in the Project Steering Committee. Pursuant to the interim CEO's letter to Agency coordinators on 20 March 2026, please confirm that the UNIDO will have a voice on the Project Steering Committee (PSC) but will not be a voting member.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNIDO will be a member of the Project Steering Committee, participating in an advisory capacity, without exercising voting rights. All decisions adopted by the Project Steering Committee shall remain subject to UNIDO's non-objection decision, exercised in its capacity as the Implementing Agency responsible for project supervision and oversight, in accordance with UNIDO's applicable rules, policies, and procedures

This will be also confirmed during the PPG phase.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

yes.

Core Indicators 7 & 8 will be re-evaluated depending on how the project is revised to accurately reflect the TDA-SAP process.

.Cleared

Agency's Comments This was done.

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments N/A

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments Yes .

Agency's Comments N/A

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments Yes project intends to be transformative. There is potential for scaling up. The project is a global project will indirectly have impacts on aligning of government policies

Agency's Comments N/A

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

There needs to be some improvement in the alignment of the project and adaptation priorities

Cleared

Agency's Comments This was done.

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments yes. The project is aligned with regional policies.

Agency's Comments N/A

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments N/A

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments yes

Agency's CommentsN/A

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Commentsyes

Agency's CommentsN/A

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's CommentsN/A

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's CommentsN/A

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's CommentsN/A

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's CommentsN/A

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Commentsyes

Agency's CommentsN/A

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's CommentsN/A

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Commentsyes

Agency's CommentsN/A

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

In kind co-financing is not considered Investment mobilized. Please adjust as needed and provide a brief explanation of how investment mobilized co-financing is identified.

Indicative Co-financing 				
Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
Beneficiaries	AOSIS	In-kind	Investment mobilized	2,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	SIDS countries	In-kind	Investment mobilized	1,844,700.00
GEF Agency	UNIDO	Grant	Investment mobilized	80,300.00
Total Co-financing(\$)				3,925,000.00
Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified				
Contributions of AOSIS and its member countries (mainly in-kind)				

Agency's CommentsThis was amended and clarified.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's CommentsThe project is a global /regional project.

Agency's CommentsN/A

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Commentsn/a

Agency's CommentsN/A

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Commentsn/a

Agency's CommentsN/A

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Commentsn/a

Agency's CommentsN/A

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's CommentsYes

Agency's CommentsN/A

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Commentsyes

Agency's CommentsN/A

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's CommentsYes

Agency's CommentsN/A

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Commentsyes

Agency's CommentsN/A

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Commentsn/a

Agency's CommentsN/A

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

Not at this stage.

Component 2 needs to be restructured, and references to loss and damage removed. It should be noted that SCCF resources should be used for adaptation activities

For Annex 2: Financing Tables ? the funding for this project will come from IW-1, not IW-2. Please revise the PIF throughout to ensure this is correctly presented.

Please clarify why a GHG calculation sheet has been submitted for this adaptation project.

Overall the PIF needs some improvement.

Ground the narrative more firmly in climate adaptation: The text should explain more explicitly how the proposed institutions, analytics, will facilitate implementation of climate adaptation action on the ground.

Clarify the practical role of institutional strengthening: The draft should better explain the purpose of the institutional architecture and what it will enable in practice, including how sound legal instruments underpin a robust institution.

Align SCCF-B content with scope: Several passages appear too broad for SCCF-B and should be revised to focus on eligible adaptation-related functions, such as support for NAP implementation, adaptation elements of NDCs, adaptation technology transfer, blended finance for adaptation, and related private sector engagement.

Avoid unsupported framing: Statements implying that GEF will contribute to resolving climate finance fragmentation for SIDS or pioneers access for other funds should be reconsidered or removed.

Ensure consistency across components and indicators: References to private sector engagement and related claims should be reflected clearly in the relevant components; otherwise, they should be narrowed or adjusted so the results framework matches the components.

Update June 17th

All the relevant issues have been addressed.. The project is recommended for clearance.

Agency's CommentsAll the comments were incorporated. Thanks a lot. It needs to be mentioned that AOSIS seems to prefer a wider technical focus not only reduced on strengthening technical capacities on adaptation and ocean energy governance. Therefore, to align with this priorities and the GEF SCCF/IW funding, it is mentioned that the technical scope may increase with other donor co-funding. Other donors could earmark funding for AOSIS Technical Desk on mitigation, loss and damage, just transition away from fossil fuels to resilient renewables, chemicals waste/circular economy.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

First Review

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)