

Global program on renewable energy systems in SIDS ? global-regional project

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
12229
Countries
Global
Project Name
Global program on renewable energy systems in SIDS ? global-regional project
Agencies
UNIDO
Date received by PM
12/17/2025
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Patricia Marcos Huidobro
Focal Area
Climate Change
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
3/25/2026 PM:

Cleared.

2/2/2026 PM:

Yes, with comments. The project involves three executing agencies. Please clarify the role of each agency and specify the components and activities for which each will be responsible.

Agency's CommentsThe roles of the executing entities are clarified now.

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 Comments

2/2/2026 PM:

Yes.

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

2/2/2026 PM:

Yes.

Agency's CommentsN/A

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

Secretariat's Comments

2/2/2026 PM:

Yes.

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

3/25/2026 PM:

Cleared.

2/2/2026 PM:

No. The M&E budget allocated to GEF financing (9.2%) exceeds the recommended 5%, while the M&E budget for co-financing is only 0.7%. Please consider rebalancing these allocations by increasing the portion assigned to co-financing and reducing the share covered by GEF funding.

Agency's Comments The M+E costs were reduced to 5% and the co-finance ratio increased.

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

2/2/2026 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments N/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

3/25/2026 PM:

Cleared.

2/2/2026 PM:

No. Innovation vs. Replication. The PIF conflates proven model scaling (ECREEE, BLOOM) with genuine innovation (new risk assessment tools, de-risking mechanisms). Please distinguish: What is replication of proven models vs. genuine innovation? For true innovations: what makes them novel, how will they be tested/adapted, what is the risk calibration strategy?

Agency's Comments This was integrated. The PIF now clearly distinguishes between innovation and replication. The section was expanded significantly.

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

3/25/2026 PM:

Cleared.

2/2/2026 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

1) The concept note would benefit from a clear list of technologies to be covered by the project. For example, it appears the proposal may include waste-to-energy technologies. This should be clearly outlined, as waste-to-energy is eligible under the GEF CCM focal area only under limited circumstances.

2) Please elaborate on each project component by describing the key activities planned under each outcome and how they contribute to the achievement of the project objectives.

Particularly, Component 3 on Private Sector/De-risking Mechanism Design is incomplete. With the largest co-financing at \$4.3M, component 3 lacks detail on financial structure. Please specify: specific de-risking instruments, financial structure and governance of de-risking facility, additionality mechanisms (ensuring support reaches MSMEs that otherwise couldn't access finance) and MSME selection criteria and inclusion strategies for women/youth-led enterprises. If additional info is not available at PIF stage, this information can be provided at CEO Approval stage.

3) Climate Hazard Analysis and Adaptation Monitoring underdeveloped. While the conceptual rationale is strong, quantitative hazard analysis and impact assessment need substantial strengthening to meet STAP/GEF adaptation standards. Please provide:

- Quantitative climate scenarios (2-3 per SIDS region) showing cyclone intensity/frequency, sea-level rise, temperature, precipitation projections
- Regional differentiation (Caribbean vs. Pacific vs. Indian Ocean hazard profiles)

- Detailed stakeholder vulnerability assessment showing climate impacts on different MSME categories

4) Climate-Resilient Design Standards Lack Forward-Looking Calibration. The project does not demonstrate that proposed technical guidelines and risk assessment tools use future climate scenarios rather than historical data. This is critical?if regional standards (Output 2.1.2) are based on historical climate, the project risks perpetuating stranded asset problems.

Please specify:

- All climate-resilient guidelines will use forward-looking projections (minimum 2050 timeframe)
- Preliminary design parameters: wind speed requirements for solar installations, elevation/setback requirements for coastal infrastructure, flood resilience standards for energy storage, heat tolerance specifications
- Mechanisms for periodic standard updates as climate science advances
- Adaptive management approach if impacts occur faster than projected

5) Please spell out UWI in full. In addition, please clarify what CMM refers to (it may be a typographical error intended to refer to CCM?)

6) BLOOM Platform: Please provide additional detail on the BLOOM platform, including its purpose, functionality, and role within the project.

Agency's CommentsThis has been addressed and the relevant sections where significantly improved.

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

3/25/2026 PM:

Cleared.

2/2/2026 PM:

No. Please see comment above on Innovation vs. Replication. The PIF conflates proven model scaling (ECREEE, BLOOM) with genuine innovation (new risk assessment tools, de-risking mechanisms). Please distinguish: What is replication of proven models vs. genuine innovation? For true innovations: what makes them novel, how will they be tested/adapted, what is the risk calibration strategy?

Agency's CommentsThis was addressed in the PIF.

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
4/17/2026 PM:

Cleared.

4/14/2026 PM:

Not cleared yet. While the PIF clearly states that potential execution support services will be determined during the PPG phase, UNIDO is still presented as one of the executing partners in the General Project Information Table (see below,). At PIF stage it is too premature for the GEF Agency to propose being the executing partner. During the preparation stage the Agency can make the case invoking one of the exceptions criteria for Managerial approval following the procedure depicted in Guidelines.

General Project information 			
Project Title:	Global program on renewable energy systems in SIDS – global-regional project		
Region:	Global	GEF Project ID:	12229
Country(ies):	Global	Type of Project:	MSP
GEF Agency(ies):	UNIDO	GEF Agency ID:	250231
Executing Partner:	UNIDO	Executing Partner Type:	GEF Agency
	GN-SEC Centres (ECREEE, CCREEE, PCREEE, SACREEE, CEREEAC)		Others
	SIDS DOCK		Others
GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change	Submission Date :	12/17/2025

2/2/2026 PM:

No. Please see comment above on executing agencies. Please clarify the role of each of the 3 proposed executing agencies and specify the components and activities for which each will be responsible.

Agency's Comments

Comment 16.04: This was removed as suggested. Thanks.

A description of the roles of executing entities was included.

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
4/5/2026 PM:

Cleared.

3/25/2026 PM:

Not cleared. As mentioned below, GHG estimations for global projects are indirect and based on replication effects and are therefore likely to be modest. In the updated PIF, it is assumed that the project will co-facilitate the installation of 10 MWp of solar PV capacity, including climate-proven battery storage, during the project life-time (mainly through Outcome 3). Could you please clarify that these 10MWp are not double counted as part of other national projects in any of the 5 countries the program is being implemented?

2/2/2026 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

- 1) Kindly note that GHG estimations are required at the PIF stage. We understand that, for global projects, these estimates are indirect and based on replication effects and are therefore likely to be modest. However, we would appreciate further clarification and elaboration on the GHG estimates provided (through a spreadsheet).
- 2) Please explain the methodology used to estimate approximately 700 project beneficiaries.
- 3) This section should be further strengthened to clearly articulate the project's adaptation co-benefits. Please include LDCE/SCCF core indicators (currently absent despite centrality to project logic).

Agency's Comments

This has been significantly strengthened in the PIF. Please find the GHG Calculation sheet under Roadmap and Documents Section.

Clarification has been provided in the relevant section (Below Core Indicators) that this is not double-counting. The capacity will be facilitated through the envisaged regional blended finance and risk mitigation activities.

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

Secretariat's Comments

2/2/2026 PM:

N/A.

Agency's CommentsN/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

3/25/2026 PM:

Cleared.

2/2/2026 PM:

No. Please consider revising the overall risk rating from *low* to *moderate* to better reflect the average rating across other indicators, and provide a brief justification for this assessment.

Agency's CommentsThe risk was changed to moderate as requested.

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

2/2/2026 PM:

Yes.

Agency's CommentsN/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

3/25/2026 PM:

Cleared.

2/2/2026 PM:

No. Although the project is requesting funding only from the Climate Change Mitigation Focal Area of the GEF, we understand the project has also significant adaptation co-benefits. As such, please considering adding a paragraph outlining alignment with the climate change adaptation objectives of the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF).

Agency's Comments This was integrated in the section.

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

2/2/2026 PM:

Yes.

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

2/2/2026 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments N/A

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

2/2/2026 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments N/A

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/17/2026 PM:

Cleared.

4/14/2026 PM:

Not cleared. It is well noted that the role of civil society has been further elaborated in the PIF. however it remains unclear which specific CSOs, NGOs and local communities and groups were consulted in project design. Please clarify and elaborate further.

2/2/2026 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

- 1) The concept note states that consultations took place between October and November. We assume this refers to 2025, but please confirm and revise accordingly in the PIF.
- 2) Please consider adding the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) as stakeholder of the project, given their active participation in the Pacific region. Please also consider adding potential stakeholders working in the region beyond UNIDO GN-SEC.
- 3) The project highlights the roles of civil society groups/organizations to ensure accountability. Please elaborate on expanded roles of civil society to inform project development as well as project plans to engage these groups as well as local MSMEs related to project components and outcomes.
- 4) Please clarify how Indigenous Peoples groups and vulnerable populations in SIDS were consulted to develop concept of the project and how the results of the consultations were integrated into the project. Also, consider including Indigenous Peoples and vulnerable population (not only gender and youth) as key partners of the project, and integrating their governance and traditional and local knowledge, and capacity building into the project design particularly Component 1 and 3, related to climate change adaptation activities.

Agency's Comments

Comment 16 April 2026: The contacted CSOs, NGOs and private sector associations during the design phase have been made more clearer.

These aspects were integrated. SPREP was added to the stakeholders.

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

2/2/2026 PM:

N/A.

Agency's CommentsN/A
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments
2/2/2026 PM:

N/A.

Agency's CommentsN/A
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments
2/2/2026 PM:

N/A.

Agency's CommentsN/A
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments
2/2/2026 PM:

N/A.

Agency's CommentsN/A
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments
2/2/2026 PM:

N/A.

Agency's CommentsN/A
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments
2/2/2026 PM:

Yes.

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 Comments
2/2/2026 PM:

Yes.

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
2/2/2026 PM:

Yes.

Agency's CommentsN/A

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 Comments
2/2/2026 PM:

N/A. This is a regional/global project.

Agency's CommentsN/A

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

Secretariat's Comments
2/2/2026 PM:

N/A. This is a regional/global project.

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 Comments
2/2/2026 PM:

N/A. This is a regional/global project.

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 Comments
2/2/2026 PM:

N/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 Comments
2/2/2026 PM:

Yes.

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 Comments
2/2/2026 PM:

Yes.

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 Comments

3/25/2026 PM:

Cleared.

2/2/2026 PM:

Yes, with suggestions. The Rio Marker for biodiversity is currently rated as BD1. However, there are very limited references to biodiversity in the proposal. Thus, we recommend either revising this rating to BD0 or update the proposal to reflect the BD angle.

Agency's CommentsThe marker was changed to BD0.

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

2/2/2026 PM:

Yes.

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 Comments

2/2/2026 PM:

N/A.

Agency's CommentsN/A

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/17/2026 PM:

Cleared.

4/14/2026 PM:

Not cleared yet. Please address comments above in yellow.

4/7/2026 PM:

Cleared with comments. Thank you for removing the highlights. As per email sent on 4/7/2026 please kindly update the project title as suggested in the email.

4/5/2026 PM:

Cleared with comments. All comments have been cleared. Please remove the highlights in the PIF and send the project back to the GEF so we can proceed with the next steps.

3/25/2026 PM:

Not cleared. Please see pending comments above in yellow.

2/2/2026 PM:

No. Please address comments above.

Agency's Comments

4/16 UNIDO: Addressed

UNIDO 4/7/2026,

Thank you, all highlights have been removed.

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

Secretariat's Comments
2/2/2026 PM:

No. At CEO Approval stage, please make sure to address/elaborate on the following comments:

1) With the largest co-financing at \$4.3M, component 3 lacks detail on financial structure. Please specify: specific de-risking instruments, financial structure and governance of de-risking facility, additionality mechanisms (ensuring support reaches MSMEs that otherwise couldn't access finance) and MSME selection criteria and inclusion strategies for women/youth-led enterprises.

2) Please ensure that in the development of the results framework, gender-specific indicators are included to facilitate monitoring and reporting. In the development of the Gender Action Plan, please indicate measures to facilitate and support its implementation (e.g., budgets, staff support, regular monitoring, adaptive management, etc.). Under M&E, please make a reference to include in PIRs, MTRs and TE, reports on gender-specific results, including the implementation of the Gender Action Plan.

Agency's CommentsBoth aspects will be integrated during the PPG phase.
Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		3/31/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		