Global Program on Climate-Resilient Renewable Energy Systems in SIDS ? National Project in Antigua and Barbuda

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
12357
Countries
Antigua and Barbuda
Project Name
Global Program on Climate-Resilient Renewable Energy Systems in SIDS ? National Project in Antigua and Barbuda
Agencies
UNIDO
Date received by PM
5/26/2026
Review completed by PM
6/16/2026
Program Manager
Rawleston Moore
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
The project is aligned with the SCCF A and is eligible to receive GEF funding.

The information in the project table is correctly populated

Agency's CommentsN/A
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
Yes, however in the Project Summary and throughout the document, please strengthen the articulation of the project being focused fully on climate adaptation and resilience, by for example, revising references such as : ?the deployment of climate-resilient renewable energy solutions? to ?deployment of climate adaptive and resilient solutions for production, transmission, and/or storage of renewable energy to x, y, z populations?

Some sections of the document , including the project summary and project rationale, seem to suggest that public servant households are experiencing increasing climate hazards more than others. . Please revise/clarify. Is the project providing special benefits to public servants over others who do not work for the government?

Agency's CommentsThe climate adaptation and resilience focus was strengthened throughout. Moreover, several tables outlining the applied solutions and positive adaptation impacts for key stakeholder groups. The focus on vulnerable MSMEs, community businesses and private households, including civil servants was clarified.
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
a) The project objective can be shortened. Please remove "Apart from direct positive adaptation benefits on the level of the electricity system, the project will also drive other important co-benefits, including the reduction of fossil fuel dependence and GHG emissions, increased energy security, as well as productivity and , adaptation gains for key island value chains, such as tourism, agriculture, and the blue economy."

b) Yes

Agency's Commentsa.) The second part was removed as suggested.

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

Secretariat's CommentsYes, however please clarify how financial instruments will be designed to ensure gender-responsive access.

Agency's CommentsThis was further explained in the gender section.

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

The components are adequately funded, however, GEF Resources allocated to PMC are 5.0%, but co-financing resources are only 4.49%. For a cofinancing of $4,000,300, the correspondent 5.0% is $200,015 instead of $180,000. Please amend.

	Sub Total ($)	2,514,025.00	4,000,300.00
Project Management Cost (PMC)			
	SCCF-A	125,701.00	180,000.00
	Sub Total($)	125,701.00	180,000.00
	Total Project Cost($)	2,639,726.00	4,180,300.00

Agency's CommentsThis was corrected.

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 CommentsPartially. The project needs to be much sharper and explicit as to what and the extent of the current and climate impacts this project will adapt and build resilience to.

Agency's CommentsThis was clarified also by integrating two tables on the applied solutions, as well as the positive impacts per stakeholder group.

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

While there is a clear explanation of why subsidies fail, perhaps there could be further discussions and explanations why other alternative financial mechanisms have not been selected. Please include a comparison of financial instruments and explain why certain financial instruments will not work.

The project will ensure resilience

The relevant stakeholders have been consulted.

Agency's Comments The comparative advantage of the suggested in comparison to other financial options is now better explained. This includes also an explanation and table how the UNIDO projects complements the UNDP approach and establishes a One UN approach.

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 Yes. The Theory of Change is well developed, clearly describing causal pathways from financial de-risking to increased deployment of climate-resilient energy systems and enhanced resilience outcomes.

However, several key assumptions (e.g., cost reductions from procurement, willingness of financial institutions to scale lending) are not sufficiently evidenced.

The key outputs of each component are defined, however SCCF resources cannot be used for component 1.4-End-of-life decommissioning protocol for solar PV and battery storage solutions. In addition GEF ID 11474 has a component on end of life policy and practices for RE equipment and components.

Agency's Comments The assumptions were further clarified. Output 1.4 was 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 Yes

Agency's Comments N/A

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

Yes.

There is description of potential coordination, however please include a table showing the exact differences between GEF ID 11474 and 12357, as there appears to be significant overlap and duplication. Please clearly define the specific roles of each project.

Agency's Comments A table was integrated. The difference and complementarity is clear. It needs to mentioned that the UNDP project has not started and the CEO Endorsement Document does not provide details on the blended financing mechanism.

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

Core indicators are aligned with SCCF requirements

Agency's Comments N/A

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

a) Yes

b) yes

c)yes

Agency's CommentsN/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

a) Yes

b) Yes the project could be replicated across the Caribbean, however please ensure that all components are designed for financial sustainability after the SCCF project ends, and articulate how this is the case.

c) At the national level, the Department of Environment (DOE) will provide overall coordination and ensure alignment with national climate policies, including the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) and Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC).

Agency's Comments

b.) the explanation was further strengthened in the sustainability section.

c.) clear

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

The project is aligned with SCCF programming directions and adaptation priorities, however there is a need for the project to specify if and how much the technology solutions that will be deployed and scaled up will be resilient to current and anticipated climate hazards and their impacts.

Agency's CommentsA table was integrated.

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

The project is well aligned with national policies, including the NAP, NDC, and energy strategy

Agency's CommentsN/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 CommentsN/A

Agency's CommentsN/A

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Commentsyes

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 CommentsYes

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

Secretariat's Comments

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
Yes, however , as it relates to co-finance please make sure that the SCCF resources are used for the additional costs of climate resilience technologies vis-?-vis other energy production, storage, or transmission. Please indicate this will be the case.

Agency's CommentsThis is indicated and a table on supported technologies was incorporated.

Annex B: Endorsements

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

Secretariat's Commentsyes

Agency's CommentsN/A

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

Secretariat's Commentsyes

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 Commentsyes

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
The PIF is not yet recommended for clearance.
There is a need for a number of clarifications and improvements.

Overall please provide more clarity on the how adaptation benefits will accrue from this project. The project needs to be much clearer as to what and extent of the current and climate impacts this project will adapt and build resilience to.
Please provide clear information on the differences with GEF ID 11474

It is clear that energy production, transmission, and storage are and will increasingly be impacted by climate hazards, particularly hurricanes, it is not sufficiently explicit and clear how the project will reduce climate impacts.
Please indicate what specific hard technology solutions will be enabled and financed to be deployed, and how those specific technologies will improve the resilience of energy productions, transmission, and/or storage in a more cost efficient manner than alternatives
The number of direct beneficiaries seems a bit low. Is it possible to increase the number of direct beneficiaries? What is the average household size being considered?

Update June 16th

Changes have been to the project. The project is recommended for clearance

Agency's Comments Thank you for the comments, which were addressed.

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

Secretariat's Comments Make sure the adaptation rationale and the linkages to the technologies selected is improved.

Agency's Comments N/A

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		