



Energy resilience and security for the residential and public sector in Antigua and Barbuda

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11474

Countries

Antigua and Barbuda

Project Name

Energy resilience and security for the residential and public sector in Antigua and Barbuda

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

10/23/2023

Review completed by PM

10/30/2023

Program Manager

Patricia Marcos Huidobro

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

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

10/27/2023 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

10/27/2023 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

12/1/2023 PM:

1) Cleared.

2) Cleared.

10/27/2023 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

1) Some of the project outputs under Component 2 are not investments activities but technical assistance, i.e. Output 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4. Please under component 2 create another row to separate investment outputs from technical assistance outputs.

2) In the components table, please add "Component 5" before M&E.

Agency's Comments

The Outputs for Component 2 have been separated into Investment and Technical Assistance Rows.

For Component 5, it is listed as "Component 5: Monitoring and Evaluation" in the Indicative Project Overview table.

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

Secretariat's Comments

12/1/2023 PM:

1) Cleared.

2) Cleared.

10/27/2023 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

1) Gender dimensions are briefly mentioned in outputs 1.1, 2.2, 4.2 and 5.1, but the gender approach shall be further elaborated in each of these outputs;

2) Likewise, gender dimensions are missing in some outputs such as 1.2, 2.3, 3.1 and 4.1. Please consider reflecting gender dimensions in these other outcomes.

Agency's Comments

During PPG a detailed gender assessment and action plan will be drafted to substantiate concrete activities and outputs. Nevertheless, additional aspects of the gender dimension have been added / expanded in Outputs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 4.1, 4.2, and 5.1.

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

10/27/2023 PM:

Cleared. GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC are proportional and the PMC is below 5%.

Agency's Comments

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

10/27/2023 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

12/1/2023 PM:

a) Cleared.

c) Cleared.

d) Cleared.

10/27/2023 PM:

a) **Yes, with comments.** Further information on the business model expected to be used for the deployment of the solar panels would be very helpful to further understand the long-term sustainability of the project. For instance, who will be the owner of the solar panel? Who will conduct the maintenance? IF not available at PIF, please provide this information at CEO Endorsement stage.

b) **Yes.**

c) **No.** Please elaborate on previous experiences with rooftop solar panels in Antigua and Barbuda and, whenever possible, describe the main lessons learned and challenges faced.

d) **No.** The stakeholders section shall be further strengthened by providing a summary of the results of the consultations, and explaining the role the stakeholders identified are expected to have during the implementation of the project. A stakeholder assessment plan shall be either added to the PIF, attached a separate document or as part of the ProDoc. Likewise, the role of the private sector in the project shall be better reflected in the proposal under the stakeholders' section. For instance, the proposal mentions 20 SMEs. Are these maintenance companies? Finally, the proposal states that it has consulted Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities as well as Civil Society Organizations, however it is unclear from list provided which these are. Please clarify and provide additional details on IPLC and CSOs consulted and to elaborate on their relevant roles to project outcomes and project components.

Agency's Comments

a) Additional details have been added to Section B on Project description (all changes highlighted in yellow for easy reference). The details on ownership of the solar panels at the different stages, as well as responsibilities for maintenance, possible insurance and

financing options will be further elaborated based on engagements with stakeholders and financial assessments undertaken during PPG to be consolidated at the CEO Endorsement Stage.

b) N/A

c) A section on lessons learned that have informed the project has been added at the end of Section A- Project Rationale:

Some of the key lessons from related projects - including the installation of PV systems that are incorporated already into the project include the following:

- The need for bulk procurement to drive prices down: Market sounding and some smaller levels of procurement have shown that the prices can be reduced significantly (perhaps up to 50%) through bulk procurement ? especially through standardised equipment purchases.

- The need for longer-term agreements for training / certification for service on the islands: if a part requires repair, it is often possible to do so with local knowledge ? but there need to be agreements and operating procedures in place with equipment providers to allow this to happen (which would save costs and time)

- The need for ?standardising? prices and practices of installation and maintenance: There is a large variety of costs and quality for the installation/maintenance services of PV systems, so further public instruction and guidance are necessary.

- The availability of financing in a concessional way that is ?retail? is very welcome: The SIRF Fund has been quite successful in conducting grass-roots outreach to end-use recipients for adaptation investments ? which should be possible to replicate and scale up for the PV + storage sector mitigations actions.

d) A summary of the results of the consultations has been added into a new Annex (Annex H). Additionally, a table summarizing the role of the various types of stakeholders has been added into the Section on Stakeholder engagement. This includes the role of CSOs and private companies.

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

12/1/2023 PM:

Cleared.

10/27/2023 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

- 1) The ToC is concise but off margins. Please amend.
- 2) Outputs of each component shall be further elaborated and strengthened.
- 3) At CEO Endorsement please identify those areas under which project ambition can be increased, for instance, under Output 3.2 development of standards and policy framework could be replaced by adoption. Same for outputs 3.2 and 3.3.

Agency's Comments

- The Theory of Change diagram has been reduced in size to fit into the page.
- The outputs of each component have been further elaborated with regards to gender issues and additional technical aspects. Further details on outputs regarding standard operating procedures, levels of concessionality for financing PV systems according to beneficiaries and criteria will be provided at CEO Endorsement request based on market and financial assessments undertaken during PPG.
- The language about adoption of policies has been added to the description of Outputs 3.2 and 3.3.

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

10/27/2023 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

12/01/2023 PM:

c) Cleared.

d) Cleared.

10/27/2023 PM:

a) Yes.

b) Execution support is not requested.

c) No. Please address the following questions:

- Please answer yes or nor to this question in the Portal.

- Section A "Project Rationale" incorporates a preliminary list of projects/initiatives to build on, including the most relevant GEF projects. However, section "Coordinaton and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Projects" has bee left blank. Please move this preliminary list of projects to the section "Coordinaton and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Projects", and elaborate further on them. For instance, is there any relevant lessons learned from GEF Project 5523 on the SIRF fund which is still under implementation? Also, this section shall include further information on other projects which are indeed contributing with co-financing such as for instance the GCF project Shelter Rehabilitation.

d) No. The approach to knowledge management and learning shall be further elaborated across the proposal, by for instance proposing tools and methods for knowledge exchange, learning& collaboration, discussing on how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project/ program impact and sustainability, incorporating plans for strategic communications, etc.

Agency's Comments

c)

-The answer has been changed to YES in the Portal

-The list of relevant projects has been copied into the section "Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Projects". Further explanation of the scope of the projects have been added including identification of projects counted as cofinancing. The lessons learnt by SIRF 5523 have been also added to section A "Project Rationale."

d. The following additional details on knowledge management have been provided:

The market coordination effort in Component 1 and the calls for applications of loans in component 2 will be done through a national communication campaign. SIRF fund new operations, stakeholder engagement activities and the call for applications to diverse beneficiaries, will be disseminated according to a pre-defined plan for strategic

communications. The participation of hardware stores in the program will be also an important aspect influencing the communication plan as these stores are used by the broad population. In parallel to the dissemination of SIRF fund operations, awareness of the environmental and economic benefits of PV systems will be undertaken. Based on lessons learnt from SIRF previous operations, the project will facilitate a repository of information that can be assessed by new staff (due to high staff turnover in A&B). This repository or platform will be key to easily access performance of the fund as well as to compile overall results for monitoring and evaluation and further capitalization by other donors.

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

12/01/2023 PM:

Cleared.

10/27/2023 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

- Please provide the spreadsheet with the GHG estimations in order for the GEF team to easily track the calculations;
- Under the table on Core Indicators, please add an explanation on how the GHG emissions and beneficiaries have been estimated;
- There is an inconsistency in Core Indicator 6 which has been estimated as 415,224 tCO₂ in the Core Indicator table, but the PIF mentions 83,000 Direct tCO₂ and 415,000 Indirect tCO₂. Please clarify this inconsistency and amend the PIF/Core Indicator Table accordingly.

Agency's Comments

- A spreadsheet showing the calculations has been uploaded to portal. It is consistent with the GEF methodology ? but not using the GEF template spreadsheet.
- Tables with the key calculation parameters is included in the section ? showing how the number of beneficiaries and the GHG emissions reduced were calculated. An additional paragraph explaining the rationale and assumptions of the CO₂ emissions reductions estimations was added as well.

- The Core Indicator section on GHG emissions has been changed to ?83,000 direct emissions reduction and 415,224 000 indirect emissions reductions?. These numbers will be further reviewed in PPG.

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/27/2023 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?

b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?

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

10/27/2023 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

10/27/2023 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

10/27/2023 PM:

Yes. The project is well-aligned with CCM Objective 1.2 - Enable the transition to decarbonized power systems.

Agency's Comments

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

10/27/2023 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

10/27/2023 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

12/01/2023 PM:

Cleared.

10/27/2023 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

- As mentioned, earlier please revise some outputs to better integrate gender activities and responses.
- The stakeholders section shall be further strengthened by providing a summary of the results of the consultations, and explaining the role the stakeholders identified are expected to have during the implementation of the project. A stakeholder assessment plan shall be either added to the PIF, attached a separate document or as part of the ProDoc.
- The role of the private sector in the project shall be better reflected in the proposal under the stakeholders' section. For instance, the proposal mentions 20 SMEs. Are these maintenance companies?
- The SESP document has not been signed up by UNDP social and environmental specialists. Please clarify if this needs to be signed at PIF.

Agency's Comments

? Gender activities have been further elaborated into Outputs? descriptions. All editions to PIF have been highlighted in yellow for easy reference.

- The stakeholder section now includes an initial plan for stakeholder engagement ? to be further elaborated during PPG. A record of stakeholder meetings during PIF development has also been added as part of Annex H.

- The role of the private sector is clarified within the initial plan for stakeholder engagement. The 20 SMEs refer to the likely scaling up of project investment activities ? wherein they will install systems for own-use.

- The SESP is cleared by safeguards regional specialist in UNDP?s Project management System as pre-requisite for submission to the donor, therefore no signature in the file is required.

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

Secretariat's Comments

12/01/2023 PM:

Cleared.

10/27/2023 PM:

Yes, with suggestions. As mentioned above, please elaborate further on the results of these consultations, and explain the role the stakeholders identified are expected to have during the implementation of the project. A stakeholder assessment plan shall be either added to the PIF or attached a separate document.

Agency's Comments

The meeting notes of the consultations have been added to Annex H and an initial stakeholder engagement plan has been added to the PIF's Stakeholder engagement section.

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

12/01/2023 PM:

Cleared.

10/27/2023 PM:

Yes, with suggestions. GEF Financing Table shall be just the title and one row below since the funds are being programmed only through one CCM objective, i.e. 1.2. The same applies to the PPG table. Only one row is required.

Agency's Comments

GEF Financing table and PPG table have been adjusted to only CC STAR allocation.

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

10/27/2023 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments
10/27/2023 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments
10/27/2023 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments
10/27/2023 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

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

10/27/2023 PM:

Yes. The PPG requested is within the allowable cap for a FSP.

Agency's Comments

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

12/01/2023 PM:

Cleared.

10/27/2023 PM:

Yes, with comments. Please elaborate below the Co-financing Table on how the Investment Mobilized has been identified. Please also add the ADFD and GCF grant in the list of projects/initiatives to build on. If not yet available, please provide the Letters of Co-financing at CEO Endorsement Stage.

Agency's Comments

The Investment Mobilized has now been described in a note: Note: The investment mobilized represents the approximate scaling up of the funds / revolving of the funds after repayment by a factor of 1.5 during the lifetime of the project (6 years) I.e. a significant portion of the initial funds outlaid for bulk purchasing will be paid back to the SIRF Fund which will allow for revolving those funds, as well as injection of new capital.

The ADFD and GCF grants are now highlighted as being sources of cofinancing in the list of projects / initiatives to build on. Letters of co-financing will be provided at the CEO endorsement stage.

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 Comments

10/27/2023 PM:

Yes. The Letter of Endorsement has been dully signed by the OFP from Antigua and Barbuda .

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/27/2023 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

12/01/2023 PM:

Cleared. An updated LoE has been uploaded in the Portal.

10/27/2023 PM:

No. The GEF financing in the Letter of Endorsement is higher than the GEF financing in the GEF Portal/ PIF Document. Break-down of requested STAR allocation among CC and LD are different between LOE and Portal?s Sources of funds table: Please obtain a revised LOE to reflect the correct numbers in the Sources of funds table.

TABLE 1:

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area Source	Amount (in US\$)				Total
			GEF Project Financing	GEF Project Financing Agency Fee	Project Preparation Grant (PPG)	Project Preparation Grant (PPG) Agency Fee	
GEFTF	UNDP	Climate Change	1,655,525	157,275	-	-	1,812,800
GEFTF	UNDP	Biodiversity	3,287,671	312,329	100,000	9,500	3,709,500
GEFTF	UNDP	Land Degradation	3,623,927	344,273	100,000	9,500	4,077,700
Total GEF Resources			8,567,123	813,877	200,000	19,000	9,600,000

The STAR resources indicated above are being endorsed for the project listed above and submitted by the GEF Implementing Agency via the GEF Portal.

Sincerely,



.....
 Mrs. Diann Black Layne
 Director
 Department of Environment
 Ministry of Health, Wellness, Social Transformation and the Environment

Sources of Funds for Country Star Allocation					
GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Glc	Focal Area	Sources of Funds	Total(\$)
UNDP	GET	Antigua and Barbuda	Climate Change	CC STAR Allocation	1,900,000.00
UNDP	GET	Antigua and Barbuda	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	3,709,500.00
UNDP	GET	Antigua and Barbuda	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	3,800,000.00
Total GEF Resources(\$)					9,409,500.00

Agency's Comments

The new LOE letter with adjusted amounts have been uploaded to the portal

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

10/27/2023 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments
Annex C: Project Location

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

Secretariat's Comments
10/27/2023 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

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
12/01/2023 PM:

Cleared.

10/27/2023 PM:

Yes, with comments. As mentioned above, the ESS document has been uploaded in the Portal but hasn't been signed by the UNDP specialist. Please clarify if signature is required at PIF stage.

Agency's Comments
SESP is cleared in the system by Safeguards expert as pre-requisite for submission, therefore no signature is needed in the file.

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/27/2023 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

10/27/2023 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

10/27/2023 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments

12/01/2023 PM:

The project is recommending for technical clearance. Please note comments below to be considered at CEO Endorsement.

10/27/2023 PM:

No. Please address comments above and upload UNDP Project Document (ProDoc)

Agency's Comments

Editions to respond to comments have been added to PIF and highlighted in yellow for easy reference.

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

Secretariat's Comments

At CEO Endorsement please:

- 1) Please provide all co-financing letters.
- 2) Identify those areas under which project ambition can be increased, for instance, under Output 3.2 development of standards and policy framework could be replaced by adoption in the title of the output. Same for output 3.3.
- 3) Elaborate further on each of the outputs, including a detailed list of activities expected under each output.
- 4) At CEO Endorsement please elaborate further on the specific business model to be used by the project, based on existing experiences in the country with the deployment of solar PV panels.

Agency's Comments

Cofinancing letters will be provided in PRODOC stage and editions to outputs 3.2 and 3.3 have been undertaken.

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

First Review
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)