



# Accelerating the transition to a net-zero, nature-positive economy in Trinidad and Tobago (TT Net-zero)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11086

**Countries**

Trinidad and Tobago

**Project Name**

Accelerating the transition to a net-zero, nature-positive economy in Trinidad and Tobago (TT Net-zero)

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

6/25/2024

**Review completed by PM**

10/30/2024

**Program Manager**

Esteban Bermudez Forn

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

## CEO

### Part I - General Project Information

**1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 8/7/2024: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 9/19/2024:

1. Thanks. Cleared.

EBF 8/7/2024:

1. We encourage you to raise the biodiversity target from Significant Objective (1) to Principal Objective (2) given this is a NZNP project.

Agency Response

UNEP 9/11/2024:

Thank you for the recommendation. The biodiversity target was raised accordingly.

**2. Project Summary.**

**a) 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 outcomes?**

**b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?**

**c) [If a child project under a program] Does the project summary include adequate and substantive link with the parent program goal and approach?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 8/7/2024: Yes. Cleared.

## Agency Response

### 3. Project Description Overview

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
- b) [If a child project under a program] Is there a project Theory of Change that is aligned and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?
- c) 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?
- d) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?
- e) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- f) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 9/24/2024:

- 1. GEF Project Financing (6.99%) and Co-Financing (7.14%) contributions to PMC have been adjusted. A note has been included justifying why the GEF project financing is above 5%.  
Cleared.

EBF 8/7/2024:

- 1. The GEF Project Financing (6.99%) and Co-Financing (4.86%) contributions to PMC are not proportional. Please correct.

## Agency Response

UNEP 9/11/2024:

The co-financing amounts were corrected in the portal given the delay in receiving the MEEI signed letter. Also, the same proportion was allocated for PMC as requested.

### 4. Project Outline

#### A. Project Rationale

- a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?
- b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?
- c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

## Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 9/24/2024:

1. Figures are now readable. Cleared.
2. Cleared
3. Cleared
4. Cleared
5. Cleared
6. Cleared
7. Noted. Cleared.
8. Cleared.

EBF 8/7/2024:

1. Fig 1, 3, 4, and 5 are difficult to read. Please reupload.
2. Table 2 mentions the High Ambition Coalition for Nature and People (HAC) and the 30x30 target under Climate Mitigation. Considering the nature-focused goals of HAC, should this initiative be more appropriately placed in the Nature section? Please address and correct if needed.
3. In Table 2 (coordination mechanism), please clarify who integrates the Climate Change Focal Point Network (CCFPN) mentioned in Table 2 and throughout the document. Also, introduce the NDC Interministerial Committee in Table 2. Currently, it is mentioned later in the document.
4. In Table 2 (under key financing lines), would it be appropriate to introduce Trinidad and Tobago's Green Fund in this section? More information is presented later (page 22 of the CEO Approval form), but it would be appropriate to introduce the Green Fund in Table 2. Please address if appropriate.
5. The country with UNEP as the implementing agency submitted a request to the GEF (GEF ID 11654) to finance the preparation and submission of its First Biennial Transparency Report, as well as a combined Second Biennial Transparency Report and Fourth National Communication (BTR1 and BTR2/NC4). Certain project outputs directly contribute to enhancing transparency. Please mention this EA project and ensure coordination between projects.
6. On page 21 of the CEO approval document, the CCFPN is again mentioned with the NDC Interministerial Committee. Please clarify the difference and complementarity between these initiatives and why the project has chosen the CCFPN to form the working groups.
7. Table 7 (key policies) mentions that Independent Power Producers (IPPs) can't generate renewable-based electricity. Please explain if this impacts any of the project outputs related to energy. If so, include considerations and risk mitigation measures as part of the project.
8. Please consider if the following GCF projects should also be considered as part of Table 6 (upstream) or Table 11 (downstream):
  - [FP242](#) Caribbean Net-Zero and Resilient Private Sector
  - [FP197](#) Green Guarantee Company ("GGC")

- [GCF Readiness](#) Multi-Country Climate Resilient Urban Development Initiative
- [GCF Readiness](#) (implemented by UNEP) Advancing a Regional Approach to the Green Hydrogen Economy in Latin America and the Caribbean

## Agency Response

UNEP 9/11/2024:

1. Figures 1, 3, 4 and 5 were re-uploaded on the portal.
2. Thanks for the comment. Indeed the HAC is better placed in the section that regards nature (Table 3). According adjustments have been made.
3. This is a valid comment. The CCFPN is coordinated by the the Multilateral Environmental Agreements Unit (MEAU) of the Ministry of Planning and Development (MPD). Currently it is inactive, but the project aims at utilizing this vehicle for bread stakeholder information dissemination and consultation purposes. The description of the CCFPN in Table two has been revised and a paragraph on the NDC Interministerial Committee has been added.
4. Thanks for the comment, yes a introduction about the Green Fund would make in Table 2. According adjustments have been made.
5. Mention to the project GEF ID 11654 has been included, and UNEP and MPD will ensure coordination between projects.
6. Currently, there is no distinct relationship between the two bodies established, as the NDC Interministerial Committee is inactive. Generally, however, oversees and manages the NDC Interministerial Committee particularly the implementation of the country's NDC. The CCFPN is a much larger body that comprises over 200 institutions, comprising institutions outside of the government agencies. it was established to facilitate as structured communication channel on climate change matters and developments among the most important stakeholders. The CCFPN has the mandate to disseminate information as well as to provide advice to the government. this is why it is the mst appropriate body to support the working groups. To make the envisaged relationship and usage between the NDC Interministerial Body, the CCFPN and the NZNP Governance Body clearer, a Figure has been added within the description of Output 1.1.
7. The fact that under the current regulation, IPPs cannot generate renewable energy-based electricity is not regarded as a risk but as a barrier to the project's objective. Hence this particular barrier is reflected and adress through Deliverable 2.2.1. As the issue around T&T's regulatory framework for an adequate RE update is addressed within the project activities, risk mitigation measures are not necessary.
8. Thanks for this valid comment. According adjustments have been made. The projects "GCF Readiness Multi-Country Climate Resilient Urban Development Initiative" and "GCF Readiness (implemented by UNEP) Advancing a Regional Approach to the Green Hydrogen Economy in Latin

America and the Caribbean" have been added in Table 6 (Upstream). The projects "FP242 Caribbean Net-Zero and Resilient Private Sector" and "FP197 Green Guarantee Company ("GGC")" have been added in Table 11 (Downstream).

## **5 B. Project Description**

**5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?**

**b) [If a child project under a program] Is the Theory of change aligned with and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?**

**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? [If a child project under a program] Does the description include how the alternative aligns with and contributes to the overall program goal and approach?**

**d) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**

**e) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?**

**f) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?**

**g) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?**

**h) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?**

**i) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?**

**j) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?**

**k) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?**

**l) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?**

**m) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? [If a child project under an integrated program] Are the specific levers of transformation identified and described? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 9/24/2024:

1. Cleared

2. Cleared
3. Cleared
4. We welcome this clarification. Cleared.
5. Cleared
6. Noted. Cleared
7. Cleared
8. Cleared

EBF 8/7/2024:

1. Fig 6, 7, and 8 are difficult to read. Please reupload.
2. Please define the relationship and complementarity between the new NZNP governance body (mentioned in deliverable 1.1.1) and the CCFPN (mentioned in deliverable 1.1.2).
3. Regarding Deliverable 1.1.5 and Output 1.2, it is key that national stakeholders build the capacities to the extent possible. We encourage that this deliverable enables stakeholders to take over after the project finishes without being constrained by proprietary or locked-in solutions.
4. Please highlight the complementarity between the ongoing CBIT project (GEF ID 10596) and Output 1.4.
5. Given that Output 1.5 aims to introduce a national carbon pricing mechanism, please consider engaging the World Bank-managed Partnership for Market Implementation (PMI). In addition to providing funds for carbon pricing initiatives, PMI has a robust stakeholder and knowledge network that can help build this component on existing experiences and lessons learned from other countries in the region.
6. There seems to be an overlap between Outputs 3.1 and 3.3. Clarify the difference and/or complementarity (if any) between Deliverable 3.1.1 and Deliverable 3.3.1, as well as Deliverable 3.1.2 and Deliverable 3.3.2.
7. Similarly, please consider rephrasing the titles of Outputs 3.2 and 3.4 to make it clear pilots will be developed under these two outputs.
8. Please refer to the comment on the GHG savings under core indicator 6. If applicable, please ensure it is also addressed in this section.

## Agency Response

UNEP 9/11/2024:

1. Figures 6, 7 and 8 were re-uploaded on the portal.
2. Under Output 1.1. the mentioned NZNP governance body will be established, which aims at consolidating the mandates for the oversight of the countries NZNP transition and all related activities. The NDC Interministerial Body will be integrated into the NDC governance body as a subsidiary body. The CCFPN, which will also be supported by the project, thereby functions as a

broader stakeholder committee and knowledge dissemination platform, receiving reports on activities and providing advice accordingly. Please see the new Figure added to Output 1.1.

3. The project aims to enable national stakeholders to build their capacities and ensure future ownership. In order to allow national stakeholders to take over the future updates and further development of the NZNP agenda, the modelling results under Output 1.2 including all assumptions and underlying data will be made available transparently to all stakeholders and hand over to the MPD for future use and updates. The Output description has been amended accordingly.

4. The complementarity between the ongoing CBIT project and Output 1.4 was highlighted in the text. In general, output 1.4 will build upon the CBIT project, enhancing the national climate transparency and knowledge management platform by adding nature-positive aspects to the framework and incorporating long-term commitments tracking mechanisms. Also, EMA as the CBIT project Executing Agency is identified as a key-partner for this output and PSC member, ensuring coordination between the two projects.

5. Thanks for the comment. According adjustments have been made. A footnote about possible engagement with PMI to implement a national carbon pricing mechanism has been added in the description of Output 1.5 and a reference has been made in Deliverable 1.5.6.

6. In the early project development process, discussions have been taken place whether the Outputs for the island of Trinidad and the island of Tobago should have been combined (including the project pipeline development (Deliverable 3.1.1 and 3.3.1) and the match making event (Deliverable 3.1.2 and 3.3.2)). The result was to address the existing barriers and issues of both islands separately in distinct Outputs and Deliverables for the following key reasons:

- The NZNP-aligned project pipeline and pilots will address different topics on both islands
- The stakeholders on both islands are not the same
- The differentiation enhances the simplicity and ease of implementation, as working together with different leading government bodies respectively to the two islands will be required
- Distinct Outputs enhance the ownership of the activities of the respective island, as leadership and engagement on the local governmental level is strengthened.

7. Thanks for the comment, the title has been amended and changes throughout the document as follows:

- Output 3.2: The technical, economic, social, and environmental feasibility of sustainable and low-emission solutions, taking into consideration nature positive aspects, is demonstrated to local and national stakeholders by demonstration pilots in Port-of-Spain, Arima and Chaguanas (Trinidad)
- Output 3.4: The technical, economic, social and environmental feasibility of solutions in Tobago's ecotourism sector, leveraging NZNP-aligned investments, is demonstrated to local and national stakeholders by demonstration pilots



8. Please see response to the comment on GHG savings. The principles to be considered for the pilots under Output 3.2 and 3.4 have been amended: "a minimum of 3,000 tCO<sub>2</sub>e (over 20 years) to be reached by the pilots of the projects on both islands" has been added.

## **5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project**

- a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?**
- b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?**
- c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).**
- d) [If a child project under an integrated program] Does the framework for coordination and collaboration demonstrate consistency with overall ambition of the program for transformative change?**

## **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

EBF 9/24/2024:

- 1. Cleared
- 2. Cleared

EBF 8/7/2024:

- 1. Fig 9 is difficult to read. Please reupload.
- 2. Considering that UNDP will be co-executing the project. Please consider elaborating further on the specific execution roles of UNDP and the Ministry of Planning and Development in ?Table 12 Constitution and Role of Project Entities?.

## **Agency Response**

UNEP 9/11/2024:

- 1. Figure was re-uploaded.
- 2. Roles of UNDP and MPD were further explained in Table 12.

## **5.3 Core indicators**

- a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)? [If a child project under a program] Is the choice of core indicators consistent with those prioritized under the parent program?**
- b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?**

## Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 10/30/2024:

1. Cleared
2. Noted. Cleared.

EBF 10/23/2024:

1. Given the uncertainty of the GHG emissions calculation. Please justify why a 40% causality factor was employed or reduce it to a more conservative value.
2. According to [IEA's Energy Profile for Trinidad and Tobago](#), the electricity emission factor in 2022 was 502 tCO<sub>2</sub>/GWh, while the grid emission factor used by the mitigation potential calculator is 0.37 tCO<sub>2</sub>/MWh (or 370 tCO<sub>2</sub>/GWh). Please corroborate if you are using the most up-to-date grid emission factor.

EBF 9/24/2024:

1. Please provide the GHG spreadsheet so the GEF team can review the calculations and assumptions made. Please f

EBF 8/7/2024:

1. Regarding core indicator 6, please explain why an e-bus project for Trinidad and a PV project for Tobago were selected to calculate the direct GHG savings if "the solutions to be implemented will be defined during the project's implementation phase". Should the selection criteria of the applicable outputs set a minimum GHG potential instead?

## Agency Response

UNEP 10/29/2024:

1. Yes, given the uncertainty we have employed a very conservative causality factor of 0,4%.
2. Thanks you for the question related to the grid emission factors. The estimation of the emission reduction potential the [Harmonized IFI Default Grid Factors 2021 v3.2](#) of the [International Financial Institution \(IFI\) Framework for a Harmonized Approach to Greenhouse Gas Accounting](#) published by the UNFCCC have been applied (published 2022). The Harmonized Default Grid Factors are determined using the [TOOL07 of the Clean Development Mechanism](#). The grid factors are expressed as Combined Margin (considering the operating and build margin). In the calculations, we applied the 370 gCO<sub>2</sub>/kWh (electricity consumption) for the e-bus transport sector case and 490 gCO<sub>2</sub>/kWh (intermittent energy) for the installation of PV systems tourism case. The CO<sub>2</sub> emission factor for

elec. & heat generation presented by IRENA are based on IEA data, calculated by dividing power sector emissions by elec. + heat gen (this corresponds basically to the operating margin). Since the project applies for international climate finance we suggest using the IFI default values, which are using approved methodologies to estimate the grid emission factor more precisely. During the implementation and monitoring the latest figures of the grid emission factors will be used ex-post.

UNEP 9/27/2024:

1. The GHG spreadsheet has been uploaded to the portal.

UNEP 9/11/2024:

1. Thanks for your comment. As per description of the demonstration pilot for Trinidad (Output 3.2) and Tobago (Output 3.4), the most promising and prioritised technologies under the pilots will be the switch to electric public transport in Trinidad along the mentioned corridors and the promotion and installation of PV system on hotels in Tobago to promote the ecotourism sector. Hence, the tool for estimating and presenting the GHG emission reduction provided by the NZNPA Global Platform has been used to estimate direct GHG emission reductions from these technologies. This illustrates the methodological approach for the estimation and order of magnitude of the impact. Even though the final pilots are not selected and will be defined during the project's implementation phase this indicative estimation already shows the minimum level of ambition for the pilots. We suggest for the pilot selection and implementation a minimum of 3,000 tCO<sub>2</sub> (over 20 years) to be reached by the project. This will implicitly put the mitigation potential as an important selection criteria for the pilots.

The principles to be considered for the pilots under Output 3.2 and 3.4 have been amended: "a minimum of 3,000 tCO<sub>2</sub>e (over 20 years) to be reached by the pilots of the projects on both islands" has been added. Also Annex C "Core Indicators" has been updated accordingly.

#### 5.4 Risks

- a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- 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 assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 10/23/2024:

2. Cleared.

EBF 9/24/2024:

1. Cleared
2. We take note of the description in the Core Indicators table. However, we notice an issue with the numbering of some tables. For example, Table 13 is referred to in the text, but there is no Table 13. Similarly, you mention Table 14 in your response, which doesn't exist in the Portal Form. Please address.

EBF 8/7/2024:

1. Regarding political risk, should the project also consider potential risks in terms of political continuity, given the upcoming parliamentary elections? If so, please indicate how the project intends to address this risk.
2. The project's overall ESS risk is classified as moderate, and UNEP attached the SCRIF. However, the environmental and social risk section does not provide a summary of risk and mitigation measures in the table. Please provide a summary of ESS risks and mitigation measures in the table.

## Agency Response

UNEP 10/18/2024:

2. Thank you for pointing this out. Since the Core Indicators section on the portal does not support the table format, the text has been updated informing that detailed information about the potential areas for restoration is available in Table 13 in the attached CEO ED. The Table 14 mentioned in our response refers to the "Key risks" table in the Portal Form. We apologize for the confusion between the CEO ED PDF version and the Portal Form.

UNEP 9/11/2024:

1. The next general elections due by November 2025 has been included as cause of a potential political risk, more specifically risk of shifting government priorities and/or lack of political buy-in, and low political leadership for the uptake of NZNP activities. Section B6 has been amended accordingly.
2. A summary of ESS risk and mitigation measures has been included in Table 14.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

## Agency Response

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

**6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?**

**b) [If a child project under an integrated program] Is the project adequately aligned with the program objective in the GEF-8 programming directions?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 8/7/2024: Yes. Cleared.

## Agency Response

**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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 8/7/2024: Yes. Cleared.

## Agency Response

**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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
EBF 9/24/2024:

1. Cleared.

EBF 8/7/2024:

1. Please elaborate on the specific project interventions that contribute to each of the targets identified, making a reference to the corresponding core indicator targets/GEBs whenever possible. Also, as per the proposal, it seems the project would also contribute to targets 11 Restore, Maintain, and Enhance Nature's Contributions to People and 14 Integrate Biodiversity in Decision-Making at Every Level. Please clarify and/or amend accordingly.

## Agency Response

UNEP 9/11/2024:

1. Thanks for your recommendations. The targets of the Kunming-Montreal Framework that align with the project interventions have been revised accordingly. Target 1 has been included instead of target 3, as target 1 appeared to be a better fit. While target 16 has been reassessed as not suitable, target 11 and 14 have been included, as suggested. Under the section "Alignment with the Kunming-

Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework " instead of the previous bullet-style list, a table has been included that lists are targets of the Kunming-Montreal Framework with which the TT Net-zero Project aligns. The table further includes a justification for each target with references to specific project interventions as well as the project's GEF Core Indicators, as applicable.

#### **7 D. Policy Requirements**

##### **7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 8/7/2024: Yes. Cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

##### **7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
EBF 9/24/2024:

1. Cleared.

EBF 8/7/2024:

1. Please ensure that the Gender Action Plan is budgeted, to ensure its implementation.

#### **Agency Response**

UNEP 9/11/2024:

1. Thanks for the comment, budgeting of the Gender Action Plan is ensured. The targets for a gender-responsive implementation of the project will mainly be supported by the Gender Expert and the Consultancy on Gender Responsive Communication and Community Engagement. For both, as per the Budget Tool, a total budget of 184,444 USD (including 12,437 USD for the support of Monitoring & Evaluation by the Gender Expert) is estimated. An additional column has been added to the Gender Action Plan, reflecting the total budget per Component which is dedicated to ensure the achievement of the GAP targets.

##### **7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
EBF 9/24/2024:

1. Cleared.

EBF 8/7/2024:

1. The project describes in detail the stakeholder consultations and analysis in project development. However, the stakeholder engagement plan for project implementation is very general. Please provide further details, i.e., a matrix of key stakeholders? roles and responsibilities in the project, the timing of the engagement throughout the project cycle, and, if possible, the resources allocated for the various activities.

#### Agency Response

UNEP 9/11/2024:

1. Thanks for the comment. The stakeholder engagement section was reviewed and further information for the stakeholder engagement plan for project implementation has been included.

#### **7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 9/24/2024:

1. Cleared.

EBF 8/7/2024:

1. Please refer to our comment on the Risks Table.

#### Agency Response

UNEP 9/11/2024:

1. The safeguards document has been uploaded and a summary was included on the Risks Table.

#### **8 Annexes**

##### **Annex A: Financing Tables**

**8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: 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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 8/7/2024: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

**8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)**

**a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestEBF 8/7/2024: Yes, the project is requesting \$99,999. Annex D provides the status of utilization of the PPG. Cleared.

Agency Response

**8.3 Source of Funds**

**Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?**

**Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request



EBF 9/24/2024:

1. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

EBF 8/7/2024:

1. No. The table in the LOE doesn't coincide with the financing tables provided in the portal.  
Please correct the financing tables in the portal or provide a new LOE so the tables are consistent.

This is the sum of each focal area source according to the data provided in the portal  
(calculated by the PM):

<b>Focal Area Source</b>	<b>GEF Project Financing</b>	<b>GEF Project Financing Agency Fee</b>	<b>PPG</b>	<b>PPG Agency Fee</b>	<b>Total</b>
CC STAR Allocation: IPs	898,913	80,902	18,518	1,667	1,000,000
BD STAR Allocation: IPs	2,696,738	242,706	55,556	5,000	3,000,000
LD STAR Allocation: IPs	44,946	4,045	926	83	50,000
STAR IP Matching Incentives	1,213,531	109,218	24,999	2,250	1,349,998

This is the table provided in the LOE:

<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>GEF Agency</b>	<b>Focal Area Source</b>	<b>Amount (in US\$)</b>				<b>Total</b>
			<b>GEF Project Financing</b>	<b>GEF Project Financing Agency Fee</b>	<b>Project Preparation Grant (PPG)</b>	<b>Project Preparation Grant (PPG) Agency Fee</b>	
GEFTF	UNEP	CC STAR Allocation	842,431	75,819	75,000	6,750	1,000,000
GEFTF	UNEP	BD STAR Allocation	2,727,294	245,456	25,000	2,250	3,000,000
GEFTF	UNEP	LD STAR Allocation	45,872	4,128	0	0	50,000
GEFTF	UNEP	STAR IP Matching Incentives	1,238,532	111,468	0	0	1,350,000
<b>Total GEF Resources</b>			4,854,129	436,871	100,000	9,000	5,400,000

#### Agency Response

UNEP 9/11/2024:

1. The financing table provided in the portal is correct and in accordance with the approved IP.  
During the preparation of the IP, the numbers in the finance tables were adjusted following a request from the GEF Secretariat to distribute PPG funds across focal areas. This adjustment was made after

receiving the Letters of Endorsement from the countries, and based on verbal guidance from the GEF Secretariat at the time, it was agreed that updated Letters of Endorsement would not be required, as the total amounts remained unchanged. The LoEs were accepted as part of the PFD package last year. Given this context, we kindly request reconsideration of the need for updated LoE.

**8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

**e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?**


Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
EBF 11/05/2024:

2.1. Cleared. The letter of support from Republic Bank has been removed from the co-financing table.

EBF 11/04/2024:

2.1. Please note in the final clearance review sheet that this low co-financing commitment relative to our required 1:7 target does not constitute a precedent for future levels of co-financing. Future projects should strive to achieve the stated co-financing target.

Please remove the letter of support from the co-finance table.

Private Sector	Republic Bank Limited	Loans	Investment mobilized	
----------------	-----------------------	-------	----------------------	---

EBF 10/23/2024:

2.1. Please update us on whether obtaining the co-financing letter from MEEI and the Republic Bank will be feasible in the next few weeks before the cancellation deadline (considering the 4-week circulation).

EBF 9/24/2024:

1. Cleared.
2. About the co-financing letters contained in the Agency's project document:
  1. Considering that the ratio between co-finance and the GEF grant is low. We encourage you to make an additional effort to increase the co-finance contribution

to this project. Please reconsider obtaining the co-financing letter from MEEI or consider other sources of co-financing.

2. Cleared

EBF 8/7/2024:

1. Please ensure that the co-financing letters are visible in the CEO Approval form.

### Confirmed Co-financing for the project, by name and type ⓘ

Please include evidence for each co-financing source for this project in the tab of the portal

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)	Uploa co-f
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Planning and Development	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	400,000.00	
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Planning and Development	Public Investment	Investment mobilized	6,350,000.00	
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Rural Development and Local Government	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	100,000.00	
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Rural Development and Local Government	Public Investment	Investment mobilized	500,000.00	
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Energy and Energy Industries	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	100,000.00	
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Energy and Energy Industries	Public Investment	Investment mobilized	5,500,000.00	
Total Co-financing(\$)				12,950,000.00	

2. We take note that the co-financing letters from the Ministry of Planning and the Ministry of Rural Development & Local Government are located in the Agency project document in the documents section of the project.
  1. Yet, we couldn't find the co-financing letter from the Ministry of Energy and Energy Industries. Please include it in the Agency project document and/or the portal form.
  2. Also, if possible, reupload the co-financing letter from the Rural Development & Local Government because the resolution is low and difficult to read.

Agency Response

UNEP 11/05/2024:

2.1 Thank you for the guidance. We acknowledge that this low co-financing commitment does not set a precedent and will strive to meet the 1:7 co-financing target in future projects. The letter of support was removed from the co-finance table.

UNEP 10/29/2024:

2.1 We would like to inform you that we won't be able to present the co-financing letters at this stage. However, we will continue to make every necessary effort to secure co-financing for the project during the implementation phase. Additionally, we would like to inform you that we have received a letter from Republic Bank (uploaded to the portal), committing to provide financing for projects aligned with the GEF-8 TT net-zero project, as anticipated under Component 3. However, we couldn't include this in the co-financing calculations because they have not yet been able to provide a specific amount for the next four years.

UNEP 10/18/2024:

2.1. Agreed. We are already making additional efforts to increase the co-finance contribution to this project and will continue these efforts throughout the implementation phase. In fact, the Republic Bank has already committed to providing co-financing for the project, and we expect to receive the signed letter in the coming weeks/months, considering some bureaucratic delays in the signing and issuance process.

UNEP 9/11/2024:

1. The co-financing letters were uploaded in the form.

2.1. We regret to inform that, despite previous agreements, we did not receive the signed co-financing letter from MEEI in time for submission. As a result, we have excluded their co-financing figures in the project proposal. We remain committed to securing additional partnerships and will keep GEF Sec informed of any future developments.

2.2 The co-financing letter from the MRDLG was re-uploaded.

**Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:**

**Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestEBF 8/7/2024: Yes. The project is endorsed by Mr. Hayden ROMANO. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 8/7/2024: Yes. Cleared.

#### Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 9/24/2024:

1. Cleared.

EBF 8/7/2024:

1. Please address the comment related to the financing tables and submit a new LOE if appropriate.

#### Agency Response

UNEP 9/11/2024:

1. The mismatch was caused by an error in entering the amounts on the form. It was corrected in the form.

#### Annex C: Project Results Framework

**8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?**

**b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)**

**c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?**

**d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?**

**e)[If a regional/global coordination child project under an integrated program] Does the results framework reflect the program-wide result framework, inclusive of results from child projects and specific to the regional/global coordination child project? [If a country child project under an integrated program] Is the child project result framework inclusive of program-wide metrics monitored across child project by the Regional/Global Child project?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 9/24/2024:

1. Cleared.

EBF 8/7/2024:

1. Please refer to the comment on the GHG savings under core indicator 6. If applicable, please ensure it is also addressed in this section.

#### Agency Response

UNEP 9/11/2024:

1. Please see response to the comment on GHG savings. The principles to be considered for the pilots under Output 3.2 and 3.4 have been amended: "a minimum of 3,000 tCO<sub>2</sub>e (over 20 years) to be reached by the pilots of the projects on both islands" has been added. Also Annex C "Core Indicators" has been updated accordingly.

#### **Annex E: Project map and coordinates**

**8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 8/7/2024: Cleared.

#### Agency Response

#### **Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating**

**8.8 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 8/7/2024: Yes. Cleared.

#### Agency Response

#### **Annex G: GEF Budget template**

**8.9 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?**

**b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?**

**c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 8/7/2024:

1. The TORs of project staff charged to project components and PMC are included in the agency project document. Cleared.

#### Agency Response

**Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes**

**8.10 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.**

**b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.**

**c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

**Agency Response**

**Additional Annexes**

**9. GEFSEC DECISION**

**9.1. GEFSEC Recommendation**

**Is the project recommended for approval**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 11/05/2024: The PM recommends the project for further processing. The outstanding comment from the O&P Division of the GEF related to the co-financing table has been addressed.

EBF 11/04/2024: Please address the comment above related to the co-finance table.

EBF 10/23/2024: Please address the comments above and remove the highlights from the portal form and the agency project document. Also, include the clean agency project document (without highlights) as "public" in the documents section when circulating to the GEF Council.

EBF 9/24/2024: Please address the comments above, highlight changes **in green** for ease of review, and resubmit. Also, include the agency project document as "public" in the documents section to include it when going on circulation to the GEF Council.

EBF 8/7/2024: Please address the comments above, highlight changes **in yellow** for ease of review, and resubmit. Also, include the agency project document as "public" in the documents section to include it when going on circulation to the GEF Council.

**9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	8/7/2024	7/11/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/24/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/23/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/30/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/5/2024	