

Global Program on Renewable Energy Systems in SIDS ?

National Project in Barbados: Establishment of an Integrated Knowledge and Technology Support Platform to Promote Innovation in Micro-, Small- and Medium-sized Enterprises

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

12230

Countries

Barbados

Project Name

Global Program on Renewable Energy Systems in SIDS ? National Project in Barbados: Establishment of an Integrated Knowledge and Technology Support Platform to Promote Innovation in Micro-, Small- and Medium-sized Enterprises

Agencies

UNIDO

Date received by PM

12/18/2025

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

4/21/2026 PM:

Cleared.

4/15/2026 PM:

Not cleared. The name of the Executing Agency in Portal includes some text ("University of the West Indies (UWI) Cave Hill Campus (SIDS-SIDS Green and Blue Economy Knowledge Transfer Hub)") that is not in LoE ("The University of the West Indies, Cave Hill Campus"). Please make the Executing Partner in Portal matching exactly that in LoE.

Also, as discussed via email thank you for revising the title of the project. As agreed, please do provide us with the email from the OFP confirming they are ok with the proposed title change.

1/30/2026 PM:

Yes, please address the following comments:

1) Project title in Portal (?Piloting an integrated knowledge and technology transfer support platform to enable green, clean energy and circular innovation in micro, small and medium sized enterprises in Barbados?) is slightly different than in LoE (?Establishment of an Integrated Knowledge and Technology Support Platform to Promote Green, Clean Energy and Circular Innovation in Micro-, Small- and Medium-Sized Enterprises in Barbados?). Please include in Portal the title in LoE. The title can be further updated at CEO Approval stage. If possible, at CEO approval stage please considering adding the name of the program to the title, the same UNIDO did for the national project in S. Kits and Nevis, i.e. #12231 Global program on climate-resilient renewable energy systems in SIDSs - national project in Saint Kitts and Nevis. This will help to easily track and identify the project.

2) As per the general project information table, it seems the project has two executing entities, i.e., University of the West Indies (UWI) Cave Hill Campus (SIDS-SIDS Green and Blue Economy Knowledge Transfer Hub) and Barbados Trust Fund Ltd. However, under the section "Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives", the proposal states that the final execution strategy will be determined during the PPG. While this is ok and there is no need to identify the executing entity at PIF stage, please make the information consistent across the document. Also, the LoE includes UWI but does not mention the Barbados Trust Fund Ltd. Please remove this institution from the table (this can be added later during the preparation).

Agency's Comments

- Title has been adjusted to the one mentioned in the LoE. A new LoE was obtained.
- Barbados Trust Fund Ltd. has been removed, leaving University of the West Indies (UWI) Cave Hill Campus as the only executing entity.
- **Comment 16 April 2026:** The name of the executing entity was adjusted and agreement by the OFP for the project title "Global Programme on Renewable Energy Systems in SIDS National Project in Barbados: Establishment of an Integrated Knowledge and Technology Support Platform to Promote Innovation in Micro-, Small- and Medium-sized Enterprise" was received.

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

1/30/2026 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

1/30/2026 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

1/30/2026 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

4/5/2026 PM:

Cleared.

1/30/2026 PM:

No. The M&E costs for the GEF financing portion are approximately 9%, which is higher than the recommended 5%. In contrast, the M&E allocation for the co-financing portion is 0.8%. Please consider rebalancing the M&E allocations so they are closer to the recommended 5% level.

Agency's Comments The M&E costs were reduced to 5%.

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

4/5/2026 PM:

Cleared, with thanks for the clarification.

1/30/2026 PM:

Yes, with comments. We notice that Barbados has not conducted a Technology Needs Assessment (TNA), neither global nor sector/technology specific, which could have helped in the implementation of this project. Is Barbados considering a TNA as part of this or other projects?

Agency's Comments

The project does not foresee a TNA but the development of technology roadmaps.

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

4/5/2026 PM:

Cleared.

1/30/2026 PM:

No. In general further clarification is needed on innovation vs. replication. It is unclear the value added of the project over the several on-going initiatives in the country, and how the proposed project will really scale up MSMEs participation the renewable energy and energy efficiency sector. What is new and/or innovative of the proposed project compared to the IDB support program, Accelerator Lab, BLOOM, Wildly Green Business Support Project and the Credit Scheme Guarantee? Also, some of these other initiatives have been included as part of the co-financing. Please elaborate further complementarity among them and the value added of the proposed project.

Agency's Comments

The PIF has been revised and strengthened to:

- present a concise justification for the integrated MSME cleantech ecosystem over narrower alternatives;
- clarifies how the projects covers the incremental costs;
- clarify innovation vs. replication by specifying what is new (institutional anchoring at UWI, a dedicated gender-responsive blended finance mechanism,
- MSME-focused roadmaps/incentives, and operational quality infrastructure) versus what is being scaled or institutionalised from prior initiatives;
- explain the scaling pathway for MSME RE/EE and circular adoption (policy/market pull + capability/standards + de-risked finance);
- detail complementarity vis-à-vis the IDB program, UNDP Accelerator Lab, BLOOM, PAGE/Wilkey, and the Credit Guarantee Scheme (CGS), including who funds baseline functions vs. what GEF finances as incremental; and
- list stakeholder roles and co-financing linkages, ensuring the financing plan coherently reflects the baseline/alternative logic.

In short, the value added is that the project consolidates and institutionalises previously time-bound or siloed efforts into a permanent national platform at UWI and couples it with a targeted blended finance mechanism and quality infrastructure so that MSME demand, bankability, and supply capability advance together something none of the referenced initiatives deliver in combination. This is precisely how the project scales MSME participation in RE/EE and circular solutions.

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
4/5/2026 PM:

Cleared.

1/30/2026 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

1) Please provide additional details on each project outcome to better illustrate the scope, scale, and activities associated with each component.

2) Component 2 has been tagged as "Investment" activity type. However, from the short description of Component 2 it seems all the activities are technical assistance. For instance, it is unclear whether output 2.1.4 will finance any pilot (investment) or just the MSEM business plans (technical activity). Please clarify and amend accordingly.

3) Please elaborate more on output 2.1.3 *"Innovative blended finance mechanisms for MSME cleantech adoption and innovation"*. This is the largest component in terms of financing but lacks detail on financial structure. Please specify: specific financial instruments, financial structure and governance of potential instruments, additionality mechanisms (ensuring support reaches MSMEs that otherwise couldn't access finance) and MSME selection criteria and inclusion strategies for women/youth-led enterprises. It is also unclear the role of Barbados Trust Fund Ltd. in the proposed financial mechanism. If this information is not available at PIF stage, please indicate in PIF that specificities of the financial instrument will be provided at CEO approval.

Agency's Comments
All three points are now addressed:

- Outcomes detailed with explicit links to Outputs 1.1.1-5.1.3 across Components 1-5.
- Component 2 clarified
- Output 2.1.3 expanded

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
4/5/2026 PM:

Cleared.

1/30/2026 PM:

No. Please see comment above on the need to elaborate further on the complementarity with on-going initiatives and innovativeness of the proposed project.

Agency's Comments The PIF has been revised to elaborate on the incremental cost reasoning by clearly distinguishing the baseline scenario from the GEF alternative, highlighting complementarity with ongoing national and donor-funded initiatives, and explaining the added value and innovativeness of GEF support. The updated text clarifies how GEF financing enables integrated policy, finance, and quality infrastructure, and innovation mechanisms that do not exist under the baseline and addresses previously identified system gaps.

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

4/5/2026 PM:

Cleared.

1/30/2026 PM:

No. Please see above comment on the need to ensure consistency on the executing agency across the PIF. Also, Section ?Coordination with other initiatives? lacks information. Please ask elaborate further this section.

Agency's Comments

PIF has been adjusted to ensure consistency with the executing agency. Section ?Coordination with other initiatives? has been expanded.

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.

1/30/2026 PM:

No. Please provide a GHG calculation sheet at PIF stage and elaborate further on how core indicator 6 has been estimated. Also, please include an estimation at PIF for Core Indicator 11.

Agency's Comments A GHG emission calculation sheet has been developed initially covering the clean energy impact scopes of renewable energy and energy efficiency. Further calculations will be done during the PPG phase. Please find the calculation sheet under roadmaps and documents section.

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

Secretariat's Comments
1/30/2026 PM:

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
4/5/2026 PM:

Cleared.

1/30/2026 PM:

No. Please elaborate further on the Overall Risk Rating.

Agency's Comments UNIDO has expanded the overall risk rating narrative to clearly justify the final ?Low? rating after mitigation. The revised section explains how the combination of institutional partnerships, existing policy alignment, established financial mechanisms, and

strong implementation arrangements significantly reduces residual risks. The section now synthesizes all risk categories (contextual, institutional, technological, financial, environmental/social) and provides a rationale showing that remaining risks can be effectively managed through the proposed mitigation measures and project governance mechanisms.

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

4/5/2026 PM:

Cleared.

1/30/2026 PM:

No. Please see previous comments on the need to clarify project's innovativeness and complementarity with on-going initiatives.

Agency's Comments

The PIF has been expanded to clearly articulate how the project is integrated, durable, and transformative, with explicit statements on innovation vs. replication, scaling?up pathways, and policy coherence. The revised text explains the project?s value added over ongoing initiatives (IDB programs, BLOOM, PAGE Wildey, Accelerator Lab, and the Credit Guarantee Scheme), the role of the UWI?hosted cleantech platform as a permanent institutional home, and the design of an MSME?oriented blended finance mechanism for adoption and innovation. It also details how sectoral technology roadmaps, incentive proposals, and quality infrastructure and certification will align and strengthen national policies and implementation.

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

4/5/2026 PM:

Cleared.

1/30/2026 PM:

No. Please clearly indicate that the project is aligned with GEF Climate Change Mitigation Strategy Objectives 1.1 and 1.2. Also, given that the proposal is expected significant climate change mitigation co-benefits, please elaborate further on these and include a comment regarding alignment with the Special Climate Change Fund strategy.

Agency's Comments Section C has been revised to clearly state alignment with the GEF's Climate Change Mitigation Strategy, specifically Objectives 1.1 and 1.2. Additional text has been added to elaborate on the project's significant climate mitigation co-benefits and to demonstrate its alignment with the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) Strategy, particularly regarding climate-resilient technologies and MSME adaptive capacity. The updated section now fully addresses the Secretariat's request.

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

1/30/2026 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

1/30/2026 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments N/A

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

1/30/2026 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

4/5/2026 PM:

Cleared.

1/30/2026 PM:

No. PIF states that consultations took place between October and November. Please indicate the year of the consultations to ensure transparency and traceability. In addition, please provide a brief summary of the findings of these consultations to inform project design and provide further details on plans to engage and consult MSMEs and civil society, including effort to engage poor and marginalized groups.

Agency's Comments

The PIF has been adjusted to indicate that consultations took place between October and November 2025. Moreover, a summary of the findings of these consultations to inform project design has been included in the PIF, as well as further details on plans to engage and consult MSMEs and civil society, including efforts to engage poor and marginalised groups.

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

4/5/2026 PM:

Cleared.

1/30/2026 PM:

No. Sources of funds table in Portal (see screenshot below) doesn't match that in LoE (see screenshot below). Please amend by either changing the Focal areas? allocation in Portal (providing that there are funds), ot to obtain a new LoE.

Sources of Funds for Country Star Allocation					
GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Sources of Funds	Total(\$)
UNIDO	GET	Barbados	Climate Change	CC STAR Allocation	900,000.00
UNIDO	GET	Barbados	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	697,000.00
UNIDO	GET	Barbados	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	396,423.00
Total GEF Resources(\$)					1,993,423.00

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area Source	Amount (in US\$)				
			GEF Project Financing	GEF Project Financing Agency Fee	Project Preparation Grant (PPG)	Project Preparation Grant (PPG) Agency Fee	Total
GEFTF	UNIDO	Climate Change	1,776,484	168,766	50,000	4,750	2,000,000
Total GEF Resources			1,776,484	168,766	50,000	4,750	2,000,000

Agency's Comments

A new LOE was issued and uploaded in the portal

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

1/30/2026 PM:

N/A.

Agency's CommentsN/A

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

1/30/2026 PM:

N/A.

Agency's CommentsN/A

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

1/30/2026 PM:

N/A.

Agency's CommentsN/A

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

Secretariat's Comments
1/30/2026 PM:

N/A.

Agency's CommentsN/A
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments
1/30/2026 PM:

N/A.

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
1/30/2026 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
1/30/2026 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
1/30/2026 PM:

Yes.

Agency's CommentsN/A

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

Secretariat's Comments

1/30/2026 PM:

Yes.

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

4/5/2026 PM:

Cleared.

1/30/2026 PM:

Yes, with comments. Please see comment above regarding executing agency and the need to be consistent between the LoE and the project document.

Agency's CommentsPIF has been adjusted, and Barbados Trust Fund was removed as executing entity.

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

1/30/2026 PM:

Yes.

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

1/30/2026 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

4/21/2026 PM:

Cleared.

4/15/2026 PM:

Not cleared. Thank you for updating Key risks including vulnerable population and environmental and social risk in the Key risk table said 'Moderate' risk (page 30). However, both environmental and social screening template and D. Policy Requirements of Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) Risks still said 'Low' risk (page 37). Please make environmental and social risk consistent with each other.

1/30/2026 PM:

Yes, with comments. Please ensure inclusion of vulnerable populations including small-scale farmers and fishers and informal sectors not only women and youth.

Agency's Comments

The ESS section under "Key Risks" has been updated to explicitly include vulnerable populations beyond women and youth. It refers now to small-scale farmers, fishers, informal sector workers, and low-income micro-entrepreneurs as key vulnerable groups potentially affected by project activities. Mitigation measures and inclusion strategies have been incorporated into the safeguard screening narrative to ensure these groups are considered in risk analysis, stakeholder engagement, and project design.

Comment 16 April 2026: The risk table is now aligned with the ESS risk ratings. The ESS risk is considered "low".

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments
4/5/2026 PM:

Cleared.

1/30/2026 PM:

No. Rio Markers for BD and LD have been tagged as Significant Objective 1. However, the proposal barely mention biodiversity and land degradation co-benefits. Please consider updating Rio Markers for BD and LD or strengthen the proposal's contribution to BD and LD.

Agency's Comments This has been addressed in the portal.

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments
1/30/2026 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments N/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
1/30/2026 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments N/A

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2026 PM:

Cleared.

4/15/2026 PM:

Not Cleared. Please address comments above on the rating for environmental and social risks, and the name of one of the executing agencies. Also, as discussed via email thank you for revising the title of the project. As agreed, please do upload the email from the OFP confirming they are ok with the proposed title change.

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 but project is returned to the agency to remove the highlighted sections of the PIF.

1/30/2026 PM:

No. Please address comments above.

Agency's Comments

Comments have been addressed comprehensively.

4/7/2026 comments are addressed. Thank you!

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

Secretariat's Comments

1/30/2026 PM:

If not available at PIF stage, please elaborate further at CEO approval on the following items:

1) Please specify: specific financial instruments, financial structure and governance of potential instruments, 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. Finally, please ensure that knowledge products also capture lessons learned and best practices in advancing gender equality and women's empowerment, and that these are widely disseminated for broad learning. Please regularly report on the implementation of the GAP, and specify any adaptive management measures introduced, if applicable.

Agency's CommentsThank you, This will be integrated in the CEO Endorsement Document.

Review Dates

PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	1/30/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	