



Antigua and Barbuda Sustainable Low-Emission Island Mobility Project

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10281

Countries

Antigua and Barbuda

Project Name

Antigua and Barbuda Sustainable Low-Emission Island Mobility Project

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

7/23/2020

Review completed by PM

1/12/2021

Program Manager

Milena Vasquez

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/17/2020: Slight changes from the concept stage have been clarified. The project is aligned with the GEF CCM strategy. Cleared.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: Yes, the project structure is appropriate.

12/21/2020: According to the GEF policies and guidelines, there should be proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. As the GEF amount is around 5% of GEF project financing, so to should be the co-financing amount. Hence, for a co-financing of \$9,704,315, the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$485,215 instead of \$15,000. Please amend accordingly.

1/12/2021: PMC co-financing has been increased to meet proportionality guidelines. Comment cleared.

Agency Response 01/06/2021: Co-financing has been updated accordingly. We have also separated out M&E.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8/17/2020: N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/17/2020: Co-financing of \$9,719,315 has been confirmed and investment mobilized of \$9,569,315 has been described. Cleared.

12/21/2020: In order to match exactly the information on the letter from the Department of Environment, please split the \$8,000,000 amount into two entries, with \$7,000,000 as loan and \$1,000,000 as grant.

1/12/2021: Co-financing from the Department of Environment has been split accordingly. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

01/06/2021: Done.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: Yes, the financing as presented in Table D is adequate. Nevertheless, per the newly approved guidelines on the project cycle, the Budget Template in Appendix A should be completed by the Agency and submitted at the time of CEO

Endorsement/Approval as an annex in the Portal. The indicative project budget should present a clear distinction between: i) PMC activities, ii) Monitoring and Evaluation

activities and iii) project activities (?project budget?). The same Budget Template in excel format should be uploaded in the Portal - section ?Documents?.

11/24/2020: While we do not expect Agencies to reopen these processes, we do expect the new budget template to be filed out by the GEF Coordinator (or equivalent) to report to us the summary of such already-developed and cleared budgets, in the categories set out in the new template. To help minimize such burden on them, the information so provided may be at a higher level of aggregation, e.g. providing just the totals or sub-totals by expenditure categories in the new template. Please copy-paste it onto the portal in Annex F.

12/9/2020: Thank you for copy-pasting the budget. The table in Annex F needs to be reformatted to fit the page when converted to pdf.

1/12/2021: Budget template has been reformatted. Comment cleared.

1.

•

Agency Response

24/09/2020

UNEP understands, based on discussions between UNEP's GEF Coordinator and the GEF's Director of Strategy and Operations, that projects that had previously negotiated their budgets with executing agencies and national partners and were already undergoing internal quality assurance processes, would not be required to change the budget template at this point, so as to avoid creating duplicate work under already challenging contexts for implementing and executing agencies and national partners.

11/25/2020:

Noted. GEF new budget template was completed and pasted into Annex F of the GEF portal.

01/06/2021: Done.

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8/17/2020: Yes, the whole PPG has been utilized. Cleared.

Agency Response

Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/17/2020: Yes, refined estimates for GHG mitigation have been provided as well as for direct beneficiaries. Cleared.

12/21/2020: We noticed that the wrong indicator was filled out for the GHG expected to be mitigated. Please fill out sub-indicator 6.2. (outside AFOLU sector) and delete the entries under sub-indicator 6.1 (in AFOLU sector) to report on GHG emissions mitigated.

1/12/2021: Correct indicator has been filled out. Comment cleared.

Agency Response 01/06/2021: Done

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: Yes, there is sufficient elaboration on the global environmental problems and the root causes and barriers to be addressed by the project. Cleared.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: There is elaboration on the baseline scenario; however please address the following comments:

- The footnote for Figure 4 makes reference to a document prepared by LOGIOS, but the figure refers to electric grid GHG emissions factor projections. Please confirm that the source is correctly referenced. Please also clarify if there are any plans or baseline projects to improve the energy distribution system as illustrated.

- Please clarify how the current bus fleet is estimated to be 1,800 vehicles, yet the public transport system is only 400 buses. Are the rest of those buses privately owned for other

applications (tourism, school, etc)? Are there any fleets that could be targeted for transition to electromobility in addition to the public transport buses?

- Considering the advanced age of the operating taxi fleet, it would appear that most of these vehicles would be replaced soon. Please comment on these plans (if any). Are replacements usually financed by the drivers? Do they get any support from financial institutions? Do they usually trade the car and lease a new one? Has the project considered incentives for trading in these vehicles and replacing with e-vehicles?

- Please comment on any future development strategy/agendas considering it is already 2020 and the MTDS ends this year.

- On waste, please add information on the inception and outcomes of the Environmental impact assessment Environmental impact assessment and solid waste management strategy for the decommissioning of vehicles and used batteries prepared by LOGIOS for the Department of Environment, which is cited several times.

- It appears that the Italian electric school bus pilot program is quite relevant to this project, yet there is no indication as to how lessons learned or this experience has informed this proposal or whether there is room for scaling up that initiative with this project. Please comment.

- Please provide specific details as to the GCF project that is being explored in terms of objectives and scope as well as potential timelines.

11/24/2020: Thank you for the clarification provided. Comments cleared.

Agency Response

24/09/2020

1. Energy distribution system. Footnote has been updated. On plans to improve the energy distribution system, the government is currently considering options to enhance the grid to reduce transmission losses, integrate renewable energy sources and make it more resilient to extreme climatic events. As initial steps, it is currently procuring energy storage technologies to eliminate curtailing of energy produced through the 3 MW solar array located on the grounds of the VC Bird International Airport. Text added to the baseline section.
2. Bus fleet. The current bus fleet number has been corrected to 1096 (754 petrol and 342 diesel). The Public Service Department classifies any vehicle with over 12 seats as a bus, thus including public buses (397 units), school buses (46), other government vehicles (91), large taxis (415) and commercial fleets, for instance, of the hotel industry (147). Text in section 2 has been updated. Through the national development plan for low-carbon and climate-resilient electric mobility (output 1.5), all buses will be targeted for the transition to electromobility. The GEF project focuses initially on public buses as

a way of creating consumer confidence in the technology in local conditions (component 2) and creating a market and incentives for scale-up to all buses (component 3).

3. Taxi replacement. Antigua and Barbuda does not have policies or regulations on taxi replacement. As a consequence, there is no requirement to retire a taxi from the fleet at a certain vehicle age or level of usage (vehicles are only retired involuntarily only if certified as unroadworthy). When a taxi driver decides to replace a taxi (based on their autonomous decision), purchases are made through a combination of cash and loans from local financial institutions and car dealerships. They can buy an imported new or used vehicle to use as a taxi. The taxi driver generally sells their used vehicle or dumps it (a well-documented challenge in the country, see section 1 of the document). If they have a newer used car (1-5 years old), they also have the option to trade it back to the car-dealer which they bought it from. Car-dealerships are not interested in receiving old vehicles due to the lack of resale value and potential disposal issues. For newer second-hand cars, trade ins are not a barrier as there is a strong second-hand market for such vehicles. For loans from local financial institutions, such as the Antigua Commercial Bank and the Community First Co-operative Credit Union, a cash deposit of 0-50% is required, with loan interest rates ranging between 8 and 15%. The cash deposit and interest rates are higher for used vehicles. Taxis are purchased individually, with taxi leasing not been using in the country. Text has been added to the baseline to clarify. Output 3.1 aims to incentivize taxi owners to replace their existing vehicles with electric vehicles by eliminating the incremental cost. The project has not focused on incentives to trade in vehicles, as local financial institutions and car dealerships are not interested in receiving the primarily old used cars (due to the lack of financial value and waste disposal issues, to be addressed through component 4). Notwithstanding this, through deliverable 3.1.3, further incentives and business models are to be developed during the project to facilitate implementation of the national development plan for low-carbon and climate-resilient electric mobility. Text has been added to 3.1 to clarify.

4. Continuation of MTDS. The government is working on the development of a new development strategy; however it has been delayed due to the COVID pandemic. The new development strategy will also draw upon and be aligned with the country's updated NDC, which will be finalized in 2020. Text has been added to the baseline section to clarify.

5. Logios report. Information has been added to the document, see baseline section on waste and output 4.2.

6. Italian bus pilot (EBUS). Text added to table 3.

7. GCF. The Department of Environment is currently in the process of developing a project concept for a GCF project. The concept is a work in progress, with discussions ongoing within the country and with the GCF secretariat. Antigua and Barbuda will submit the project to the GCF in 2021 for consideration of the final GCF Board meeting in 2021. Based on the current concept draft (and noting that this may change), the project would consist of a US\$10 million loan with the objective of supporting the government to scale up the GEF-7 electric mobility project and EBUS project through the procurement of electric buses for public transport and schools. The loan would support the broad replacement of the existing internal combustion engine bus fleet with

electric buses. It would also facilitate the decommissioning of 30% of the government fleet's internal combustion engine vehicles and facilitate bulk replacement with electric vehicles, prioritizing vehicles in the emergency and education sectors. The GCF project would build upon the regulatory and policy provisions implemented through the GEF project, and draw on the early stage technology introduction through the GEF project pilots. The scope is primarily on public transport and governmental fleets. The project is currently designed to consist of a US\$10 million loan, a US\$10 million reimbursable grant and a US\$15 million grant. Text has been added to table 3.

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

8/20/2020: The alternative scenario is explained in a very detailed manner. Please address comments below:

Component 1 - The coordination with the NDC Partnership work under this component is encouraging. Please clarify further what specific stakeholders will be involved in which activities and how they will be engaged. Please also clarify how this commitment and plan for low-carbon and climate-resilient electric mobility will coordinate with the ongoing work to update the NDC.

Output 2.1 - Please clarify why the project aims to install solar panels at the airport when there is already 3 MW installed that are not currently being fully utilized. Has the project considered investing instead in energy storage to facilitate the use of the electricity generated by the installed solar array? (is there storage installed with the existing solar array?).

Output 2.2 - Building on the comments in the question above, please comment on whether this output will also explore existing replacement plans for taxis in service and potential incentives for trading in older vehicles for EVs to scale up the demonstration of the 10 EV taxis.

Output 2.3 - Please comment if the project has considered the purchase of energy storage to enable electricity generated during the day can charge buses at night, when not in use.

Component 3 - Please clarify if the SIRF funding expected to support the cost of the demonstration vehicles (in combination with GEF funds) has already been included in the co-financing. Will there be a target for the size of the financial window under the SIRF fund? Will that be monitored by the project results framework and in reporting co-financing during the project implementation?

11/24/2020: Thank you for the clarifications. Comments cleared.

Agency Response

24/09/2020

Component 1. Text on coordination with the NDC Partnership has been added to the stakeholder table (table 5). On alignment with the updated NDC, text added to outputs 1.4 and 1.5, and also in the institutional arrangements and coordination section (chapter 6).

Output 2.1. The Antigua Public Utilities Authority (APUA) has recently informed that it is procuring energy storage to ensure full utilization of the solar array. Text has been added to the baseline section to clarify. Output 2.1 has also been modified accordingly. The project will install solar panels at the airport for multiple reasons. Firstly, the installed solar panels will be grid-interactive, feeding the grid with further solar power when not needed to charge the electric vehicles. If the grid fails (for instance due to a cyclone), the grid-interactivity will ensure that the electric vehicles can continue to be charged. The demonstration of this resilient grid-interactivity is an important aspect of the project for promoting resilient renewable energy (and resilient public transport) in Antigua and Barbuda. Secondly, the installation of solar panels will ensure further GHG reductions for the GEF project, ensuring the vehicle charging through the grid will be offset by renewable energy additions. Thirdly, the installed solar panels will play an important role in creating further public awareness on the technical and economic feasibility of a clean grid in Antigua, as the airport is a highly visible location.

Output 2.2. As noted in the answer to the previous section, there is no vehicle replacement regulation for taxis. Considering the early stage of electric vehicle technology presence in Antigua, the primary objective of output 2.2 is to create confidence amongst taxi drivers/owners and passengers as to the economic and technological viability of electric vehicles as taxis in local conditions. Output 3.1 aims to incentivize taxi owners to purchase electric vehicles by eliminating the incremental cost. As noted in the answer in the previous section, the trade-in modality has little effect either due to the old age of the used taxi vehicles (no interest of financial actors to receive such vehicles) or the flourishing market for newer used vehicles (no interest of owner to trade in as can sell the vehicle). Through deliverable 3.1.3, further incentives and business models are to be developed during the project to facilitate implementation of the national development plan for low-carbon and climate-resilient electric mobility. Furthermore, in the development of these incentives it will be explored as to the possibility of directly incentivizing those taxi drivers that tested the electric taxis through 2.2. Text has been added to output 3.1 to clarify. Please refer also to the response in the previous section on taxi replacement.

Output 2.3. All vehicles chargers and solar panels purchased through the project (through outputs 2.1 and 2.3) will be grid-interactive. This means that solar energy generated during the day feeds directly into the grid when not charging connected electric vehicles. If the grid is down, the grid-interactivity ensures that electric vehicles can continue to be charged. The demonstration of this resilient grid-interactivity is an important aspect of the project for promoting resilient renewable energy in Antigua. For

Antigua, the purchasing of energy storage not connected to the grid would lead to a parallel energy system with higher energy costs.

Component 3. GEF funds are being used to initially capitalize the SIRF Fund electric mobility window. Due to the very early stage of electric vehicle technology penetration in A&B, there is an absence of interest and participation of private sector financial institutions in the financing of electric mobility. The GEF funds thus play the role of creating the electric vehicle window, providing its initial capitalization, creating confidence amongst local financial institutions and supporting the creating of a local finance market for electric vehicles. Vehicles will be purchased through a combination of owner equity, local financial institution loans and SIRF Fund window financing to cover the incremental cost. Text has been added to output 3.1. to clarify. Information on additional stakeholders has also been added to table 5. As part of activities under output 3.1, a long-term financial plan will be developed and executed to ensure sustainable financing of the electric mobility window beyond project completion. In the context of the aforementioned circumstances, there is not currently additional co-financing for the SIRF Fund, although investment will be mobilized during project execution (for instance, through loans of local financial institutions to support electric vehicle purchasing). The amount of investment mobilized will depend on the size of the local financial institution loans, which will depend on the size of equity held by the purchasers. There will not be a target for the size of the SIRF Fund electric vehicle financial window. Instead, the target will be on the number of vehicles financed (through the covering of the incremental up-front cost). i.e. the focus is on the output rather than the input. During the GEF project lifetime the target is to finance the purchasing of 10 electric vehicles. This will be monitored through the project results framework (indicator 3). Additional investment mobilized will be reported during project implementation.

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: This project is aligned with the CCM strategy and is part of a larger programmatic approach. Cleared.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: Yes, the incremental reasoning of this project is clearly elaborated. Cleared.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: Yes, the GHG estimate is further elaborated. Cleared.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: This section is well elaborated. However, considering the strong synergies potential for this project to be scaled up by the GCF, we would like to see that explanation elaborated further. Please highlight specifically how this project will inform the future GCF proposal, including potential timelines.

11/24/2020: This comment has been addressed. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

24/09/2020

Text has been added to this section of the document.

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: Yes this is provided. Cleared.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: This section could be strengthened. Please explain further the expected linkages between this child project and others in the region and the specific contributions from and to the global program, considering the implementation timelines.

11/24/2020: This comment has been addressed. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

24/09/2020

Text added to this section.

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: Yes, a stakeholder consultation summary during preparation and engagement plan during implementation are provided. Please add additional relevant stakeholders with which this project will coordinate included the NDC partnership, GGGI, OECS, the GCF, etc. and any relevant regional networks/groups. We also note there are no financial institutions in the table either.

11/24/2020: This comment has been addressed. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

24/09/2020.

Additional relevant stakeholders have been added, including those of the NDC partnership, regional organizations and financial institutions.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: Yes, the gender analysis identified gender differences and opportunities. The gender action plan includes specific indicators and expected results. Cleared.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: Yes, private sector will be a key stakeholder of the project both as beneficiary and potentially as financier.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: Consider providing probability and impact levels in the risk level rating to further differentiate among the different indicated risks.

Consider access to credit as an additional financial risk to the scale up of the pilot demonstrations for additional taxis and buses.

Regarding climate risk assessment, please provide additional information in line with the guidelines developed by STAP which seek to answer the following:

- (i) How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately?
- (ii) Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?
- (iii) Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?
- (iv) What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?

11/24/2020: These comments have been addressed.

12/21/2020: Regarding the climate risk assessment, we appreciate the information provided in this section trying to answer the questions outlined above; however, we would like to see a more thorough assessment. One area that seems to be missing for example is wind speeds (and potential changes to wind speeds due to climate change) and how it influenced the technical design for solar panels and vehicle charging installations. Please refer to the relevant STAP guidance (can be found here: <http://www.thegef.org/events/gef-and-world-bank-training-climate-risk-screening-climate-change-knowledge-portal>) .

1/12/2021: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

24/09/2020.

1. Risks have been separated into columns of probability and impact.
2. Access to credit added as risk.
3. Additional information on climate risks has been added.

01/06/2021: A more thorough climate assessment has been included.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: The executing agency will be the Department of Environment. The institutional arrangements are properly described and cleared. Some information related to coordination with ongoing GEF projects is provided, but timeframes are missing for 3 of the projects listed. In addition, there is very little information provided as to coordination with other initiatives. Please provide additional details with regards to specific ways in which the project will coordinate with the different initiatives listed, as well as with the Global Platform and other child projects in the region.

11/24/2020: This comment has been addressed. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

24/09/2020

1. Timeframe for the three projects has been included.

2. Information added on how the project will coordinate with different national initiatives.
3. Information added on how the project will coordinate with the Global Platform and other child projects in the region.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: Yes, the project is aligned with the country's climate change commitments to the Paris Agreement. Cleared.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: Yes, the project is part of a global program, which has a KM approach. In addition, the project will carry out specific KM activities embedded in the different activities under components 1 and 3. Cleared.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: The M&E section in the portal does not include the budget; however, this is included in Annex J of the ProDoc. The budgeted amount is within the norm.

11/24/2020: Please copy-paste the M&E budget adding up to the \$75,000 to the portal submission. Apologies for not asking this earlier.

12/9/2020: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

11/25/2020: Done.

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: Yes, socioeconomic benefits are properly described. Cleared.

11/24/2020: In response to the ongoing COVID-19 Crisis, the GEF Secretariat is qualitatively and quantitatively tracking how considerations related to COVID-19 is being incorporated into projects' risk analysis and response measures, as well as opportunities to support COVID-10 response in the short and long-term. Risks and response measures due to COVID are well covered in the Risks section, however, the project is missing a summary of how the project may or may not impact Antigua & Barbuda's response to the socioeconomic impacts brought on by COVID (including for example, job creation and training, local economic development, productivity improvements, improved access to essential services, public health benefits, etc. in the short term, and/or strengthened supply chains, consistent with long-term decarbonization targets, avoid lock-in of carbon or energy intensive infrastructure, increase natural and economic resilience and adaptive capacity, protect natural capital, limit human-wildlife contact, etc. in the long-term). This could be added to the benefits section.

12/9/2020: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

11/25/2020: Information on how the project may impact Antigua and Barbuda's response to the socio-economic impacts brought on by COVID has been added to the benefits section, as requested.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: see below.

12/21/2020: Please copy paste Council and STAP comments into the Portal in Annex B so that when the project is converted to pdf, the documentation is complete. As Annex B was made as a separate document, it is important that when the project is circulated to Council, Annex B as an attachment should be part of it.

1/12/2021: Comment cleared.

1.

Agency Response

01/06/2021: Done.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: Project results framework is provided; however, "Indicator 1: Government ministries hold discussions with a view to agreeing on a national commitment for promoting electric mobility" does not seem to fully encompass Outcome 1. Is there are a more specific/stronger indicator that can better inform the progress of the project as it relates to enhanced coordination and strategies and plans that will be achieved through that component? Same comment for Indicator 4.

11/24/2020: This comment has been addressed. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

24/09/2020.

Indicators have been updated.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: No, please also provide summary of responses to Council comments at the program level. For now, there are no additional comments specific to Antigua and Barbuda.

11/24/2020: This comment has been addressed. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

24/09/2020.

Responses added.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: No, please provide summary of responses to the STAP comments at the program level. (While they concurred, they included some comments that are relevant to the program).

11/24/2020: This comment has been addressed. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

24/09/2020.

Responses added.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8/20/2020: N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8/20/2020: N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8/20/2020: N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8/20/2020: PPG has been fully utilized according to information presented. Cleared.

Agency Response

Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8/20/2020: N/A

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8/20/2020: Project map of Antigua and Barbuda provided, as well as specific coordinates for two pilot electric vehicle charging locations.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) 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 in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: N/A

Agency Response

01/06/2021: RESPONSE FOR SECTION: RECOMMENDATION BELOW : -

Expected implementation start date adjusted.

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/20/2020: Please address comments above.

11/24/2020: Please address highlighted remaining comments.

12/21/2020: Please change the expected implementation start date to a later date considering the review process (including the 4 week circulation to Council). Please address remaining comments (highlighted) above.

1/12/2021: All remaining comments have been cleared. PM recommends CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

| | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement | Response to Secretariat comments |
|---|---|---|
| First Review | 8/20/2020 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 11/24/2020 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 12/9/2020 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 12/21/2020 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 1/12/2021 | |

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations