



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5523		
Country/Region:	Antigua And Barbuda		
Project Title:	Building climate Resilience through Innovative Financing Mechanisms for Climate Change Adaptation		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-1; CCM-2; CCM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$5,000,000
Co-financing:	\$6,290,000	Total Project Cost:	\$11,390,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Rawleston Moore	Agency Contact Person:	Ermira Fida,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Yes. Antigua and Barbuda are eligible to receive resources.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	A letter from the operational focal point is on file.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or	Yes, resources are currently available on SCCF-A	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Technology Transfer)?		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	Yes the project is aligned with the LDCF results framework.	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	The project is consistent with the national strategies in Antigua and Barbuda.	
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	Yes, the baseline projects are sufficiently described.	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	Yes, the outcome and outputs in the project framework are clear sound and appropriate.	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	The description of additional reasoning is sound and appropriate and the adaptation benefits are identified.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	The role of public participation has been identified, and the means for engagement explained. Please provide further information on public participation at CEO Endorsement.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Yes the project takes into account potential risks and describes sufficient mitigation measures.	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>There needs to be further clarification on the Sustainable Island Resource Framework (SIRF) Fund , the relevant windows of the fund and its relationship with GEF projects Sustainable Pathways-Protected Areas and Renewable Energy (PMIS 5370) and OECS Sustainable Financing and Management of Eastern Caribbean Marine Ecosystem Project (PMIS 3858). For example is the SIRF Fund part or the same as the national trust fund to be established in GEF Project PMIS 5370 and 3858</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please provide a schematic of the relevant funds and their windows and the relationship with PMIS 5370 and 3858.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>The project will identify strategies to integrate innovative financing mechanisms into the baseline projects to climate-proof their activities, and increase ecosystem services and benefits to local communities. To ensure the sustainability of the project the project will put in place a robust knowledge base for designing appropriate innovative financing mechanisms and adaptation interventions . Institutional strengthening and capacity building of local and national government will be carried out to facilitate the application of innovative financing mechanisms for adaptation. The activities in this project can easily be replicated in other countries in the region.</p> <p>Update August 30 2013</p> <p>Please explain in detail how the outputs of the project can be scaled up and replicated in member countries of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States and the wider Caribbean.</p> <p>i,·</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-</p>	<p>Yes the GEF funding and co-financing as</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	Yes the amount of cofinancing is adequate.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	Yes the level of funding for project management cost is appropriate.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	A PPG is requested and the resources requested are within the norm.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council?</li> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
<b>Recommendation at PIF Stage</b>	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>The PIF is not recommended for clearance. Please clarify issues in Box 12.</p> <p>Update August 30th 2013.</p> <p>The project is recommended for clearance and approval in an upcoming work program.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please make sure there is no duplication between components 2 and 3. Please also identify the specific small scale adaptation interventions to be designed under component 2. Please ensure the project is designed in collaboration with the other ongoing GEF financed projects in Antigua and Barbuda, and that there is complete compliance with the Operational Policies and Guidance for the Use of Non-Grant Instrument outlined in the paper GEF/C.33/12, given tht SCCF resources are to be used as seed resources for the fund.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
<b>Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval</b>	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**