



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9849		
Country/Region:	Antigua And Barbuda		
Project Title:	Capacity Building for Improved Transparency on Climate Actions through an Environment Registry in Antigua & Barbuda		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CBIT-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$1,000,000
Co-financing:	\$200,000	Total Project Cost:	\$1,200,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Milena Vasquez	Agency Contact Person:	Ruth Coutto,

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	MGV, June 30, 2017: Yes, the project is aligned with the CBIT Programming Directions.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MGV, June 30, 2017: Yes, the project is aligned with Antigua and Barbuda's Environment Protection and management Act and its National Communications and INDC.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	MGV, June 30, 2017: Yes.	

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>drivers² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>		
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>MGV, June 30, 2017: Please address the following comments: 1. Thank you for providing the information from the NCSA; however, as it is from so long ago, could you please outline and highlight the barriers and gaps identified in the second and third National Communication, as a more relevant source of needs assessment given the timelines under Part 1 of the PIF. 2. Could you please clarify the linkages between the EPMA and Antigua and Barbuda's NDC to better understand how the project will specifically support its transparency framework with regards to the different components of the NDC.</p> <p>MGV, August 8, 2017: 1. Thank you for adding some information on the third NC and INDC; however, a sufficient concrete discussion of the gaps mentioned - specifically with regards to data availability and collection, enhancing MRV processes and developing standardized baselines - is still</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>missing. This is to provide a more detailed picture of the current MRV framework to better inform and illustrate the incremental reasoning of this CBIT project and how specifically the project components will address those gaps. In addition, Antigua and Barbuda is already receiving support for its first BUR and TNA with GEF funding through UN Environment, which is not referenced in the baseline scenario nor under coordination. Please ensure this information is included.</p> <p>2. Comment not addressed. The text is the same as in the previous submission. Please specifically describe how the Environment Registry will incorporate the different components of Antigua and Barbuda's NDC, including reporting on the different sectors and/or policies, measures and actions addressed in its national contribution. Beyond the GHG inventory which is included in the Pollution section of the Environment Registry, how does Antigua and Barbuda envision alignment between its NDC and associated reporting under the Convention and the Environment Registry?</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>MGV, March 29, 2018:</p> <p>1. Information on the BUR and TNA has been added. In addition a more thorough discussion on gaps has been added based on an assessment carried out last year by the UNEP DTU Partnership. Comment cleared.</p> <p>2. Thank you for the added information and details. The proposed system would include MRV of climate actions for adaptation and mitigation as well as climate financing support received. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>MGV, June 30, 2017: Please address the following comments:</p> <p>1. Could you please elaborate further as to what and how exactly the components will achieve in terms of enhanced transparency.</p> <p>2. Can you please elaborate on the Small Grant awards outlined in Figure 1 as Activity 2.1.3 and how the project will support this output.</p> <p>MGV, August 8, 2017:</p> <p>1. The changes on Output 1.1.4 are better aligned with the NDC. However, it is still not clear what each component will achieve in terms of enhanced transparency with respect to the gaps identified and considering the resources requested. Please</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>provide more details on the activities listed under each output and make reference to the concrete gaps and needs identified:</p> <p>a. With regards to Component 1, please describe the types of capacity building envisioned as well as expected participants in Outputs 1.1.1 and 1.1.2. Please also describe the stakeholders referenced under Output 1.1.1. Please also clarify if the indicators to be developed in line with the NDC will be tracked by the Environment Registry, and if so, whether training on their MRV will be part of Output 1.1.1.</p> <p>b. With regards to Component 2, please explain how it differs from Component 1. The training under Output 2.1.1 seems similar to that of Output 1.1.1, while the step-by-step manual under Output 2.1.2 seems similar to the activity under Output 1.1.2. Ensuring that stakeholders input data under Output 2.1.2 seems tied to the MOUs developed under Output 1.1.1.</p> <p>c. Overall, these details should provide a clear picture of the incremental reasoning of the project and how the resources will be used to concretely address the specific needs and gaps identified by Antigua and Barbuda, complementing without</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>overlap the relevant baseline projects from Table 1 (including the BUR and TNA).</p> <p>2. Comment cleared.</p> <p>MGV, March 29, 2018:</p> <p>1. Outputs have been revised and more details have been provided. Comment cleared.</p> <p>a. Comment cleared.</p> <p>b. Comment cleared.</p> <p>c. Comment cleared.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MGV, June 30, 2017: Yes.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	MGV, June 30, 2017: N/A. This project uses resources from the CBIT Trust Fund.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	MGV, June 30, 2017: N/A. This project uses resources from the CBIT Trust Fund.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 	MGV, June 30, 2017: N/A. This project uses resources from the CBIT Trust Fund.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>MGV, June 30, 2017: Please address comments in Box 4 and 5.</p> <p>MGV, August 8, 2017: Not yet. Please address comments in Box 4 and 5.</p> <p>MGV, March 29, 2018: All comments have been cleared. P.M. recommends CEO PIF Approval.</p>	
Review Date	Review	June 30, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 08, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 29, 2018	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.