



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

GEF ID:	5686		
Country/Region:	Dominica		
Project Title:	Low Carbon Development Path Promoting Energy Efficient Lighting and Solar Photovoltaic Technologies		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4969 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-2; CCM-2; CCM-3; CCM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$1,726,484
Co-financing:	\$8,940,000	Total Project Cost:	\$10,866,484
PIF Approval:	June 12, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ming Yang	Agency Contact Person:	Oliver Page

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	MY January 15, 2014. Yes.	MY 10/26/2015 Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	MY January 15, 2014. Yes. The OFP endorsed: \$100,000 for PPG \$1,726,484 for the project \$173,516 for agency fees Total: \$2,000,000.	MY 10/26/2015 Yes.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	MY January 15, 2014. Yes. As of January 15, 2014, Dominica has not used any GEF STAR funds	MY 10/26/2015 Yes.

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

¹ 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 ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		(\$4,000,000).	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	<p>MY/FJ January 23, 2014. Yes. As of January 15, 2014, Dominica has not used any GEF CCM funds (\$2,000,000). Since Dominica is a flexible country and seems to have \$4 million total of unused allocation across all GEF focal areas, the Agency may consider, in coordination with the GEF focal point, a more ambitious project (e.g. expended to electric appliances), addressing the comments below, and using the remaining country STAR allocation.</p>	<p>MY 10/26/2015 Yes.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	MY January 15, 2014. N/A	<p>MY 10/26/2015 Not applicable (N/A).</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	MY January 15, 2014. N/A	<p>MY 10/26/2015 N/A</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	MY January 15, 2014. N/A	<p>MY 10/26/2015 N/A</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	MY January 15, 2014. N/A	<p>MY 10/26/2015 N/A</p>
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</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>	<p>MY January 15, 2014. Yes, Climate change objective 2: "Promote market transformation for energy efficiency in industry and the building sector"</p>	<p>MY 10/26/2015 Yes, as in the PIF.</p>
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports</p>	<p>MY/FJ January 23, 2014. No. The PIF mentions the country's National Communications (NCs) but fails</p>	<p>MY 10/26/2015 Yes, as in the PIF.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	<p>to address how this project will contribute to the country's priorities in terms of mitigation.</p> <p>a) The NCs identified electricity demand reduction as a key part of its mitigation strategy through the adoption of energy efficient appliances. The proposed project focuses on public lighting but not on appliances. Please clarify the rationale behind this choice and identify whether lighting represents a higher share in electricity consumption than electric appliances (including air conditioning).</p> <p>b) Please also clarify the rationale behind targeting solar PV among the different existing option for renewable energy production.</p> <p>c) In both cases, clarifications are expected on (i) the potential share of emissions from the selected technologies and sectors, and (ii) the cost of the proposed technologies compared to the existing alternatives.</p> <p>MY/FJ 6/11/2014 Yes, comments were cleared. At the CEO approval request stage, details are expected on (i) the potential share of emissions from the selected technologies and sectors, and (ii) the cost of the proposed technologies compared to the existing alternatives.</p>	
	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>MY/FJ January 23, 2014. No. Please provide additional information on the baseline activities and clarify what the project will achieve with GEF resources.</p>	<p>MY 10/26/2015</p> <p>Not at this time. The CEO ER document needs to provide more detailed information on baseline technologies, namely energy inefficient lighting and</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		MY/FJ 6/11/2014 Yes, comments were cleared.	non- or little-solar PV technologies in the country's energy supply mix, and more importantly on GHG emissions. This is to give readers a clear picture: what would happen to energy efficient lighting and solar PV technologies, and GHG emissions to the country if the GEF does not finance this project. MY 2/24/2016 Yes, comments were addressed.
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	MY/FJ January 23, 2014. Not at this time. a) In Table B on pages 1-2, please indicate the numbers of (1) training workshops to be conducted and people to be trained; (2) pilot EE lighting and solar PV demonstrations; (3) energy performance standards to be reviewed; (4) new rules to be enhanced; (5) programs to be prepared for towns and island communities; (6) financial and institutional methods and mechanisms to be defined; (7) economic and fiscal instruments to be enhanced; (8) MW of solar PV to be developed; (9) kilometers of street to be installed with energy efficient lighting through this project; and (10) kWh electricity to be saved and tonnes of GHG to be mitigated from the project. b) Please clarify whether the project is targeting the entire country or only part of it and justify it. Component 1: c) The baseline presentation identifies	MY 10/26/2015 Not at this time. Please quantitatively put project targeted outputs in Project Framework (Table C). If the Agency forgot how to do it, please see Table B of the PIF that is for this project. MY 2/24/2016 Not completed at this time. Please also see the comments in Box 16. MY 3/15/2016 Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>several initiatives (China bilateral aid, SIDS DOCK, etc.) that would qualify as demonstrations of EE lighting and solar PV. Please then clarify why additional demonstrations would be needed.</p> <p>d) If, as the PIF explains, the main issue of existing initiatives is the unsatisfactory quality of the proposed products, it seems that a key solution would be to improve and enforce quality and efficiency standards and certification systems. Instead, the bulk of the project expenses focuses on training and demonstration. Please clarify.</p> <p>Component 2:</p> <p>e) Please clarify why the proposed enforcement of EE and PV standards does not seem to apply to the private uses of efficient lighting and solar PV.</p> <p>Component 3:</p> <p>f) Please clarify what financial barriers component 3 is trying to address. Please then clarify (i) the type of instruments proposed by the project to address these barriers, (ii) the partners that will manage them and their experience in such instruments, (iii) the financing needed for these instruments, and (iv) the activities the project will use to ensure these instruments will continue to operate beyond project completion.</p> <p>MY/FJ 6/11/2014 Yes, comments were cleared. By CEO approval, the project proposal is expected to detail (i) what co-financing</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		will be available for EE appliance activities, (ii) how the co-financing will be used to cover the entire country, (iii) what form the economic and fiscal instruments will take, (iv) what activities the project will implement to ensure that the incentives and subsidies set in place by the project can be sustained beyond project completion, (v) how the instruments developed under component 3 will be used for demonstration supported under component 1, and (vi) what mechanism the project will support to incentivize private banks in developing lending that they may consider more risky than other ventures. The full project proposal is also expected to consider ways to assess the remaining need for incentives before the end of the project and how to deal with them. It is expected that the project activities and their replication will be based on realistic and analytically sound assumptions on how demonstration examples may lead to behavior changes among stakeholders.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>MY/FJ January 23, 2014. No. The business as usual scenario for EE lighting and solar PV cannot be associated with a hypothesis of no development of EE or RE since initiatives described in the table on page 5 are already in place.</p> <p>MY/FJ 6/11/2014 Yes, comments were cleared (In the Table on page 8, energy efficiency is expressed as a fuel output with negative</p>	<p>MY 10/27/2015 Not at this time.</p> <p>1. The CEO ER document presented a few energy efficiency applications and renewable energy technology projects. However it does not show emissions from the existing inefficient lighting system and the existing application of solar PV without GEF investment, which is the baseline of the project. Please write two sections to elaborate the baseline with a focus on low carbon</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		carbon emissions)	<p>development path promotion for the country. Please provide detailed costs/benefits of solar PV and EE products, the existing electricity price, and forecasted electricity price in the forthcoming 10 to 15 years.</p> <p>2. Please clearly show the cost of energy efficient lighting technology and solar PV technology that are planned to happen to the country through the GEF project. This is to justify incremental/additional reasoning for the proposed GEF project.</p> <p>3. The calculation of the global environment benefits (GHG emission reductions) is not robust. Please show detailed methodologies, data, assumptions, and calculation steps for the calculation of GHG emission reductions for both the energy efficient lighting and the solar PV components of the project.</p> <p>MY 2/24/2016 Yes, comments were addressed.</p>
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , 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?		<p>MY 10/27/2015 Not at this time. Please elaborate in detail how energy efficient lighting will benefit local communities and the country. For solar PV, please indicate if this project will create any jobs in the country or in local communicates for energy efficient lamp or solar PV panel productions, or for solar PV</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>maintenance and services.</p> <p>MY 2/24/2016 Not completed yet. Comments were addressed, but there is a typo in the response matrix: "approximately .2MW". Please fix it and resubmit the matrix.</p> <p>MY 3/15/2016 Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p>
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	MY January 15, 2014. Yes (page 7).	<p>MY 10/27/2015 Not completed at this time.</p> <p>Please indicate how CSOs and indigenous people will participate in energy efficient lighting and solar PV technology investments and promotion. More technology related information is needed in the CEO ER stage than in the PIF stage in this area.</p> <p>MY 2/24/2016 Yes, comments were addressed.</p>
	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)	MY January 15, 2014. Yes (page 8).	<p>MY 10/27/2015 Yes. An additional risk (low oil price) is also identified.</p>
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	MY January 15, 2014. Yes (page 8).	<p>MY 10/27/2015 Yes, as in the PIF.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>MY/FJ January 23, 2014. No. a) Please address the questions in Box 7. b) Please provide a rough comparison of the costs/benefits of solar PV and EE lighting and the existing electricity price. Further comments will follow depending on the response.</p> <p>MY/FJ 6/11/2014 Comments were cleared. By the stage of CEO approval request, details are expected on the costs/benefits of solar PV and EE products and the existing electricity price.</p>	<p>MY 10/27/2015 Yes, as in the PIF.</p>
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		<p>MY 10/27/2015 Yes, a couple of small tasks were added to the project after the PIF approval.</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>MY 10/27/2015 Yes. As identified, energy efficient lighting and solar PV are cost-effective technologies to the country.</p>
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>MY January 15, 2014. No. It cannot be evaluated at this time, because the outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) are not clear. Please see comments in Box 7.</p> <p>MY/FJ 6/11/2014 Yes, comments were addressed. Additional comments and questions on the co-financing may be posed by the</p>	<p>MY 10/27/2015 Not at this time. Please put quantitative targets in Table C. Then, the Program Manager can see if GEF funding and co-financing in Table B are appropriate.</p> <p>MY 2/24/2016 Not completed at this time. The Agency misunderstood the GEF's previous</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		GEF Secretariat at the CEO approval stage when costs/co- financing instruments are clarified.	comment. Please put the numbers of expected outputs (not break-down co-financing amounts) in Table C. For example, please indicate the number of selected EE applications and RETs to be piloted through an EPC arrangement under the Expected Outputs of Component 1. For another example, please put the number of scaled-up RE and EE installations in Component 3. Please check all other Expected Outputs and provide the relevant numbers. MY 3/15/2016 Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.
	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?	MY January 15, 2014. Yes.	MY 10/27/2015 Not at this time. Please provide a revised co-financing letter from the UNDP showing that 50% of the \$1.6 million is for investment and another 50% is from in-kind. MY 2/24/2016 Yes, the comment was addressed and the issue was cleared.
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	MY January 15, 2014. Yes.	MY 10/27/2015 Yes.
	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	MY January 15, 2014. Yes. A PPG (\$100,000) is requested. The amount is normal for the MSP.	MY 10/27/2015 Yes. It is on page 18 of the CEO ER.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	MY January 15, 2014. N/A	MY 10/27/2015 N/A
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		MY 10/27/2015 Yes.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		MY 10/27/2015 Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		MY 10/26/2015 N/A
	• Convention Secretariat?		MY 10/26/2015 N/A
	• The Council?		MY 10/26/2015 N/A
	• Other GEF Agencies?		MY 10/26/2015 N/A
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	MY January 15, 2014. No. Please address the above comments. Please contact the GEF secretariat prior to resubmission. MY/FJ 6/11/2014 Comments were cleared. But four issues need to be further cleared during the PPG and the CEO Endorsement Stage.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO	MY/FJ 6/11/2014	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	endorsement/approval.	<p>1. For Question (Box) No. 5, details are expected on (i) the potential share of emissions from the selected technologies and sectors, and (ii) the cost of the proposed technologies compared to the existing alternatives.</p> <p>2. For Question (Box) No. 7, By CEO approval, the project proposal is expected to detail (i) what co-financing will be available for EE appliance activities, (ii) how the co-financing will be used to cover the entire country, (iii) what form the economic and fiscal instruments will take, (iv) what activities the project will implement to ensure that the incentives and subsidies set in place by the project can be sustained beyond project completion, (v) how the instruments developed under component 3 will be used for demonstration supported under component 1, and (vi) what mechanism the project will support to incentivize private banks in developing lending that they may consider more risky than other ventures. The full project proposal is also expected to consider ways to assess the remaining need for incentives before the end of the project and how to deal with them. It is expected that the project activities and their replication will be based on realistic and analytically sound assumptions on how demonstration examples may lead to behavior changes among stakeholders.</p> <p>3. For Questions (Box) 13, details are expected on the costs/benefits of solar PV and EE products and the existing</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>electricity price.</p> <p>4. For Question (Box) 16, more requests or comments for the co-financing may be provided to the GEF Sec in the CEO approval stage when costs/co- financing instruments are clarified.</p> <p>5. Please add a component: Monitoring and Evaluation in Table B Indicative Project Framework.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>MY 10/26/2015 Not at this time.</p> <p>Please address comments in boxes: 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, and 17.</p> <p>MY 1/5/2016 Not at this time. Please present the responses to comments in the same format as that in the PIF stage, which is shown in Annex B on page 22 of the CEO ER document. More comments may be provided after the next submission of the CEO ER document.</p> <p>MY/1/12/2016 Not at this time. Please present the Matrix in a correctly-numbered format. Please also check the responses and comments to make them consistent.</p> <p>MY 2/24/2016 Not completed at this time. Please address comments in Boxes 7, 9, and 16.</p> <p>MY 3/15/2016</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Yes, all comments were addressed and issues were cleared. The PM recommends COE Endorsement.
	First review*	January 15, 2014	October 27, 2015
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 25, 2014	January 05, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 11, 2014	January 12, 2016

* 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.