



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

GEF ID:	5312		
Country/Region:	Regional (Antigua And Barbuda, Grenada, St. Vincent and Grenadines)		
Project Title:	Sustainable Energy for the Eastern Caribbean (SEEC) Program		
GEF Agency:	IADB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-2; CCM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,013,698
Co-financing:	\$110,435,000	Total Project Cost:	\$113,448,698
PIF Approval:	April 24, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	June 20, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Rawleston Moore	Agency Contact Person:	Christiaan Blanco Gischler

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> ?	Antigua and Barbuda, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, and Grenada are eligible to receive resources.	MO September 14, 2015 Yes.
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	<p>The endorsement letter on the file for St.Vincent and the Grenadines need to be updated.</p> <p>The endorsement letter from St. Vincent and the Grenadines, is from 2010. In addition the operational focal point for St.Vincent and the Grenadines has now changed and is Ms. Yasa Belmar.</p> <p>Recommendation Action: Please provide updated endorsement letter for St.Vincent</p>	MO September 14, 2015 Yes.

\*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)
		and the Grenadines.  RM, April 12, 2013: comment cleared.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>Antigua and Barbuda, Grenada, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines are flexible countries under the rules of the STAR. The available STAR allocation in the countries in the various focal areas are as follows:</p> <p>Antigua and Barbuda- CC-US\$2million, BD-US\$1.5million, LD-US\$9,400 (Grand total available US\$3.509,400)</p> <p>Grenada-US CC-\$1.5million, BD- US\$-250,000, LD-US\$-219,000 (Grand total available US\$1,031,000)</p> <p>St.Vincent and the Grenadines-CC-US\$2million, BD-US\$1million, LD-US\$17,000 (Grand total available of US\$3,017,000)</p> <p>UNDP has submitted a project for consideration by the GEF secretariat for St.Vincent and the Grenadines (PMIS 5297) requesting US\$1,726,484</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat has also had upstream consultations with UNEP on a project proposal for Antigua and Barbuda worth US\$2.6 million.</p>	MO September 14, 2015 Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Recommended Action: Please discuss the proposed project with countries again as it relates to resource availability. The current proposal requests US\$1.2million for Antigua and Barbuda. This amount with the proposed UNEP project will exceed the proposed STAR resources available for Antigua and Barbuda.  RM, April 12, 2013: comment cleared.	
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b> ? <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>	The project is aligned with climate change focal area results and strategic objectives. CCM-2 and CCM-3 are identified.	MO September 14, 2015 Yes.
	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?	The project is consistent with the national energy plans of Antigua and Barbuda, Grenada and St.Vincent and the Grenadines.	MO September 14, 2015 Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	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>The baseline is currently not sufficiently described. There is the identification of the currently national energy plans, but there is not enough detail on the baseline activities on which the project will build.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please provide additional information on the baseline activities, for example the activities of the DFID, GIZ and IDB projects that are providing significant cofinancing for the project.</p> <p>RM, April 12, 2013: comment cleared.</p>	<p>MO September 14, 2015 Please explain how the baseline projects relate to the GEF grant, especially in Antigua and Barbuda.</p> <p>MO September 16, 2015 Comment cleared.</p>
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>The components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework are clear, sound and appropriately detailed.</p>	<p>MO September 14, 2015 1) On Component II, the PIF expected an outcome of regional collaboration, but it is not included in the request for CEO endorsement. Please explain the reason of this change. 2) Geothermal will be developed in Grenada and St. Vincent and the Grenadines. Please explain which renewable energy will be invested in Antigua and Barbuda, and what outcomes are expected from the Component II and III in Antigua and Barbuda. 3) On Component II, the expected outcome only include legal frameworks of geothermal. Please explain why the project does not expect legal frameworks of EE and other RE as an outcome.</p> <p>MO September 16, 2015 Comments cleared.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes the global environmental benefits have been adequately identified. The proposed project will enable an increase in renewable investment in the participant countries, with emissions reductions of 4,000t of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2 eq) per year. Please estimate the direct and indirect CO2 eq figures for the project duration.	MO September 14, 2015 Yes. Because the project increases investment of renewable energy to 60 MW, instead of 3MW in PIF stage, the direct emission reduction of 339,442 tons of CO2eq per year and 10.15 million tons of CO2eq in 30 years lifetime of the project. The indirect mitigation benefit will be 22.84 million tons of CO2eq in 30 years lifetime of the project.
	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?		MO September 14, 2015 Yes.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	The private utility companies, including Antigua Public Utilities Authority(APUA), Grenada Electricity Services (GRENLEC), and St.Vincent Electricity Services Ltd (VINLEC) have indicated their willingness to participate in the program.  Recommended Action: Consideration should also be given to involve community level civil society organizations where appropriate for the project.  RM, April 12, 2013: comment cleared.	MO September 14, 2015 Please explain how CSO will participate.  MO September 16, 2015 Comment cleared.
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient	The project takes into consideration potential major risks and appropriate actions.	MO September 14, 2015 Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>The project will coordinate with ongoing regional activities to ensure that there will be no overlap and maximize synergies. These regional activities include (i) The Caribbean Sustainable Energy Program (CSEP) implemented by the OAS; (ii) Energy for Sustainable Development in Caribbean Buildings, financed by the UNEP; (iii) Sustainable Energy Initiative for Small Island Developing States (SIDS DOCK) overseen by a Steering Committee composed of Ambassadors to the United Nations in New York and technical experts; (iv) Eastern Caribbean Energy Regulatory Authority (ECERA) financed by The World Bank; and The Caribbean Hotel Energy Efficiency Action Program (CHENACT) financed by the IDB, GIZ, the Center for Development of Enterprise, UNEP, and other donors .</p> <p>At the national level there may be considerable overlap with this project and the proposed UNDP project Promoting access to clean energy services in St Vincent and the Grenadines PMIS 5146. The expected outcomes of the UNDP proposal for St.Vincent include (i) The effective enforcement of approved clean energy enabling policy framework, (ii) Clean energy technical and institutional awareness developed and implementation capacity in strengthened, and (iii)</p>	MO September 14, 2015 Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Renewable energy solutions have been demonstrated to be feasible, economically viable and have resulted in operational electricity generation.</p> <p>For the proposed UNEP project in Antigua and Barbuda, the upstream consultation between UNEP and the GEF, has indicated that this project will focus on investments in renewable energy technologies.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please work with the countries and agencies to ensure that there is no duplication with the proposed project activities.</p> <p>RM, April 12, 2013: comment cleared.</p>	
	<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 proposed program is innovative in terms of the technologies, which have been identified and the new financial mechanisms it will create, which will allow greater access to renewable energy technologies. In terms of sustainability the project is consistent with the long term policies of the respective governments. The project also proposes to put in place policies, regulations and instruments which will remain after the project is completed. This project can easily be replicated in other countries in the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS).</p>	<p>MO September 14, 2015</p> <p>It is innovative to develop regulatory frameworks of renewable energy and energy efficiency, and to invest geothermal energy through Public-Private partnership.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>MO September 14, 2015</p> <p>1) Please see box 7.</p> <p>2) On Component II, the large GEF resource (2/3 of GEF resource) will be</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			used for institutional capacity building comparing with PIF. Please explain the reason of this change, and how the GEF resource will be used. 3) Please explain why the GEF resource for investment components (I and III) are reduced comparing with PIF.  MO September 16, 2015 Comments cleared.
	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?		MO September 14, 2015 Yes.
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?	The GEF funding and co-financing per component appear to be is appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs. However, the figures in Tables A through D include errors, and totals do not correspond.  Recommended Action: Please provide the correct information in Tables A, B, C and D, as the information provided in incomplete and not correct.  RM, April 12, 2013: comment cleared.	MO September 14, 2015 Please see box 7 and 14.  MO September 16, 2015 Comments 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?	The amount that the Agency is bringing to the project is in line with its role. IDB will provide US\$2million in cash and US\$5.6million in the form of a soft loan.	MO September 14, 2015 No. JICA and CTF has not provided the letters.  MO September 16, 2015 Co-financing from JICA and CTF are removed. Comment cleared.



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	Please clarify the project management costs by completing Table B.	MO September 14, 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 PPG fund?		MO September 14, 2015 PPG was not requested.
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	There is no non-grant instrument in the project.	MO September 14, 2015 There is no non-grant instrument in the project.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		MO September 14, 2015 Yes.
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		MO September 14, 2015 Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>STAP?</li> </ul>		MO September 14, 2015 Please provide response to comments from STAP.  MO September 16, 2015 Response was provided in Annex B. Comment cleared.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council?</li> </ul>		MO September 14, 2015 Please provide response to comments from Canada and Japan.MO September 14, 2015

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			MO September 16, 2015 Response was provided in Annex B. Comment cleared.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		NA
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>PIF clearance is not recommended. Please address the issues highlighted in boxes 2,3,6,10, 12,16 &amp;18.</p> <p>The project identifies the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB), and the Organization of American States (OAS) as executing partners. Please provide further information on the actual role of the CDB and OAS in the project.</p> <p>RM, April 12, 2013</p> <p>The changes and explanations provided are sufficient. The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	At the CEO Endorsement stage, please provide confirmed letters of cofinance. Please also elaborate on the relevant coordination mechanism, with other ongoing projects such as SIDS DOCK.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		<p>MO September 14, 2015 Not at this time. Please address comments.</p> <p>MO September 16. 2015 All comments cleared. Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	First review*		September 14, 2015
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		September 16, 2015
	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.