



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

GEF ID:	5733		
Country/Region:	Trinidad and Tobago		
Project Title:	Improving Energy Efficiency in the Social Housing Sector		
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;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$2,550,000
Co-financing:	\$11,700,000	Total Project Cost:	\$14,250,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ming Yang	Agency Contact Person:	Natacha Marzolf

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?	DR/MY, Mar 14, 2014. Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	DR/MY, Mar 14, 2014. Yes. PPG: \$100,000 Project: \$2,450,000 Fee: \$242,250 Total: \$2,792,250 The agency used \$750,000 in a feasibility study for this proposed project. It is no longer necessary to use the GEF \$100,000 in PPG. In the PIF, the Agency proposed to use the \$100,000 in the project without asking the OFP to revise the endorsement letter. The OBS team (Ramesh and Lily) concurred.	

*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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Resource Availability	3. 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? 	DR/MY, Mar 14, 2014. Yes. As of 3/14/2014, this country had a remainder of \$2.86 million in STAR.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	DER/MY, Mar 14, 2014. Yes. As of 3/14/2014, this country had a remainder of \$2.84 million in CCM.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	NA	
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <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>	DR/MY, Mar 14, 2014. Yes. Yes, the project is in line with the Climate Change Mitigation objective 2: "Promote market transformation for energy efficiency in industry and building sector".	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE,	DR/MY, Mar 14, 2014 Not at this time. Please double check the statement in the second paragraph of Section B.1 on page 10:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>"In the Second National Communication to the IPCC, T&T recognizes..." It should be "In the Second National Communication to the UNFCCC, T&T...".</p> <p>Please use arguments, or facts, or statements in the Second National Communication of T&T to the UNFCCC to justify it.</p> <p>The Second National Communications to the UNFCCC http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/ttonc2.pdf</p> <p>DR/MY 3/21/2014 Yes. Comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p>	
<p>Project Design</p>	<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>	<p>DR/MY, Mar 14, 2014.</p> <p>Not at this time.</p> <p>a) The PIF indicated the baseline scenario: Housing Development Corporation built 3,500 units of homes in 2012 even if its target was 6,500 homes. Further data collection for the baseline project is needed to identify the energy saving potentials for the investments in the new units.</p> <p>b) Please forecast the number of: 1) new housing units to be built in the next 10 years with a dynamic approach (not fixed 3500 units per year) based on the improving capacity of new home development in the whole construction industry, 2) fossil energy consumption by these homes with natural energy efficiency penetration without the GEF funding, and 3) availability of energy efficiency products and technologies in T&T.</p> <p>DR/MY 3/21/2014 Yes. Comments were addressed and issues</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		were cleared.	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>DR/MY, Mar 14, 2014.</p> <p>Not at this time.</p> <p>a) Please remove the tasks in Component 1: "Baseline assessment and saving potentials identification" form the PIF. The tasks should be undertaken during the PPG stage. Then, please re-do the budget accordingly. For example, please consider a PPG</p> <p>b) Please consider increasing a component of policy and regulatory framework development that will facilitate energy efficiency in the housing sector.</p> <p>DR/MY 3/21/2014 Yes. Comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p> <p>Note: The agency used \$750,000 in a feasibility study for this proposed project. It is no longer necessary to use the GEF \$100,000 in the PPG. In the PIF, the Agency proposed to use the \$100,000 in the project without asking the OFP to revise the endorsement letter. The OBS team (Ramesh and Lily) concurred. So, the total project cost of \$2,550,000 is acceptable although the OFP endorsed \$2,450,000 for the project and \$100,000 for the PPG.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>DR/MY, Mar 14, 2014. Yes. The project target is to mitigate 242,550 tonnes of CO2 in a period 10 years.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<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>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>DR/MY, Mar 14, 2014.</p> <p>Not at this time.</p> <p>a) The role of public participation including women, and indigenous was not identified and explained. Please describe it where relevant.</p> <p>DR/MY 3/21/2014 Yes. Comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p>	
	<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)</p>	<p>DR/MY, Mar 14, 2014. Yes.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>DR/MY, Mar 14, 2014. Yes.</p>	
	<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 	<p>DR/MY, Mar 14, 2014.</p> <p>Not at this time.</p> <p>a) The PIF does not address innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up in detail. Please add one paragraph for each of the above three topics. In Innovation paragraph, please use facts to argue the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>project is innovative.</p> <p>In Sustainability paragraph, please articulate how the demonstration project will continue operating after the project implementation is over. For example, who will maintain the EE units, the home owners or a professional company? Who will pay for the service?</p> <p>In Scaling up paragraph, please indicate how the EE unit models will be scaled up due to the results of the GEF project. Please use facts of developing new policy, regulations, technologies, and capacity building, etc.</p> <p>DR/MY 3/21/2014 Yes. Comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</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>Project Financing</p>	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>DR/MY, Mar 14, 2014.</p> <p>Not at this time.</p> <p>a) \$200,000 budget for Component 1 may be more than enough.</p> <p>See comments in Box 7.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		DR/MY 3/21/2014 Yes. Comments were addressed and the budget was reduced to \$100,000.	
	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?	DR/MY, Mar 14, 2014. Not at this time. a) The agency did not contribute any funding to the project. Please consider putting some cash as co-financing to the project. DR/MY 3/21/2014 Yes. Comments were addressed and \$720,000 were budgeted.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	DR/MY, Mar 14, 2014. Yes. (It is 2%).	
	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?	DR/HY/MY, Mar 14, 2014. No PPG is requested, even though the OFP endorsement letter identifies funding for a PPG. Please clarify. DR/MY 3/21/2014 Yes. Comments were addressed. The Agency used its own funding for the PPG. Note: The agency used \$750,000 in a feasibility study for this proposed project. It is no longer necessary to use the GEF \$100,000 in PPG. In the PIF, the Agency proposed to use the \$100,000 in the project without asking the OFP to revise the endorsement letter. The OBS team (Ramesh and Lily) concurred. So, the total project cost of \$2,550,000 is acceptable although the OFP endorsed \$2,450,000 for the project and \$100,000 for PPG	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	DR/MY, Mar 14, 2014. Not applicable.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	DR/MY, Mar 14, 2014 Not at this time. Please address comments in Boxes 5, 6, 7, 10, 13, 16, 17, and 19. DR/HY/MY 3/21/2014 Yes. All comments were addressed and issues were cleared.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	DR/MY 3/21/2014 Please estimate indirect GHG emission reductions at the CEO endorsement stage.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	March 18, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 21, 2014	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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.**