



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

GEF ID:	<b>5390</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Antigua And Barbuda</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Sustainable Pathways - Protected Areas and Renewable Energy</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-1; CCM-3; SFM/REDD+-1;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$2,639,726</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$7,980,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$10,619,726</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>April 30, 2013</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>June 20, 2013</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Mark Zimsky</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Kristin McLaughlin</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	April 11, 2013  Yes. Antigua and Barbuda (AnB) has ratified both the CBD and the UNFCCC.	December 12, 2014  As at PIF stage.
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	April 11, 2013  Yes, the OFP endorsed the project on March 13, 2013.	December 12, 2014  As at PIF stage.
<b>Resource Availability</b>	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	April 11, 2013  Yes, the amounts for BD and CC requested are within the STAR	December 12, 2014  As at PIF stage.

\*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)
		allocation. And the SFM funding is of the appropriate amount.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>		December 12, 2014 Yes.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		December 12, 2014 NA.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		December 12, 2014 NA.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		December 12, 2014 NA.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		December 12, 2014 NA.
Strategic Alignment	<p>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></p>	<p>April 11, 2013</p> <p>The project is aligned with the results frameworks for BD, CC, and SFM.</p> <p>The project has articulated how it will help achieve the Aichi Targets and the results framework uses SMART indicators.</p>	<p>December 12, 2014</p> <p>BD: The project logframe and presentation of outcomes and indicators related to the achievement of improved management effectiveness and enhanced financial sustainability is unclear. This is compounded by the fact that the submission did not include the BD tracking tools.</p> <p>For improved management effectiveness of MONP, one baseline number should be presented based on the 30 questions in the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool. The project logframe, and all other associated presentations of the outcome and indicator for management effectiveness, should then also include this one number along with an ambitious target for improving</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>management effectiveness by the end of the project.</p> <p>In addition, we also expect clearer indicators and presentation for improving financial sustainability of the PA system and associated targets and these too should be extracted from the GEF tracking tool on financial sustainability. Please clarify the targets for the system and for MONP. Please also submit the tracking tool correctly completed as no tool was presented with the submission.</p> <p>January 26, 2015</p> <p>The target for management effectiveness increase is extremely modest for such a small protected area and the final score of 40 is not very ambitious particularly given that this is the only site on which the project will focus management attention. During implementation, we encourage the project proponents to aim higher with regards to strengthening management effectiveness.</p>
	<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>	<p>April 11, 2013</p> <p>Yes, the project is consistent with both its NBSAP and its National Energy Policy.</p>	<p>December 12, 2014</p> <p>As at PIF stage.</p>
	<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</p>	<p>April 11, 2013</p> <p>Yes, the baseline is clear and assumptions appear sound.</p>	<p>December 12, 2014</p> <p>Adequate presentation of baseline.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	assumptions?		
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>April 16, 2013</p> <p>UNEP has gone a significant way in terms of answering questions and making changes to the PIF to resolve the issues mentioned below. UNEP has satisfactorily answered the questions with regard to the wind energy component of the project. However, we request some further changes in terms of this project's consistency with GEF project #3858. Please see section 12 for these comments.</p> <p>April 11, 2013:</p> <p>The objectives with regard to BD 1.1 and 1.2 and components 1 and 2 are clear.</p> <p>But we have significant concerns about the lack of consistency between the sustainable financing mechanism under this project and the one required to be established under the GEF-funded OECS Sustainable Financing &amp; Management of Eastern Caribbean Marine Ecosystem Project. (GEF#3858). Please see the comments in section 12, but we can't approve this project unless it provides financing to the national conservation trust fund to be established under the OECS project mentioned above.</p> <p>Comments on CCM: ANW, JS,</p>	<p>12/2/2004</p> <p>BD: See comments above under question four.</p> <p>In addition, the project notes a series of threats to BD in MONP in paragraphs 33-39. However, the project design, does not provide a substantive analysis at all of the threats the project logframe proposes to measure as progress:"Threats from farming and grazing as a result of agricultural expansion decreased", nor is a clear strategy presented on how these threats will be addressed. In addition, please identify measurable, quantitative indicators that the project will measure of expansion decreased.</p> <p>Finally, in the description in paragraphs 33-39, the only real threats discussed are invasive species and introduced species, but no strategy is presented in how these will be dealt with in MONP or how progress will be measured. Please clarify.</p> <p>CC-M: Table A on focal area objectives has extra information on investment and emissions targets. It is not necessary to include those metrics in Table B and the numbers appear confusing when compared to the CEO Endorsement request document and the tracking tools.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Under Component 3:</p> <p>a) The PIF has mentioned that there is a net-metering framework in place which allows feeding of power into the grid. But we need the PIF to clarify whether there are instruments in place to support feeding a considerable amount of power into the grid, for example feed-in-tariffs.</p> <p>b) Please explain the impact of this project on the policy and regulatory framework for renewable energy in Antigua and Barbuda.</p> <p>c) Please clarify in the PIF who will be the owner and operator of the power plant. Please clarify.</p> <p>d) Please provide an assessment in the PIF of whether the APUA or the operator has the capacity to operate the wind farm. If it does not, what type of TA will the project provide to enable sustainable operation?</p> <p>Under Component 4:</p> <p>e) We do not understand how forest fires will be reduced nationwide since the project's actions will take place in Obama National Park and the surrounding areas only. Or correct the PIF to note that impacts will be local in nature.</p> <p>f) Table A lists CC-5 as an objective, but</p>	<p>Therefore, we recommend removing them from Table B. However, if the numbers remain, please ensure exact alignment with the document and tracking tools.</p> <p>Some of the numbers are repeated in Table B. It is better to put these types of metrics into Annex S (projects results framework) and ensure they align with figures in the tracking tool. Please clarify all of this so it is consistent and coherent.</p> <p>Outputs 3.1 and 3.2 appear to conflict. One says that pumped hydro is the preferred option; the other says reverse osmosis for dump load. These are both very expensive options. Please clarify which options are identified and will be able to be funded within the project period.</p> <p>If the outputs are simply analytical results and not investments, please indicate. This also relates to Output 3.5, which indicates pumped hydro is not viable during the pilot stage which is also noted in the project document as an output of the PPG. It seems unhelpful and confusing to include items in the project results framework which have already been determined as non-viable in the PPG stage. Please clarify.</p> <p>January 26, 2015</p> <p>BD: Adequate clarifications provided.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		in table B, it appears that all CC funds will be used under CC-3. Please either indicate what CC funds will be used for component 4 (under CC-5), or delete the CC-5 objective from table A.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>April 12, 2013 AV</p> <p>UNEP has explained how it derived the estimate for direct CC benefits from the wind farm.</p> <p>April 9, 2013: CCM: ANW, JS,</p> <p>In the PIF, please provide details and explain how the 100,000 tCO2 direct impact on greenhouse gas emission was derived for the wind farm.</p>	
	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?	<p>April 11, 2013</p> <p>Yes, this is adequate.</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>April 12, 2013</p> <p>Satisfactory answers and changes to the PIF have been provided.</p> <p>April 11, 2013</p> <p>It takes into account significant risks, but</p>	<p>December 12, 2014</p> <p>With regards to the relationships of renewable energy installation to Important Bird Areas, the point made at PIF stage had to do with the need to not only assess the location of the actualy installation, but the siting of the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>with regard to possible impacts of the wind farm on resident and migratory birds, we ask the following: First, on page 7, in paragraph A, the issue is not that waterfowl are at some distance. Please rewrite this by noting that, there is a need to site the wind facility and operate it in a way that avoids and minimizes bird strikes, from both migratory and resident birds. (Bird island is actually not that far away from the site, and includes important pelagics.) Please state that the EIA process will be used to determine an optimum siting location, and will develop recommendation for avoiding or minimizing bird strikes through an environmental management plan.</p> <p>On page 10, please rewrite the risk as follows: "Negative impacts from bird collisions in the wind turbines." We are pleased that you will follow ABC guidelines. But please rephrase: "Consistency with guidelines of the American Bird Conservancy with respect to siting and operation of wind turbines."</p>	<p>infrastructure vis a vis migratory pathways. The project document does not adequately address this issue and the response in the CEO endorsement request is not adequate. Please clarify.</p> <p>While we understand the logic of the project that profits from renewable energy will flow into a funding window of the SIRF dedicated to protected areas, we do not see how the sustainability of this process will be managed if, as happens in other countries, consumers will demand reduced prices for electricity. Over time, it is likely that the government owned utility will be under tremendous pressure to use the profits for lowering consumer prices, grid upgrades, maintenance, etc. Please clarify the medium and long-term risk mitigation and sustainability strategy to ensure a sustainable flow of resources to the management of protected areas.</p> <p>January 26, 2015</p> <p>BD: Adequate explanation provided on ensuring siting follows best practice guidelines vis a vis migratory birdt flyways.</p>
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>April 17, 2013</p> <p>The changes below have been made to the satisfaction of the GEF Secretariat.</p> <p>April 16, 2013</p>	<p>December 12, 2014</p> <p>The explanation provided in the CEO endorsement request is unfortunately not very clear with regards to the requests made by the GEF vis a vis the requirements for NPTAFs under the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>The GEF will only support the establishment of one trust fund in Antigua and Barbuda to provide sustainable financing for the management of protected areas. The GEF is already supporting the creation of a National Protected Areas Trust Fund (NPATF) through the World Bank-implemented Sustainable Financing &amp; Management of Eastern Caribbean Marine Ecosystem Project (World Bank ID P103470/GEFID3858).</p> <p>We request a few additional changes to the PIF make it clear that UNEP and Antigua and Barbuda understand that CEO endorsement will be conditioned on (a) the Environment Fund being the sole trust fund to support protected areas, (b) that this fund will receive profits from the renewable energy instillation and direct them for the purpose of protected area management, and (c) the Environment fund be determined to meet, to the satisfaction of the GEF Secretariat, the requirements for NPTAFs under the GEF-funded, World Bank-implemented Sustainable Financing &amp; Management of Eastern Caribbean Marine Ecosystem Project" (World Bank ID P103470/GEF # 3858).</p> <p>Consistent with this, we have included the following language in the track-change version of the PIF that is included with this review sheet, which is below:</p> <p>1) Passage of the Environment</p>	<p>GEF-funded, World Bank-implemented Sustainable Financing &amp; Management of Eastern Caribbean Marine Ecosystem Project" (World Bank ID P103470/GEF # 3858).</p> <p>In particular, the text on page 26 in response to point 7 is unclear.</p> <p>Please clarify the following and rewrite the explanation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We assume that SIF fund mentioned in the first line is the SIRF. Please clarify.</li> <li>2. The SIRF is actually not the "sole protected area trust fund" but rather a larger environmental fund. Please clarify the text.</li> <li>3. We understand, based on other text in the submission, that a window is being created within the SIRF through which money will be channeled to the protected areas. Please clarify the operations of this window, including its governance and whether it will be established per the guidelines and best practices of trust fund establishment for protected areas applied in the GEF and consistent with requirements being placed on all Trust Funds being established through the WB project referenced above.</li> <li>4. The text says "The SIRF Fund will serve as the cofinance requirement". This is inconsistent with the first sentence of the paragraph which states that the "SIRF Fund is the sole National</li> </ol>



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Management Bill, which includes establishment of a national-level trust fund (hereafter referred to as "the national trust fund") that includes a mandate of providing support to the management of protected areas and biodiversity conservation.</p> <p>2) Agreement for the national trust fund to receive the profits from the the Renewable Energy Installations and that the national trust fund will direct these resources to support of the management of protected areas.</p> <p>3) Furthermore, the Government agrees to designate sufficient lands identified for wind development and designate surrounding lands for farming or other compatible use surrounding (Crabbs Point).</p> <p>4) APUA agrees to purchase and/or wheel renewable energy generated.</p> <p>5) APUA agrees to maintain and operate the solar, wind and pumped hydro facilities at actual cost to be negotiated.</p> <p>6) Decisions on development within the boundaries proposed Mount Obama National Park contingent upon the approval of the local area plan to be developed by the project.</p> <p>7) In accordance with applicable legislation, a screening of the proposed development shall be led by the Environment Division in conjunction with the Development Control Authority.</p> <p>These conditions are essential for proceeding with the CEO endorsement.</p>	<p>Protected Area Trust Fund". That is, a fund can not cofinance itself. Therefore, please clarify with more precise text what will be the source of cofinance for the money provided through the WB project to the NPATF.</p> <p>5. In the second paragraph, reference is made to the NCTF. Is this another fund? This acronym is not presented in the document table of acronyms. Please correct and clarify. Is it a mistake and it should be the NPATF?</p> <p>In sum, this entire section requires a clear rewrite and presentation of how the project design meets the requirements for CEO endorsement as presented at the time of the PIF review.</p> <p>January 26, 2015</p> <p>Thank you for the improved explanation. However, our request for clarification on points above is not entirely satisfactory.</p> <p>We had asked whether there is a window being created in the SIRF for protected area management and if this was the NPATF. In the response matrix, the text reads "The NPATF in Antigua is being established as a non-profit entity under ." But the sentence is not concluded. It does not clearly state what the NPATF is being established "under as a non-profit entity". Thus, is the NPATF being established as a non-profit entity that serves a window under</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Moreover, UNEP and Antigua and Barbuda understand that GEF CEO endorsement will be conditioned on the national trust fund (a) being the sole national protected area trust fund (NPATF) established in Antigua and Barbuda, (b) that it direct profits from the Renewable Energy Instillation to support protected area management, and (c) that the trust fund be determined to meet, to the satisfaction of the GEF Secretariat, the requirements for NPATFs as contained in the relevant project documents of the GEF-funded, World Bank-implemented Sustainable Financing &amp; Management of Eastern Caribbean Marine Ecosystem Project" (World Bank ID P103470/GEF # 3858).</p> <p>April 11, 2013</p> <p>We do not believe this project is sufficiently consistent or coordinated with the OECS Sustainable financing project implemented by the World Bank (GEF 3858). Project 3858 requires that each of the OECS countries establish a national conservation trust fund (NCTF) to support the management of protected areas (marine and terrestrial), but that the board of each fund have a majority of non-government members, and that these members not be selected by the government (nor can the non-government board members be removed by government) and the assets of the NCTF cannot be controlled by the Government.</p>	<p>the SIRF fund through which resources will be channeled for protected area management? The relationship between the NPATF and the SIRF must be clearly presented.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>It is our understanding that the Environment Fund proposed for receipt of funds from the wind farm is not consistent with these requirements. This raises concerns that the GEF is supporting two rival financial mechanisms, which would not make sense in an even larger country.</p> <p>To move forward, the PIF will need to include a clear requirement that the wind farm will only provide funding to the NCTF that is established in accordance with the requirements of GEF-WB project 3585 (World Bank project number P103479). This will enable the proceeds from the wind farm to serve as matching financing from the proceeds from the Caribbean Biodiversity Fund. This will need to be verified at CEO endorsement.</p> <p>We would also appreciate it if the PIF could enhance the connection between the two projects at the top of page 5 (after 2)). On page 11, note that UNEP will coordinate on development of this financial mechanism with the GEF-WB OECS project to ensure this effort strengthens the NCTF.</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</li> </ul>	<p>April 16, 2013</p> <p>UNEP has offered a sufficient justification for how the wind farm is expected to be profitable and thereby resources for the NPATF. It has also explained how it, together with UNDESA, will seek to scale up this</p>	<p>December 12, 2014</p> <p>As at PIF stage.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	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"> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>innovation nationally and throughout the Caribbean. We clear on this point.</p> <p>April 11, 2013</p> <p>This has the potential to be a very innovative project in that it will invest in renewable energy generation in a manner that is likely to produce sustainable financing for the national protected areas system.</p> <p>For this effort to be successful, however, the wind farm will need to be both profitable and financially sustainable after the GEF project. Please provide additional explanation and assurance as to why UNEP believes this venture will be profitable and financially sustainable?</p> <p>In the PIF, please explain how UNEP and/or the authorities will seek to replicate this wind farm model in A&amp;B and other parts of the Caribbean. Please also explain how the UNEP could seek to replicate the overall model (wind as a sustainable finance mechanism for PAs) in other countries in the region, if it proves sustainable.</p> <p>The wind farm could be replicated to other areas on the island. If this effort proves to generate resources for the protected area system, it is an intervention that could be disseminated to other countries in the region.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		December 12, 2014  Yes.
	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?		12/1/2014  On the carbon calculations the figures are appreciated but unclear. The key is to identify the incremental benefit attributable to the project. If one divides the total Project Annual Carbon Savings 11,786 tC by the given Growth Rate 3.32333 tC/ha this gives 3,546 ha which is greater than the total area identified (3,052 ha) not all of this area is expected to be fire impacted and therefore cannot be considered incremental.  Some additional clarification on the GHG benefits is therefore necessary:  1. As the proposal is to address GHG losses through arresting fire rather than deforestation, the 3rd column should not identify deforestation rate or is this actually the fire loss rate? Footnote 15 on Page notes and increase 2011-2012 of 85% but no area figure is provided. 2. Please explain where the growth rate of 3.32333tC/ha/yr is derived from on the table in Appendix 24 – it does not appear in the excerpt from the National GHG Inventory. 3. Please confirm that column 4 is the maximum potential biomass increase between pre-and post- fire scenarios.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Stating these levels explicitly would help clarify and would be appreciated.</p> <p>January 26, 2015</p> <p>Adequate explanation provided.</p>
Project Financing	<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>April 11, 2013</p> <p>We note that the co-financing ratio of 1:2 is rather low. Please seek to attract additional financing prior to CEO endorsement.</p>	<p>December 12, 2014</p> <p>The figures presented in Tables A and D in the CEO endorsement request are inconsistent. Please review carefully and correct presentation of all budget numbers.</p> <p>January 26, 2015</p> <p>Adequate explanation provided.</p>
	<p>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?</p>	<p>April 11, 2013</p> <p>UNEP is bringing a \$30,000, which is within UNEP's capacities in this regard.</p>	<p>December 12, 2014</p> <p>As at PIF stage.</p>
	<p>18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?</p>	<p>April 11, 2013</p> <p>Management costs are consistent with norm.</p>	<p>December 12, 2014</p> <p>As at PIF stage.</p>
	<p>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</p>	<p>April 12, 2013</p> <p>A PPG is requested, in an amount consistent with the norm. We recommend approval.</p>	<p>December 12, 2014</p> <p>Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	April 11, 2013  No.	December 12, 2014  NA.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		<p>12/1/2014</p> <p>No BD tracking tools were included. Please include.</p> <p>Please note that the figures presented for the METT scores in the project logframe are incorrect. The METT score is one score and is not broken up by PA Threat and Assessment as separate scores.</p> <p>The score for capacity for a PA system to become more financially sustainable is based on a potential score of 220, thus a score of 50 will be very poor by the end of the project. Please clarify.</p> <p>In addition, this element of the GEF biodiversity strategy is focused on reduction of the funding gap, so this should be the outcome measure for this element of the project and be reflected in the logframe accordingly. The financial sustainability scorecard will measure the reduction over time.</p> <p>SFM TT Section 1 a) needs some forest type to be identified, 1 b) is it primary, managed or degraded and 1 c) who has management control public/private?</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Section 3 â€™ has area of avoided deforestation 1,039 ha but no GHG value. Please explain how does this relate to the 3,052 ha noted in Appendix 24 and pleas also include the GHG figures.</p> <p>January 26, 2015</p> <p>Adequate revisions provided.</p>
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		<p>December 12, 2014</p> <p>Yes.</p>
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		<p>December 12, 2014</p> <p>Adequate responses to STAP.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		<p>December 12, 2014</p> <p>NA.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council?</li> </ul>		<p>December 12, 2014</p> <p>Please provide a matrix response for the comments from Germany.</p> <p>January 26, 2015</p> <p>Adequate response, however, please note request above to clarify the relationship between SIRF and the NPATF.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		<p>December 12, 2014</p> <p>NA.</p>
Secretariat Recommendation			



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<p>Recommendation at PIF Stage</p>	<p><b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b></p>	<p>April 17, 2013</p> <p>The changes requested below have all be made. This PIF is now technically cleared for possible inclusion in a future work program.</p> <p>April 16, 2013</p> <p>We request the last few changes mentioned above. If these are made, we are ready to technically clear this project.</p> <p>April 11, 2013</p> <p>Not at this time. Please address the issues noted above.</p>	
	<p>25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</p>	<p>April 16, 2013</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat will require the following at CEO endorsement.</p> <p>1) As mentioned in the comment 12, the final project document will need to demonstrate (a) that the Environment Fund is the sole national trust fund to support protected area management in Antigua and Barbuda, (b) that the Environment Fund will receive profits from the renewable energy instillation and direct them for the purpose of protected area management, and (c) the Environment Fund be determined to meet, to the satisfaction of the GEF Secretariat, the requirements for NPTAFs under the GEF-funded, World Bank-implemented Sustainable Financing &amp;</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Management of Eastern Caribbean Marine Ecosystem Project" (World Bank ID P103470/GEF # 3858).</p> <p>2) An assessment that demonstrates how the wind farm will be profitable and financially sustainable.</p> <p>3) Demonstration that the Environment Division has agreed develop to 10MW of wind energy over the long-term so that funding will be generated for the PAS. (We believe this is already included as a risk mitigation strategy.)</p> <p>4) We appreciate the preliminary estimates provided on CO2e . By CEO endorsement, please provide baseline information on forests at the project site (acreage, type, estimated carbon etc.) along with the extent of threat of citranella invasion. Also, a discussion on the quality of forests and carbon storage capacity within before and after cintranella invasion will be helpful. The likelihood of the proportion of citranella-invaded forest to be burnt by fire would help understand the emissions that would be avoided by removal of such invasive species.</p> <p>5) An explanation in the project document of the methodology to estimate CO2e avoided and amount of carbon sequestered.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat recognizes that</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Antigua is a SID. But we would appreciate it if additional co-financing could be raised prior to CEO endorsement, particularly private financing for the wind farm.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>12/12/2014</p> <p>No.</p> <p>Please respond to all issues raised in the review sheet and resubmit.</p> <p>Also, the project document could benefit from a spell check and some editing to improve presentation.</p> <p>January 26, 2015</p> <p>The revised CEO Endorsement Package has addressed almost all issues, however, the relationship between the NPATF and the SIRF was not adequately described. Please respond to the question provided above and resubmit.</p> <p>February 2, 2015</p> <p>Yes, all issues have been addressed.</p>
	First review*	April 11, 2013	December 12, 2014
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 16, 2013	January 26, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 17, 2013	February 02, 2015

\* 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.