



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

GEF ID:	5390		
Country/Region:	Antigua And Barbuda		
Project Title:	Sustainable Pathways - Protected Areas and Renewable Energy		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; CCM-3; SFM/REDD+-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$2,639,726
Co-financing:	\$5,360,000	Total Project Cost:	\$8,099,726
PIF Approval:	April 30, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Andrew Velthaus	Agency Contact Person:	Kristin McLaughlin

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 ?	April 11, 2013 Yes. Antigua and Barbuda (AnB) has ratified both the CBD and the UNFCCC.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	April 11, 2013 Yes, the OFP endorsed the project on March 13, 2013.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	April 11, 2013 Yes, the amounts for BD and CC requested are within the STAR	

*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)
		allocation. And the SFM funding is of the appropriate amount.	
	• 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 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>	April 11, 2013 The project is aligned with the results frameworks for BD, CC, and SFM. The project has articulated how it will help achieve the Aichi Targets and the results framework uses SMART indicators.	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	April 11, 2013 Yes, the project is consistent with both its NBSAP and its National Energy Policy.	
	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?	April 11, 2013 Yes, the baseline is clear and assumptions appear sound.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (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 & 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>Under Component 3:</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<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 in table B, it appears that all CC funds will be used under CC-3. Please either</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		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 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?		
	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 with regard to possible impacts of the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>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>	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<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>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</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>supporting the creation of a National Protected Areas Trust Fund (NPATF) through the World Bank-implemented Sustainable Financing & 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 & 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 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</p>	

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

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

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>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 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. 	<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 innovation nationally and throughout the Caribbean. We clear on this point.</p> <p>April 11, 2013</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<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&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>	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		
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?	April 11, 2013 We note that the co-financing ratio of 1:2 is rather low. Please seek to attract additional financing prior to CEO endorsement.	
	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?	April 11, 2013 UNEP is bringing a \$30,000, which is within UNEP's capacities in this regard.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	April 11, 2013 Management costs are consistent with norm.	
	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?	April 12, 2013 A PPG is requested, in an amount consistent with the norm. We recommend approval.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of	April 11, 2013 No.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	reflows included?		
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?	<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>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<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 & 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</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>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 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.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	April 11, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 16, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 17, 2013	

* 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.