



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

GEF ID:	<b>5843</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Jamaica</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Deployment of Renewable Energy and Improvement of Energy Efficiency in the Public Sector</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>4900 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCM-2; CCM-2; CCM-3; CCM-3;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$100,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$1,254,987</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$10,748,754</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$12,103,741</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>David Elrie Rodgers</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Raul Alfaro-Pelico</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> ?	DER/KC, May 12, 2014. Yes.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	DER/KC, May 12, 2014. Yes. Leonie BARNABY, OFP, Senior Director, Ministry of Land and Environment, endorsed the project on April 25, 2014.	
<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?	DER/KC, May 12, 2014. Yes. Jamaica has \$1,483,713 left in its STAR allocation, as of May 12, 2014.	
	• the focal area allocation?	DER/KC, May 12, 2014. Yes. Jamaica has \$1,483,713 remaining for climate	

\*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)
		change after accounting for flexible spending in other focal area accounts, as of May 12, 2014.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	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>?</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>	DER/KC, May 12, 2014. Yes. Table A present CCM-2, energy efficiency, and CCM-3, renewable energy.	
	<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>DER/KC, May 12, 2014. Yes. The proposed project will coordinate with ongoing initiatives undertaken by the Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre (CCCCC) and the World Bank, as partners in the SIDS DOCK initiative.</p> <p>Please also see comments in box 6.</p> <p>DER/KC, June 9, 2014. The revised PIF better describes coordination. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to</p>	<p>DER/KC, May 12, 2014. Not Clear.</p> <p>Component 1:</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	address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>a) While project baseline seems clear, the incremental reasoning for GEF intervention is still not sufficiently justified. Please further elaborate on the need for additional GEF support towards capacity building and training exercises when there are similar project in the public sector are ongoing (Section A.4. Coordination). Although it excludes the targeted health sector the demonstration projects must have some success/failure lessons learned from GEF/UNEP project.</p> <p>b) The current proposal assesses low risk (section.A.3. Risk #3) for limited public sector uptake after EE/SETs grant-funded investments take place. In this case, why is the GEF grant needed when another GEF funded project is already ongoing in Jamaica in the same sector? Please rationalize the need for this project vis-a-vis other public sector projects.</p> <p>Component 3:</p> <p>a) As per Table C accounts PCJ's in-kind contributions of \$5.5M. But project justification para-3, table point #3 mentions PCJ and NHF cash contribution in establishing financial incentive and investment packages in this sector. Please clarify.</p> <p>b) Please clarify what are the possible de-risking measures required to justify GEF incrementality. As mentioned in previous comments, please clarify if these areas are not covered and/or remain not effective, that necessitates further interventions to address risks of limited</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>up-take of RE and EE technologies.</p> <p>DER/KC, June 9, 2014.</p> <p>Component 1</p> <p>a) The project will be incremental by focusing on the health sector, while also forging strong coordination with existing efforts. Comment cleared.</p> <p>b) Risk has been adjusted. Comment cleared.</p> <p>Component 3</p> <p>a) The revision makes note of the patchwork of current financing and how the proposed project will fill the gaps. Comment cleared.</p> <p>b) De-risking includes bulk procurement and other measures to address the causes of current gaps in funding. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>DER/KC, May 12, 2014. The project consists of the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Individual and institutional RE and EE knowledge and capacity strengthening in Jamaica's public sector</li> <li>2. Regulatory developments for the deployment of RE and EE promotion in Jamaica's public sector</li> <li>3. Economic and fiscal instruments for the uptake of RE and EE technologies in the Jamaica's public sector</li> </ol> <p>Please address comments in box 6 and the following comments:</p> <p>a) The investment component of component 1 is rather small. Consider skipping the demonstration phase for</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>technologies which are already well proven and documented. More progress could be made by focusing on component 2.</p> <p>b) Component 2 is the most important. Consider making this the only component in the project. Clarify the scope and breadth of the proposed regulations. Why limit them to the health sector? Why not make the regulations more expansive to cover the commercial building sector, including tourism?</p> <p>c) Component 3. The GEF portion is too small to have an impact above the planned soft loan of the national government and IADB partners. Please clarify why the GEF project is needed to help make this soft loan succeed.</p> <p>DER/KC, June 9, 2014.</p> <p>a) Demonstration phase is eliminated; training is maintained. Comment cleared.</p> <p>b) Scope was expanded to other sectors. Comment cleared.</p> <p>c) The GEF investment helps trigger soft-loan requirements which are subject to fiscal constraints. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>DER/KC, May 12, 2014. Yes.</p> <p>a) The project proposal estimates 348,995 tCO2e reduction. Please provide final estimates with detailed calculations and methodologies with CEO endorsement request. Please be advised to use the GEF/STAP methodologies wherever applicable.</p> <p>b) Please address comments in box 6.</p> <p>DER/KC, June 9, 2014. Comments</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		cleared.	
	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?	DER/KC, May 12, 2014. Yes.	
	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)	DER/KC, May 12, 2014. To be determined.  DER/KC, June 9, 2014. Comment cleared.	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	DER/KC, May 12, 2014. Yes.	
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> <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</li> </ul>	DER/KC, May 12, 2014. To be determined.  DER/KC, June 9, 2014. The project complements several existing GEF projects in the region by targeting gaps in regulatory policy and fiscal incentives. The project will employ UNDP's "de-risking" model to identify and implement policy reforms that will help unlock	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	based on GEF and Agency experience. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	private sector financing.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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?	DER/KC, May 12, 2014. Please see comment in box 6. Also, please include UNDP co-financing. The Petroleum Corporation of Jamaica appears in two different lines – is there any particular reason for this? Please clarify.  DER/KC, June 9, 2014. UNDP co-financing includes and PCJ co-financing explicated. Comment 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?	DER/KC, May 12, 2014. To be determined.  DER/KC, June 9, 2014. Yes. Please confirm at CEO approval stage. Comment cleared.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	DER/KC, May 12, 2014. To be determined.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		DER/KC, June 9, 2014. Yes, project management is within the norm. Comment cleared.	
	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?	DER/KC, May 12, 2014. Yes. A PPG is requested and is within the norm.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	DER/KC, May 12, 2014. No non-grant instrument.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council?</li> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. <b>Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	DER/KC, May 12, 2014. Yes. Not at this time. Please respond to comments in box: 5,6,7,8,11,13,16,17,18.	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		DER/KC, June 9, 2014. All comments cleared. This project is technically cleared and can be submitted for CEO PIF approval.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	DER/KC, June 9, 2014. a) Please update/confirm the GHG emissions estimates, using GEF/STAP methodologies wherever applicable. b) Please increase/confirm UNDP co-financing and submit all co-financing letters including private sector partners c) Please submit CCM tracking tool with the CEO approval.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	May 12, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	June 09, 2014	
	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.**