

ISLANDS - Caribbean Child Project

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10279

Countries

Regional (Latin America and Caribbean)

Project Name

ISLANDS - Caribbean Child Project

Agencies

UNEP, FAO

Date received by PM

12/7/2020

Review completed by PM

3/17/2021

Program Manager

Anil Sookdeo

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. The project is based on the three pillars established in the PFD.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The components on reducing chemicals in agriculture are not well defined. Please clearly articulate in the project description what will be the approach for phasing out the use of harmful chemicals in agriculture. Additionally the project 10195 - CSIDS-SOILCARE Phase1: Caribbean Small Island Developing States (SIDS) multi-country soil management initiative for Integrated Landscape Restoration and climate-resilient food systems should be taken into account in the implementation of the project. This project is also implemented by FAO.

March 9, 2021 - Comment addressed.

Agency Response

Response04/03/2021

Additional text in green highlight.

Clarification has been provided in the alternative scenario to better define the reduction of chemicals in agriculture (opening paragraph, output 2.1, activity 2.1.2, output 2.2, activity 2.2.3)

Reference to the soilcare project has been added in the regional baseline section (green highlight) and in section 5 (contribution from the baseline).

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

For the core indicators indicated, yes. Please provide a value for core indicator 10.

March 9, 2021 - The project will seek to eliminated a significant amount of uPOPS (25% of the target for core indicator 10) - comment addressed

Agency Response

Response04/03/2021

Omission in the table has been corrected

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes. Please include the newly approved project in Suriname under the Basel Plastic Partnership from which lessons learned can be used to inform work in the ISLANDS program.

March 9, 2021 - Comment cleared.

Agency Response

Response04/03/2021

Additional text in purple highlight in the Suriname baseline

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. The project components are well articulated in describing how both innovation and sustainability is to be achieved.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. The project has both a well defined gender analysis and plan and well incorporates gender elements into the activities.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. Public-private partnerships and co-financing for waste management and recycling systems are an expected outcome of the project's execution. To ensure these are feasible and sustainable post-project, the project will seek to engage and learn from potential private sector partners. In each Caribbean SIDS private sector stakeholders have been identified, together with the external drivers of their activities, the constraints they currently face, and their underlying interest.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

a. COVID-19

Direct risks from the COVID-19 pandemic to the project include travel restrictions and the generation of additional single use plastic waste. Some Pacific SIDS, for example, have indicated plans to close their borders until 2022, while SIDS in the Caribbean and Indian Ocean continue to be subject to rolling lockdowns. Restrictions on traveling to and within SIDS will impact project execution activities.

SIDS are also importing COVID-specific medical equipment, leading to increased pressure on medical waste management. These medical wastes include single use plastics and other impact-heavy waste streams that the ISLANDS programme seeks to reduce.

Indirect risks and decreased resilience from the COVID-19 pandemic include decreased local support due to shifted priorities and impacts to SIDS economies. SIDS governments have had to prioritise their COVID-19 response over other management issues, including waste management. Tourism-dependent countries in particular are facing significant decreases in GDP and sharp increases in state debt.

b. Climate change

SIDS are highly vulnerable to climate change, facing increased natural disasters and rising sea levels in the present and future. In particular, coral atolls and low-lying island regions, such as in the Bahamas, Barbuda, the Cook Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Kiribati, the Maldives, the Marshall Islands and Tuvalu are at high risk of damage to infrastructure and the economy due to rising sea levels and more frequent storm surges. SIDS globally are also at risk of more frequent and more intense cyclone activity that may result in infrastructure damage, disaster waste, shifts in political priorities, and delays in project outputs. For example, in recent years hurricane activity has been much more frequent and severe than the historical average in the Caribbean region.

Vulnerability to extreme climatic events poses risks to project activities. Consideration must be given to storage sites for waste, and also of the need for climate-proofing waste management infrastructure. Without such consideration, project gains in waste management improvements are at significant risk of being undermined or destroyed by extreme climate events.

All project countries face COVID-19 and climate change related risks. Regionally specific mitigation measures are needed to adequately address specific regional vulnerabilities.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please describe coordination with the FAO implemented project: 10195 - CSIDS-SOILCARE Phase1: Caribbean Small Island Developing States (SIDS) multicountry soil management initiative for Integrated Landscape Restoration and climate-resilient food systems should be taken into account in the implementation of the project.

March 9, 2021 - alignment with the SOILCARE project has been done - comment cleared.

Agency Response

Response04/03/2021

Additional text in green highlight.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. The project describes in detail how the activities are aligned with the national plans of each country.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. A core part of the program is to foster knowledge exchange among and between SIDS.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request The results framework is clear, however please include the value for core indicator 10.

Agency Response

Omission in the table has been corrected

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Child project to be returned to the Agency due to:

1- Co-financing:

- Since IUCN is not the implementing Agency for this GEF grant, please use ?donor Agency? rather than ?GEF Agency? as the source of co-financing. Also, the letter from IUCN does not specify the type of co-financing (grant).

- There is an error in the FAO co-financing letter and the total amount is US\$ 11,271,060. Please revise the table C accordingly.

April 8, 2021 - Comments addressed and cleared.

Agency Response

Response: April 1, 2021

IUCN classification has been changed as suggested and a new letter specifying the type of co-financing has been obtained and uploaded
FAO co-financing have been reduced by \$100,000 to account for the error in the letter

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request All comments from the Council have been addressed.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request STAP comments have been addressed.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request None received.

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request None received

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request None received

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request PPG has been used and reported on.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request The map of countries with potential sites have been provided.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please respond to the comments raised in the review sheet.

March 25, 2021 - Please see comments in the GEF Secretariat field

April 8, 2021 - The project is recommend for CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	2/22/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/16/2021	

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)	3/25/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/8/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations