

# Demonstration of a Caribbean Mechanism Toward Establishment of a SIDS-SIDS Green-Blue Economy Knowledge Transfer Hub

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10992

**Countries**

Regional (Barbados, Grenada)

**Project Name**

Demonstration of a Caribbean Mechanism Toward Establishment of a SIDS-SIDS Green-Blue Economy Knowledge Transfer Hub

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

4/14/2023

**Review completed by PM**

6/1/2023

**Program Manager**

Asha Bobb-Semple

**Focal Area**

Land Degradation

**Project Type**

MSP

**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

4/26/2023:

Yes

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

5/31/2023:

Noted and cleared.

4/26/2023:

Please consider the comments below.

-Table B has no reference to LD or LDN given that the focal area is being used as an entry point. Can this be incorporated?

-Please consider including additional indicators which will measure the usefulness or access to the Hub overall- such as no.of GEF OFPs or Project Executing Agencies utilizing the hub; no. of new projects (GEF or otherwise) designed with information extracted from the Hub etc.

### Agency Response

5/15/2023

- Indeed, the project is a land degradation focal area project, and the narrative fully clarifies this however also acknowledges the close synergies with other GEF focal areas recognizing that it is not exclusively confined to the LD focal area, given the orientation of the project. In this light, the project design and nomenclature (components, outcomes, outputs) does not specify land degradation, the rationale as approved at PIF stage.

- The outcome level indicator 2.1 (i) *?Gender-sensitive rating assessment/appraisal scores provided by reviewers and stakeholders on tools, quality of curricula, demonstrated efficacy of KT Hub model?* reflects the use value of the Hub, and the 3.1: outcome level indicator (ii) *?Number of emergent opportunities (policies, business plans, financing mobilized) gained by stakeholders from KTH knowledge exchanges in their respective areas?* intends to capture opportunities that the Hub may have triggered where financing mobilized relates to new project formulation. In the results framework there are output-level indicators that signal the interface with the Hub.

**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

6/14/2023:

Additional co-financing letter from CAF provided. Cleared.

5/31/2023:

-Acknowledge that the UWI letter indicates their specific contribution during the project duration only. Cleared.

-Additional co-financing letters to be provided.

5/8/2023:

-Please upload the outstanding co-financing letters.

- Please ensure the UWI co-financing letter explicitly indicates the type of support they are providing to the Hub, along with a statement on the long-term sustainability of their investment.

-- As UNIDO is not the implementing agency, please revise ?GEF Agency? to ?Donor Agency?.

#### Agency Response

5/15/2023

- The co-financing letter from the Government of Grenada is secured; the co-financing letters from the Development Bank of Latin America (CAF) and the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB) await final signatures and anticipated ahead of CEO endorsement. The letter from FRIEETAD is being followed up on, and will be submitted as soon as received.

- The co-financing letter from the UWI has been revised to specify in-kind co-financing. The letter now contains a statement on the long-term sustainability of their investment.

- Designation for UNIDO changed to ?Donor Agency?.

#### 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

5/31/2023:

The revised TOR is cleared by the PM.

5/11/2023:

- On the TORs: out of 17 activities, only one (?Contribute technical inputs in delivery of outputs under all three project components. These will include the following key activities  
Comp 1: 1.1.1.2, 1.1.2.1, 1.1.2.3, 1.1.3.1, 1.1.3.4. Comp 2: 2.1.1.2, 2.1.3.4, 2.1.4.1, Comp 3:

3.1.1.4, 3.1.2.1 and 3.1.1.3. (in yellow shadow below) provides TORs on the technical components. This activity does not do justice to charge 85% of the Project Manager's salary to the project component's and M&E while only 5% is charged to PMC. Per Guidelines, TOR's describing unique outputs linked to the respective components are required. Please adjust the TORs accordingly.

**Agency Response**

5/15/2023

- The TORs have been now further elaborated to describe the explicit tasks that the project manager is expected to deliver on. The updates are in yellow highlight in Annex K.

**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

4/26/2023:

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

4/26/2023:

No adjustments made.

**Agency Response**

5/15/2023

Noted

## 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

4/26/2023:

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

4/26/2023:

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

5/8/2023:

Cleared.

4/26/2023:

Yes the alternative scenario is well laid out with connections to the LD focal area where necessary and possible.

-Please clarify how the other campuses of the UWI and other tertiary institutions in the region would be involved ? Do they have a role?'

-Output 2.1.4 - Please also consider including here the National Convention Focal Points given their role at MEA COPs. They can also serve as useful partners to share knowledge about the Hub at COPs.

-It is not clear what mechanisms (with corresponding Outputs and Indicators) are in place to ensure sufficient feedback loop to project developers, decision makers and national executing agencies on lessons and the suitable approaches of intervention in a GEF context as well as considering SIDS audiences beyond the Caribbean sub-region. This could potentially also be included in Output-2.1.4 which seems to be outward facing but specific to Ambassadors.

-Please provide further information on how stakeholders in the field may access the Hub-small farmers associations, cooperatives etc.

### Agency Response

5/15/2023

- The roles of the other UWI campuses, Mona, St. Augustine and the Five Islands Campuses have been further elaborated, along with the indication that the project will cultivate collaborative relationships with other affiliate universities such as the University of Technology (UTech), Jamaica and University of Guyana, as well as others in the wider SIDS regions as over the course of implementation. This update is now included in Table 1 under the Stakeholders Section in the main narrative and in Annex P.

- Suggestion adopted; the narrative under Output 2.1.4 updated.

- Feedback mechanisms have been considered already. Under Output 1.1.1, a user assessment / feedback mechanism on the operability of the knowledge transfer hub is anticipated. Similarly for Output 1.1.2 on the Institutional Cooperation Agreements, the efficacy of these arrangements will also be subject to an assessment. Under Output 2.1.4, the Pilot Ambassadorial Knowledge Transfer Initiative, there is already consideration for learner group validation / assessment anticipated as a deliverable. These are specified in the results framework (Annex A) and the key benchmarks and deliverables (Annex J).

- The use of the ICT Hub Platform will be available to all stakeholders in Caribbean SIDS, subject to the necessary controls and engagement protocols. The use of social media platforms to share information and engage local stakeholder groups is commonplace. The narrative under Output 2.1.3 has been updated to note that the project will use social media platforms such as Whatsapp group messaging, Facebook, LinkedIn of the organizational affiliates to target farmer groups, private sector and youth groups.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/26/2023:

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/26/2023:

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

4/26/2023:

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

4/26/2023:

Yes

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

4/26/2023:

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

N/A

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

5/31/2023:

Cleared.

5/8/2023:

-How were the regional OFPs engaged for early buy in? National Convention Focal Points are an additional target group to consider.

Agency Response

5/15/2023

- This has been an on-going process with extensive discussions during the preparatory process leading up to the convening of and approval of Decision 8 of the XXII Meeting of the Forum of Ministers of Environment for Latin America and the Caribbean, which called for the establishment of a SIDS-SIDS Knowledge Transfer Hub, preferably in a SIDS University. This decision was endorsed by 33 Member States of LAC, where a Special SIDS Working Group was established within the context of the Forum, to afford the Caribbean SIDS the opportunity to discuss the Hub concept and the form it should take. These inflow discussions included Convention Focal Points and GEF OFPs of the region. Additionally, in the context of the synergistic and complementary knowledge management efforts with the GEF SOILCARE Project (Phase 1), extensive discussions (facilitated by the Partnership on Sustainable Land Management) on the connection to the KTH were held with the UNCCD (land degradation) Focal Points on its implications for SOILCARE sub-projects and how the

projects must complement each other. The above is incorporated into the Stakeholders Section in Table 1 and replicated in Annex P. (additions in yellow highlight)

#### **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

5/8/2023:

-As the project already underscored that gender equality considerations will be fully integrated in the extraction of learning elements (Component 2), please include this in the learning pilots by adding it to Table 1, under Cross-cutting issues: Gender equality considerations. This will ensure that gender perspectives are captured in the pilot countries.

#### **Agency Response**

5/15/2023

- Noted; for emphasis this has been added within the scope of Environmental governance in Table 1.

#### **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

4/26/2023:

Yes

#### **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  
4/26/2023:

Yes

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  
4/26/2023:

Yes

Agency Response  
**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  
4/26/2023:

Yes

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  
4/26/2023:

Yes

Agency Response

**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

**Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/26/2023:

Yes

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

6/14/2023:

Cleared.

5/8/2023:

M&E budget of \$141,200 at 8% of project financing amount is higher than the recommended threshold of 5% for MSP ? please revise.

Agency Response

5/15/2023

- The M&E budget is reduced to \$ 114,200 and now represents 6.5% of the project financing amount. The agency requests that this revised budget, although still above the recommended threshold, be considered given that an MTR is anticipated as best practice (amount reduced from \$30,000 to \$25,000; the TE budget is reduced from \$40,000 to \$35,000), and to retain GEF budget to cover costs of the Inception Workshop, support to monitoring by the PSC and advisory technical group and the project Closing Workshop. Oversight travel was reduced.

**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  
4/26/2023:

Yes

Agency Response  
**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
4/26/2023:

Yes

Agency Response  
**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
4/26/2023:

Yes

Agency Response  
**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
6/14/2023

Cleared.

4/26/2023:

Please include responses to GEF Sec comments provided at PIF stage.

Agency Response

06/07/2023

The comments are uploaded to the portal.

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/26/2023:

Yes

Agency Response

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
4/26/2023:

Yes

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  
6/14/2023:

CAF cofinancing letter has been submitted and the co-financing table has been edited. The project is cleared and recommended for CEO Endorsement.

6/1/2023:

Co-financing letters are still pending and will need to be submitted prior to CEO endorsement or the entries in the co-financing table for the missing letters will have to be removed.

5/11/2023:

The project is not yet technically cleared. Comments above need to be addressed.

#### Review Dates

|   | Secretariat Comment at<br>CEO Endorsement | Response to<br>Secretariat comments |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| <b>First Review</b>                         | 4/27/2023                                 |                                     |
| <b>Additional Review<br/>(as necessary)</b> | 5/11/2023                                 |                                     |
| <b>Additional Review<br/>(as necessary)</b> | 6/1/2023                                  |                                     |
| <b>Additional Review<br/>(as necessary)</b> | 6/5/2023                                  |                                     |
| <b>Additional Review<br/>(as necessary)</b> | 6/14/2023                                 |                                     |

#### CEO Recommendation

#### Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations