

Elimination of Hazardous chemicals from Supply Chains Integrated Programme in Trinidad and Tobago

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11176

Countries

Trinidad and Tobago

Project Name

Elimination of Hazardous chemicals from Supply Chains Integrated Programme in Trinidad and Tobago

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

6/26/2024

Review completed by PM

11/11/2024

Program Manager

Astrid Hillers

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(7/29/2024)

1. Please provide the correct region (LAC/Caribbean not T&T)

(10/24/2024)

GEF IT (Wanderson and team) confirmed that this cannot be changed at this point (portal issue).
Cleared.

Agency Response

Response to 7/29/24 review sheet:

The GEF portal only asks for country information, which is listed as "Trinidad and Tobago", there is no portal field to enter region. The region in the Word version of the "General Child Project Information" section (page 2) of the CEO endorsement document currently states "Latin America and the Caribbean?", highlighted in green.

b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(7/29/2024) Yes

Agency Response

2. Project Summary.

a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

c) [If a child project under a program] Does the project summary include adequate and substantive link with the parent program goal and approach?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(7/29/2024) Overall, yes but:

1. Provide better links between Carnival and fashion and how Carnival designs influence fashion.

(10/24/2024)

Addressed.

Agency Response

Response to 7/29/24 review sheet:

The project summary and project rationale sections now provide better links between Carnival and fashion and how Carnival designs influence fashion, **additional text highlighted in green**.

3. Project Description Overview

a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?

b) [If a child project under a program] Is there a project Theory of Change that is aligned and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?

c) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

d) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?

e) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

f) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(7/29/2024)

1. PDO: Please consider to modify the expression "... thereby promoting the use of raw sustainable materials..". This statement in itself does not make much sense. Do you maybe mean : " "...thereby promoting the use of (*locally sourced?*) *sustainable raw* materials..." Please change as appropriate to be more clear what the project aims at in this regard.

2. The co-finance for components is extremely low while the co-finance to PMC ratio is quite high. Please explain. Also, with such a low co-finance the buy-in and support by the government and private sector reflected appears very low. The component co-finance should therefore be increased.
3. Also on the PMC: there seems to be an error as the amount, from co-financing, allocated to PMC is higher than the total amount of co-financing for this project.

(10/24/2024)

1. Addressed.
2. and 3. The portal numbers are still the same. I am assuming the revisions have not changed. Please move co-finance from PMC to components. Please also show co-finance for M&E.

(11/1/2024)

The comment has been addressed and the relatively high PMC co-finance is in line with the letter of co-finance provided by the Environmental Management Authority.

The overall co-finance to the project is very low and has dropped since the last submission. While this can be explained by the yet to increase local private sector capacity of the sector (which so far heavily relies on imports) and the fact of being an island state, we urge the agency to identify and raise additional co-finance during implementation and report in this in PIRs and at MTR and TE stage.

Cleared.

Agency Response

Response to 7/29/24 review sheet:

1. The project objective, **text highlighted in green** has now been appropriately modified.
- 2-3. The updated co-financing by component will be available on the week of 21 October.

Response to 10/24/24 review sheet:

2. and 3. The co-financing numbers have been updated according to letters of co-financing received to date. Co-finance amount has been added to M&E.

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

- a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?
- b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and

how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(7/29/2024)

1. Please revise and tighten up the rationale section which appears to often be repetitive and repeat facts under the different headings and the jump from overall textiles, to carnival world wide to the carnival in T&T and back does not help to build a clear picture of not only the problem but avenues to tackle it. Aspects of existing finance for e.g. SMEs is not described nor is the contribution of e.g. young designers in the fashion and carnival sector and their role in innovation.

2. Also, while the problem is laid out it appears to outline a nearly intractably complex problem and little is done to show entry points and players that could make a change and therefore likely be partners of the project, such as e.g. Carnicycle and a few nascent efforts to recycle and reuse materials.

Please aim to restructure and build a clearer storyline, including clearer alignment with the parent program.

3. Please strengthen the arguments for transforming fashion through creation of a sustainable carnival design culture particularly in the national baseline description and justification for the project.

(10/24/2024)

Comments have been **addressed**.

During implementation please encourage the connections (via Universities and designers) between the carnival and fashion industry and transfer of lessons to move towards more durable fashion and reduction of overproduction and waste.

Agency Response

Response to 7/29/24 review sheet:

1. The rationale section has been revised to address repetitions and clarify the problem and avenues to tackle it. Aspects of existing finance for SMEs and contribution of young designers in the fashion and carnival sector and their role in innovation have now been added to the rationale section.

2. Entry points and potential players/partners of the project like Carnicycle and efforts to recycle and reuse materials have now been added to the main CEO endorsement document.

3. The national baseline description and justification for the project has now been strengthened in terms of transforming fashion through creation of a sustainable carnival design culture.

Response to 10/24/24 review sheet:

Point is noted. Connections (via Universities and designers) will be encouraged between the carnival and fashion industry as well as transfer of lessons to move towards more durable fashion and reduction of overproduction and waste.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?

b) [If a child project under a program] Is the Theory of change aligned with and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region? [If a child project under a program] Does the description include how the alternative aligns with and contributes to the overall program goal and approach?

d) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

e) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

f) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

g) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?

h) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?

i) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?

j) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?

k) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

l) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

m) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? [If a child project under an integrated program] Are the specific levers of transformation identified and described? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(7/29/2024) The project description is well elaborated and portrays a consistent approach to a shift in behavior, sourcing and incentivizing a shift in the materials and designs used in the T&T carnival and sharing the experiences with other major carnivals. Gender considerations are well mainstreamed across the component. The description acts across the levers of the parent program and could initiate a transformational shift in the large carnival industry.

1. Please outline any current policy incoherence and subsidies that counteract a shift to fewer imported and more environmentally friendly and reusable materials in the carnival.
2. Are there existing finance facilities and lessons that this project could build on (component 3.2)?
3. Knowledge Management ? Please include an activity that seeks to work with the National Carnival Association and National Association of Band Leaders to adopt sustainability criteria in judging of bands.
4. Gender ? Please more clearly integrate gender specific actions into the components of the project.
5. Stakeholders ? Please describe activities that require working with various stakeholders throughout the components including the private sector, NGOs etc.

(10/24/2024)

1. Can you please provide at least some examples of the key areas of incoherent policies and consequences/potential consequences.
2. Addressed at endorsement stage but please in PIR report on other financial mechanisms the project may build on as well as lessons from the Fashion Climate Fund.
3. Addressed.
4. Noted. Please make sure these footnotes are not overlooked and include gender action in workplans. Addressed
5. Addressed.

(11/1/2024) Addressed.

Agency Response

Response to 7/29/24 review sheet:

1. The project description now outlines current policy incoherence and subsidies that counteract a shift to fewer imported and more environmentally friendly and reusable materials in the carnival (additional text highlighted in green).
2. Information related to existing finance facilities and lessons that this project could build on (output 3.2) has now been included in the project description.
3. Work with the National Carnival Association and National Association of Band Leaders to adopt sustainability criteria in judging of bands is included in Activity 3.3.1 of the project description, text highlighted in green.
4. Reference to the gender action plan has now been included in the project description as footnotes on the corresponding activity.
5. Activities that require working with various stakeholders including the private sector, NGOs, etc., are described throughout the components in the project description.

Response to 10/24/24 review sheet:

1. Some examples of the key areas of incoherent policies and consequences/potential consequences are provided on the National Baseline section (highlighted in blue).
2. PIR will report on other financial mechanisms the project may build on as well as lessons from the Fashion Climate Fund.
4. Point noted. Gender action will be included in workplans during project implementation.

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

- a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?
- b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?
- c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).
- d) [If a child project under an integrated program] Does the framework for coordination and collaboration demonstrate consistency with overall ambition of the program for transformative change?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(7/29/2024)

1. PSC ? The PSC should include a representative of the Carnival fraternity as well as the design community.
2. Please answer the question of the GEF agency will play an executing role with "Yes/No".

(10/24/2024)

1. Are you using the Carnival Fraternity synonymous to "Carnival Industry Rerepresentative" and/or could this be added as footnote?

2. Not answered with "no" . Again, I assume there has been a portal problem in saving this update. Can you please try to address? **If all fails** , please add a sentence in the para describing the role of the Implementing Agency that states that " The GEF agency will play no executing role in the project."

(11/1/2024)

1. Addressed.

2. Thank you and good to know as we cannot see how it looks from your end. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response to 7/29/24 review sheet:

1. The PSC now includes representatives of the Carnival fraternity as well as the design community.
2. The question whether the GEF agency will play an executing role has now been answered with a "No".

Response to 10/24/2024 review sheet:

1. Yes, the Carnival Fraternity is being used synonymously with "Carnival Industry Representative". This has now been added as a footnote (highlighted in blue).
2. The only option in the portal is to check a box if ?yes? applies. As this is not applicable in this case, the box has not been checked. A sentence stating that ?**The GEF agency will play no executing role in the project?** has now been added to the paragraph describing the role of the Implementing Agency (highlighted in blue).

5.3 Core indicators

- a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)? [If a child project under a program] Is the choice of core indicators consistent with those prioritized under the parent program?**
- b) Are the project?s targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(7/29/2024)

1. Indicator 6. No comments from the CCM reviewer.

[just as a note: The information in the project document is too broad to allow for a detailed analysis. No standardized methodology is employed to calculate the resulting GHG mitigated by the project.

However, the resulting avoided GHG GEBs seem to be conservative. Direct avoided GHG emissions in the CEO stage are the same as what was reported at the PIF stage.]

2. Please provide an estimate of residual plastics that can be reduced by the implementation of the project.

3. Indicator 11 - no comment. Assumptions and numbers to be verified during implementation at MTR and TE.

(10/24/2024)

Addressed.

Agency Response

Response to 7/29/24 review sheet:

2. Estimate of residual plastics that can be reduced by the implementation of the project is now provided.

5.4 Risks

- a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**
- c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(7/29/2024)

- 1. Please separate/distinguish the assessment of the respective risk from the mitigation measures. Be specific and please quantitatively assess where appropriate (e.g. with regard to climate change risks).
- 2. Environmental and Social - moderate ranking is consistent with ESR rating of UNEP. Please add that according to the safeguards summary ESMF will be required for certain project aspects and grievance mechanisms be paid attention to.
- 3. Please fill out the field for fiduciary risk

(10/24/2024)

Addressed.

Agency Response

Response to 7/29/24 review sheet:

1. The assessment of risks and the respective mitigation measures are now separate, specific and quantitatively assessed where appropriate (key risk table, Part II Project Justification).
2. It has been added that according to the Safeguards summary ESMF will be required for certain project aspects and grievance mechanisms be paid attention to (key risk table, Part II Project Justification).
3. Fiduciary risk has been added to the key risk table (Part II Project Justification).

5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

b) [If a child project under an integrated program] Is the project adequately aligned with the program objective in the GEF-8 programming directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request(7/29/2024) Yes.

Agency Response

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request(7/29/2024) Yes

Agency Response

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request No BD benefits are specifically targeted.

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(7/29/2024) Yes

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(7/29/2024) Yes (under additional annexes)

During implementation, please ensure that the PIRs, the MTE and the TE include a review and reporting of the GAP and relevant gender dimensions of the project.

Agency Response

Response to 7/29/24 review sheet:

It will be ensured during project implementation that the PIRs, MTE and TE include a review and reporting of the gender action plan (GAP) and relevant gender dimensions of the project.

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request (7/29/2024) Yes (under additional annexes)

Agency Response

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(7/29/2024) Yes, but as mentioned under Risks, please note that:

1. The project's overall ESS risk is classified as moderate, and UNEP attached the Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF) (Annex F). SRIF said that "The Carnival Costume manufacturing processes and repurposing will require E&S assessment and requisite management plans before commencement. Stakeholder engagement, management of grievances and community safety and security will need careful attention and deployment of appropriate safeguard instruments." However, it is not clear how and when the project will develop an E&S assessment as stated in the SRIF.

Please provide a plan to prepare an E&S assessment and ESMP with budget, timeline, and responsibility.

(10/24/2024)

Addressed, but please note that the project manager is unlikely to combine all these skills and there may be a conflict of interest. It appears wise to follow your first statement of hiring an specialist consultant.

Addressed

Agency Response

Response to 7/29/24 review sheet:

The structure and content of the ESMF developed will depend on the costume manufacturing processes and repurposing activities to be carried out during the project. The ESMF will be developed in the 1st year of the project. Following review and approval by the Implementing Agency, it will be transmitted to the Trinidad and Tobago Government representatives so that risk management planning and implementation of mitigation measures at the country level can commence from the second half of year 2 onwards. Monitoring of the measures will be integrated in the overall project risk monitoring e.g. during PSC meetings and the annual PIR process.

Budget: \$3-4K and to be absorbed from interventions in components 1-3.

Timeline: Year 1-2

Responsibility: Specialist consultant hired by BCRC Caribbean. If practical, the project manager with the technical capacity would develop the plan during the inception period (year 1) of the project. See TOR Appendix 5e which specifies the ESMF as a deliverable.

Response to 10/24/24 review sheet:

Point noted. The project will follow the recommendation that BCRC Caribbean will hire a specialist consultant to develop the ESMF.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request(7/29/2024) Yes

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(7/29/2024) Please list both the Hazardous Chemicals IP and International Waters IP contributions in the *Focal Area Elements* Table.

(10/24/2024)

Again, this change does not seem to have been saved by the Portal. Please redo and ask GEF IT team for support as needed.

(11/1/24)

In fact correct as is. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response to 7/29/24 review sheet:

Both Hazardous Chemicals and International Waters have now been listed in the Focal Area Elements Table

Response to 10/24/24 review sheet:

Focal Area Elements table is not editable in the GEF Portal. Confirmed as per email from GEF Program Manager Ms. Astrid Hillers (copied here below for ready reference).

Thursday, October 31, 2024 at 10:58:03 Greenwich Mean Time

Subject: FW: ASSIST WITH COMMENT RESPONSE/GUIDANCE FOR PROJECT: GEFID11176: Elimination of Hazardous chemicals from Supply Chains Integrated Programme in Trinidad and Tobago -
Date: Monday, 28 October 2024 at 11:31:19 Greenwich Mean Time
From: UNEP-gef
To: Eloise Touni, Yolanda Cachu (Affiliate), Daria Babenkova
Priority: High
Attachments: image001.png, image002.png, image003.png, image004.png, image005.png, image006.png

Dear Colleagues,

I hope this message finds you well.

Here we go, please find the response below from Astrid (the projects GEF PM) regarding the Trinidad and Tobago project.

We can go ahead now and resubmit the projects.

Regards

Dickson Njiru
UN Environment Programme
Global Environment Facility (GEF) Coordination Office
P.O. Box 30552, Nairobi, Kenya
Phone. (+254) 20 762 3321
Mobile. (+254) 795 751 083

From: Astrid Hillers <ahillers@thegef.org>
Sent: 25 October 2024 17:08
To: UNEP-gef <unep-gef@un.org>; Wanderson Batista Roldao <wbatistaroldao@thegef.org>; Priyanka Chandrahas Kamat <pchandrahasamat@worldbankgroup.org>; ITSOP GEF Portal technical team <ITSOP_GEF_Portal_technical_team@worldbankgroup.org>
Cc: Henry Salazar <hsalazar@thegef.org>; Ersin Esen <ersin.esen@un.org>; Joyce Njeri Muchai <joyce.muchai@un.org>
Subject: RE: ASSIST WITH COMMENT RESPONSE/GUIDANCE FOR PROJECT: GEFID11176: Elimination of Hazardous chemicals from Supply Chains Integrated Programme in Trinidad and Tobago -

Dear Dickson.

You are correct in fact that the Focal Area Elements table cannot be edited for the child project and **correctly has to ONLY lists 'Hazardous Chemicals IP'**.
Please ignore that review comment!

My mistake to not be aware of this as its entirely specific to the GEF 8 IPs.

Please let me know if there are any other questions.

Kind regards,

Astrid

Astrid Hillers (she/her) – currently on RWS and reachable until 3 PM daily
Sr. Environmental Specialist | International Waters
M +1(202) 446-8037 | ahillers@thegef.org
Mail stop: N8-800 | 1818 H Street NW - Washington DC 20433 USA

Global Environment Facility (GEF)
[Thegef.org](https://thegef.org) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [YouTube](#)

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(7/29/2024)

1. On the utilization of the PPG: the amounts do not add up for each category. [Budgeted amount] = [Amount Spent To Date] + [Amount Committed]. Please amend.

(10/24/2024)

Addressed.

Agency Response
Response to 7/29/24 review sheet:

1. Annex D on PPG utilization has now been corrected.

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?

Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request(7/29/2024) No STAR allocation.

Agency Response

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(7/29/2024)

1. Please upload missing letters of co-finance and then link all uploaded co-finance letters to the co-finance table (Annex A).
2. Please seek additional co-finance, including as possible grant/investment mobilized funds.
3. For the Ministry of planning and Development the amount of in kind resources in the letter (as well as the project duration) differ from the table of co-finance. (USD 46,822.23 vs. USD 93,644.00). Please ensure the figures are consistent.
4. There is no UNEP co-finance.

(10/24/2024)

Please address comments.

Please note that the only letters of co-finance attached are the first three.

(11/1/24)

Letters are addressed and specify the type and specific nature of the in-kind co-finance. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response to 7/29/24 review sheet:

- 1-2. The co-financing letters are expected in the week of 21 October 2024.
3. The updated co-finance letter from the Ministry of Planning and Development is also expected in the week of 21 October 2024.
4. This is correct, there is no UNEP co-finance.

Response to 10/24/24 review sheet:

1. All co-financing letters have been uploaded to the portal in section ?C. Confirmed Sources of Co-Financing for the Project by Name and by Type?.
2. We are committed to seeking additional co-finance and report it during the yearly PIRs and MTR appropriately with additional co-financing secured
3. Figures for the Ministry of Planning and Development in-kind resources (USD 93,644.45) have been updated in the co-financing table to agree with the letter which now states the correct project duration of 6 years.
4. There is no UNEP co-finance.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:

Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request(7/29/2024) Yes. LOEs were submitted and cleared at PFD stage.

Agency Response

c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(7/29/2024) LOEs were submitted and cleared at PFD stage.

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

e)[If a regional/global coordination child project under an integrated program] Does the results framework reflect the program-wide result framework, inclusive of results from child projects and specific to the regional/global coordination child project? [If a country child project under an integrated program] Is the child project result framework inclusive of program-wide metrics monitored across child project by the Regional/Global Child project?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(7/29/2024) Yes.

CIs are included (first row of RF) as well as gender differentiated targets and/or indicators.

Agency Response

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request(7/29/2024) Yes

Agency Response

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating

8.8 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request(7/29/2024) Yes

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.9 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources

(Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(7/29/2024)

1. Please for the portal uploaded version and just to increase readability please consider removing the columns for budget by year. Having that many columns makes the budget much harder to read. Please request the agency to use the template provided in the Guidelines on the Project Cycle. **When resubmitted, we will review the budget table and provide additional comments as appropriate.**

2. Please ADD a column providing the budget holder for each and every budget line (i.e. the name of the agency responsible of executing each activity in the budget table).

3. National project assistants - please move these to PMC costs or co-finance. Currently these are charged as technical inputs across components which does not seem a correct assignment of costs. Please revise or provide explanation (justification via TORs).

(10/24/2024)

Addressed.

(11/5/2024)

Please refer back to the comment of July that additional comments may arise once the budget table is linked to the endorsement request. Please address the 3 comments below:

1. The budget line *?HR and financial management for technical services?* is unclear (and not eligible) as presented. These executing functions are normally provided by one position namely Financial / Administrative Assistant (budget line above this). Please include the appropriate position that will carry out this executing function instead.

2. Kindly provide a short !! explanation of budget line 4201 for equipment for Reverse Supply Chain Scheme (RSC) to be developed and tested in the Trinidad and Tobago carnival. Could you provide some indication of the type of equipment as the budget is at 303 K equal to 11 % of the total project budget.

3. Budget totals: Please in the last line provide totals for components, M&E and PMC in addition to the project total (which is already provided). **Please make sure ! that these totals match exactly what is given in the Project Overview table.** For example, note that the total for PMC

currently is not the same in the budget table (USD132,600) as in the Project Overview table (PMC: USD 126,294).

(11/11/2024)

1. Comment addressed.

2. The added text in sub-component 1.2.2. is noted and explains the equipment related to the piloting of a Reverse Supply Chain Scheme (RSC), including for collection and dismantling. In the budget template (line item for this): Please spell out RSC to read **"Reverse Supply Chain Scheme (RSC)"** AND refer to the sub-component 1.2.2. for details on the equipment.

3. Totals for the subcomponents are provided and add up to component totals in the Child Project Description Overview; Same for M&E and PMC costs.

While this is the case, there is a portal IT related issue for which you may need to contact ITS (Priynaka) or alternatively see if formatting the budget file may solve it (e.g. cutting it so that it runs over two pages). **The problem is that the portal automatically creates a PDF file from the endorsement request. This is the file that gets web-posted by the system. In that file, the bottom of the budget table is "cut off".** Likely that happens because the bottom margin on that page with the budget is very small and the system cuts it off. Formatting on your end and having the table over two pages may be easiest way to address this. Otherwise, please contact GEF ITS to aid.

(11/14/2024)

Comments addressed.

Agency Response

Response to 7/29/24 review sheet:

The budget Appendix 4 has been updated and comments addressed.

Response to 11/5/24 review sheet:

1. The budget line ?HR and financial management for technical services? has been removed and budget reassigned to the appropriate position (Administrative assistant as suggested).

2. Budget line 4201 for equipment for *Reverse Supply Chain Scheme (RSC) to be developed and tested in the Trinidad and Tobago carnival* will cover the procurement and potential design of collection containers to be deployed at various locations across Trinidad and Tobago for Carnival costume collection. The design will ensure that items placed inside cannot be removed by unauthorized individuals.

Additionally, this budget allocation is intended to support the transportation of these containers to and from collection points to a central processing site. This project will be procuring equipment and tools for dismantling of the costumes on a large scale, as well as storage containers for the

different materials once they have been processed, prior to their reintroduction to the supply chain.

Additional text added to Activity 1.2.2 section of the Project Description section of the CEO ER (highlighted in yellow).

3. Totals for components, M&E, and PMC are now provided. The PMC amount now matches the total given in the Project Overview table (PMC: USD 126,294).

Response to 11/11/24 review sheet:

2. The budget line 4201 in the budget file (Appendix 4) has now been renamed to ?Equipment for Demonstration of Reverse Supply Chain Scheme (RSC) in Carnival Fashion Industry (refer to activity 1.2.2)?.

3. The budget file (Appendix 4) has now been formatted to run over two pages. The portal generated CEO Endorsement request PDF file should now show the complete budget table.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(7/29/2024) Please address comments provided and resubmit. Please do not hesitate to contact us for any questions.

Please note: on resubmission, please provide one consolidated file for circulation to Council (UNEP normally use the CEO Endorsement Request word version with annexes as the Project Document).

(10/24/2024) Please address the few remaining comments and resubmit.

Mainly, there seem to still be portal issues and the updates on co-finance in the project overview have not been saved. Further the comments on letters of co-finance are to be addressed and remaining letters to be attached.

Please note: on resubmission, please upload in the portal one consolidated file (including Annexes) for circulation to Council (UNEP normally uses the CEO Endorsement Request **word version with annexes as the Project Document**).

(11/5/2024) Please address the three comments pertaining to the **budget** and resubmit.

(11/12/2024) Please address the two small issue in the budget as per the comments and resubmit. Please reach out via teams if you have a question.

(11/14/2024)

The two editorial comments in the budget have been addressed. The project is technically cleared and recommended for endorsement.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

- During implementation please encourage the connections (via Universities and designers) between the carnival and fashion industry and transfer of lessons to move towards more durable fashion and reduction of overproduction and waste.
- We urge the agency to identify and raise additional co-finance during implementation and report on this in PIRs and at MTR and TE stage.
- During implementation, please ensure that the PIRs, the MTE and the TE include a review and reporting of the implementation of the Gender Action Plan and relevant gender dimensions of the project.

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	7/29/2024	10/15/2024

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/24/2024	10/31/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/1/2024	11/7/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/5/2024	11/13/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/12/2024	