

ISLANDS - Pacific Child Project

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10267

Countries

Regional (Asia/Pacific)

Project Name

ISLANDS - Pacific Child Project

Agencies

UNEP

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

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 Yes. The project is well defined.

Agency Response

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

Yes, however please include the expected reductions to be made in core indicator 10 and sub-indicator 9.6 is lower than the amount of POPS and mercury under sub-indicator 9.1 and 9.2. Please clarify.

March 16, 2021 - Comments addressed.

Agency Response

Response04March2021

For Core Indicator 10:

The correct figure is 8 gTEQ which is consistent with the core indicator table, Annex A (logical framework), and table 6.

This was entered by error in Annex F under core indicator 10.1. This is now corrected in the portal and in the project compiled document uploaded to the portal.

For Core Indicator 9.6:

The figure initially provided (176 tonnes) only accounted for the PBDEs. The amount has been corrected in line with the definition of 9.6 and the explanation provided.

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

Agency Response

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. Additionally the project describes how GEBs for BD and CCM will be monitored and reported in line with comments provided by the STAP.

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.

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. The stakeholder engagement plan is well articulated.

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

The gender analysis and plans are well articulated, further gender is well incorporated
into the project 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. The project brings in significant private sector engagement.

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, the risks posed by Covid-19 and climate change among others are well identified and planned for mitigating against.

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

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

The project describes in detail alignment with the national plans, MIAs etc.

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. KM is a core component of the program and is well described.

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 Is included in good detail.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Child project to be returned to the Agency due to:

1- In the budget table, please clarify what this specific item pay for: UNEP Youth (200K for JPO % and UNV - Samoa based, and \$300K for Pacific partners)

2- Please provide TOR for the Project Coordinator and Administration and procurement support whose costs are being charged to both project components and PMC ? the TORs should show the direct contribution to the component.

April 14, 2021 - Comments cleared.

Agency Response

Response14/04/2021

1) The implementation of the Tide Turner challenge, which is key to component 4 implementation with awareness raising and involvement of Youth Groups will be done using tools developed by UNEP-Youth (provided as co-financing). Youth organisation in the 14 participating countries will be identified and contracted to locally implement the challenge. The contracting portion of the budget (\$22,000 per country) is \$308,000. To coordinate this work, the recruitment of a UNV in the region has been identified as the most cost-effective option. The budget for this post (\$192,000) has been moved to the consultant line.

2) Posts were wrongly described in the budget table. The project manager and the administration specialist are the only project staff. The procurement specialist has been moved to the consultant section and TORs provided as appendix 13 (new).

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Council comments 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 accounted for adequately.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 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

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

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

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please reply to comments raised in the review sheet.

March 24, 2021 - Please respond to the comments in the GEF Secretariat comment box.

April 14, 2021 - The projects is recommended 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	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/24/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/14/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations