

CReW+: An Integrated Approach to Water and Wastewater Management Using Innovative Solutions and Promoting Financing Mechanisms in the Wider Caribbean Region

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

9601

Countries

Regional (Barbados, Belize, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Panama, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago, Suriname)

Project Name

CRew+: An Integrated Approach to Water and Wastewater Management Using Innovative Solutions and Promoting Financing Mechanisms in the Wider Caribbean Region

Agenices

IADB, IADB, UNEP

Date received by PM

5/25/2019

Review completed by PM

9/26/2019

Program Manager

Christian Severin

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Project Design and Financing

1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

21st of June 2019 (cseverin): No, it seems that a number of output indicators are now missing specificity. Please make sure that output indicators as included in the Request for CEO Endorsement will be delivering tangible stress reduction.

23rd of July 2019 (cseverin): Addressed, however, please ensure to forward baselines and associated targets within the first year of implementation

Response to Secretariat comments

Although outcome and output indicators as well as matching baseline and targets were defined at submission in the Log frame framework Annex A to the CEO endorsement as well as in Appendix 3 to the UNEP prodoc or Annex II to the IDB TC document while Table B in the CEO document provides a project description summary with all documents aligning with the approved PIF intervention logic, the logframe has been adjusted mostly to clarify further the stress reduction numbers in 3.1.2 and 3.2.2 and ensuring proper aggregation of targets at the outcome and then objective level. The original PIF included targets/indicators within the output titles i.e. “1.2.1 New or updated national platforms/databases, supported by a regional platform for IWWM developed in at least 6 participating countries”. In the final submission the targets have been moved from the output titles and are further elaborated in the targets in the results framework.

Regarding the submission of baselines and associated targets, the project team will submit such information within the first year of implementation.

2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

21st of June 2019 (cseverin): No, Please address below comments:

- 1) 1) Didn't the previous investments in the Caribbean provide diagnostics of the issues, as suggested in output 1.1.1???
- 2) 2) The results framework as included in the Request for CEO Endorsement, is truly generic and all specific references to understand level of effort and delivery of specific stress reduction have been removed since PIF. Please make sure that it is possible to understand what the project will be delivering. There are numerous examples throughout the submission, where PIF was more specific and these numbers have been removed from the RF in the CEO end Request.

- 3) 3)On output 1.1.2, please consider to move from the current formulation of providing recommendations, to more active wording eg such as “at least 5 of the remaining 7 countries, still to sign the Cartagena protocol, will have done so during project implementation”. Further, words such as recommendation, review etc are not particular geared towards tangible quantifiable results. Please reformulate.
- 4) 4)At PIF approval it was CLEARLY stated that the project should be ensuring that the project would be delivering on the ground, quantifiable stress reduction. This is not apparent when reading the Request for CEO End. Please make sure this becomes much clearer.
- 5) 5)Further, it was also mentioned that the investment would be focusing on supporting small scale/innovative/green infrastructure wastewater treatment in small communities and villages. It is not clear which places have been chosen for these interventions, please include.
- 6) 6)It seems that output 3.2.3 from PIF has been removed?? It is a bit odd, as this at least was promising some tangible delivery.
- 7) 7)On pp 23 there is a mention on countries that have ratified the LBS protocol. On pp 46 another number is mentioned. Which is correct??
- 8) 8)Section 2.3 is listing some regional GEF IW projects of relevance to the implementation of this investment. However, it seems that the WB/BGEF CROP project is missing. Please include.
- 9) 9)Where will the on the ground investments take place??? They document package does not identify this. Please include.
- 10) 10)Please calculate the daily reduction estimates into annual reduction estimates and indicated from when the reductions will be delivered.
- 11) 11)It seems that the project will only deliver tangible stress reduction through component 3.1. Please ensure that it is much clearer how the activities through the other components and sub components will also be delivering tangible, quantifiable results.
- 12) 12)Please include results frameworks for each of the national investments and in particular make sure that it is clear how the results from the national investments will be supporting the delivery towards the overall project objective.
- 13) 13)In section A4 Gender. Please explain why the project will only be delivering towards improving women’s participation and decision making. The other two results areas also seem extremely important and within the scope of the project.

23rd of July 2019 (cseverin): Addressed, however, please ensure to forward baselines and associated targets within the first year of implementation.

23rd of July 2019 (cseverin): Please submit IADB prodoc in its full format. The current uploaded document, contains numerous links to attachments that can not be accessed without IADB ID and password.

12th of September 2019 (cseverin): full IADB document forwarded. Thanks. Please resubmit package, where it is reflected upon, that GEF Implementing agencies CAN NOT execute activities, as such can only be granted under exceptional circumstances.

18th of October 2019 (cseverin): please ensure to fill in column on focal area outcomes in table A

28th of October 2019 (cseverin) Please fill in column on focal area Outcomes in table A.

1st of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

0,0

Response to Secretariat comments

1) The CREW diagnostic efforts were at the national level focusing primarily on 4 countries reviewing baseline and monitoring aspects essential for testing the 4 revolving funds. Whereas the policy and institutional diagnostics were undertaken at the regional level. In CREW+ given that the scope is on decentralised systems in urban and peri-urban and rural communities, the diagnostics will need to be downscaled and refocused to suit the community level in 18 participating countries. The regional guidelines will be downscaled to the national level on a country per country basis engaging further into policy reforms. CREW+ now deals as well with water management and no longer solely with wastewater as artificially separated in CREW and will support integrated water and waste water management.

2) As stated above, the logframe in Annex A to the CEO endorsement as well as in Appendix 3 to the UNEP prodoc or Annex II to the IDB TC document generally mirrors the PIF approved summary result framework table and following OECD DAC definitions, defines outcome and output indicators as well as matching baseline

and targets. In contrast, Table B in the CEO document provides a project description summary. Part II section A sub-section 3.2 of the CEO endorsement document minors adjustments from PIF stage. The rationale of the components and outcomes remain the same with no changes to the PIF, however some of the outputs have been refined or combined in order to provide more clarity and a better comprehensive structure.

3) Generally, ratification is a sovereign government decision. As a project of an agency (UNEP – IDB), we cannot impose such ratification but can only support the process hence indicators and targets need to be nuanced as we have no control over the ratification. As a result of all the project efforts the expectation is however that governments will ratify. However, based on national consultation processes during the PPG and our understanding of country willingness, we believe that the language under output 1.1.4 is a realistic reflection of what can be achieved through project execution and was already addressing GEF Sec suggestion.

Output 1.1.4	SPECIFIC INDICATORS	TARGETS	INDICATORS	OUTPUTS	INDICATORS
<p>Country specific Cabinet/Parliament submissions prepared for formal ratification of the LBS Protocol.</p> <p>UNEP</p>	<p>Number of specific submissions prepared for the ratification of the LBS Protocol.</p>	<p>Among 18 countries participating in the project, 8 countries have not ratified or acceded the LBS Protocol [5] (Barbados, Colombia, Cuba, Guatemala, Mexico, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Surinam).</p>	<p>- Specific submissions prepared for the ratification of the LBS Protocol for 8 countries (Barbados, Colombia, Cuba, Guatemala, Mexico, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Surinam); and</p> <p>- Minimum 4 more ratifications of the LBS Protocol (or in the final process of ratification).</p>	<p>- PMUs Reports;</p> <p>- LBS Protocol reporting; and</p> <p>- LBS submissions.</p>	<p>- Political willingness to adopt the LBS Protocol; and</p> <p>- Additional support if required given to support drafting of submissions.</p>

4) As stated above, the logframe in Annex A to the CEO endorsement as well as in Appendix 3 to the UNEP prodoc or Annex II to the IDB TC document generally mirrors the PIF approved summary result framework table and following OECD DAC definitions, defines outcome and output indicators as well as matching baseline and targets. In contrast, Table B in the CEO document provides a project description summary. Specific targets are provided on a country per country basis and or intervention basis. A new Annex AE has been added with country targets. The logframe has been adjusted for added clarity .

5) A table summarizing the nature of the interventions on a country per country basis has been prepared and added in the Prodoc summary section. The summary table highlights the location, stress reduction targets and other process indicators that will help achieve . impact on the ground. The national packages themselves have also been edited to reflect the indicators and targets at national/local/community level. In some cases, especially with smaller countries given the current state of affairs, detailed feasibility analysis will be continued during inception to ensure proper selection of the most appropriate technology. This will be complemented by SGP interventions to be decided during inception as well.

6) The PIF Output 3.2.3 was not formulated adequately. It read like a target not an output. As described in the CEO document Part II Section A discussing alignment with the PIF, it has been integrated into 3.2.2. Please refer to the logframe to see that indeed that output is included as an indicator for output 3.2.2.

7) 14 have ratified including US , Fr and Antigua Barbuda which are not part of the project – hence at project level it is 11 country. The text has been adjusted accordingly in para 206 of the Prodoc and CEO doc.

8) At submission the CROP project was described on page 34 of CEO doc and 108 of prodoc

9) As stated above, a table summarizing the nature of the interventions on a country per country basis has been prepared and added in the Prodoc summary section para 3. In some cases, especially with smaller countries given the current state of affairs, detailed feasibility analysis will be continued during inception to ensure

proper selection of the most appropriate technology. This will be complemented by SGP interventions to be decided during inception as well. Also note that in each national package, section IV with logframe tables has been refined.

10) This was done and the logframe was adjusted accordingly summarizing as well contemplated project targets at the objective level.

11) The core stress reduction will be achieved through outcomes 3.1 and 3.2. However, the entire project – through all its components -- will deliver stress reduction on the Caribbean, from governance to finance to on the ground activities. Enforcement of policies will result in stress reduction over time. More regulations will ensure less stressor on the environment. These stress reductions, however, cannot be quantified in the life time of the project. The logframe wording has been nuanced accordingly. For example, outcome 1.1. target now reads “Expected further stress reduction beyond life-span of project due to implementation of reforms.”

12) This was done – See added and table in the Prodoc summary and further detailed logframes in each of the national packages in section IV.

13) CEO endorsement section A4 was adjusted.

Agency Response 01/08/2019

The IDB TC Document has been updated and included in this re-submission. The list of annexes and links that are listed at the end of the document shows the annexes that have been added in this re-submission (marked in Yellow in the last page of the IDB TC Document). Those annexes include:

(File: IDB – Results Matrix)

(File: IDB – Procurement Plan)

(File: IDB – Detailed Budget)

Annex “IDB-Annex I. Results Matrix” included in the previous submission establishes the indicators for IDB delivery during the implementation period.

The IDB document "BID - TC Document GEF CReW Sept. 11" has been resubmitted along with the adjusted Budget "IDB Detailed Budget Sept 11" and the adjusted procurment plan "IDB Procurement Plan Sept 11", to reflect GIZ as Executing Agency.

Agency response October 29:

The Focal Area outcomes have been incorporated in Annex A within the Portal format

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

21st of June 2019(cseverin): This is not possible to assess before above comments have been addressed

23rd of July 2019 (cseverin): Partly addressed, however, since the costed results framework from IADB can not be accessed, it is not possible to understand to what weight wastewater management versus water management will be getting, this is important as the main objective is to built on the wastewater investment under the CREW project, by particularly demonstrating low tech solutions for dealing with wastewater in local communities.

12th of September 2019 (cseverin): Above point addressed, but as indicated a GEF implementing agency can not be executing too. Therefore please make sure that the budget reflects upon this.

128th of October 2019 (cseverin): Please ensure that there is full alignment between the GEF grant amount approved by the GEF Council and the amount that the project budget reflects upon.

28th of October 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Response 01/08/2019

The IDB TC Document has been updated and included in this resubmission. The list of annexes and links that are listed at the end of the document shows the annexes that have been added in this resubmission (marked in Yellow). Those annexes include:

(File: IDB – Results Matrix)

(File: IDB – Procurement Plan)

(File: IDB – Detailed Budget)

Annex “IDB-Annex I. Results Matrix” included in the previous submission establishes the indicators for IDB delivery during the implementation period.

These annexes show the weight given to each of the interventions, through technological and management solutions in wastewater management, and their intersections with water sustainability. The rest of the annexes (not marked in yellow) are already included in the main CReW+ annexes.

Regarding the budget allocations for water and wastewater, these were originally defined in the PIF document. This package for CEO Endorsement is fully aligned with PIF, and maintains the focus on wastewater treatment targets originally planned for.

The document "IDB Detailed Budget Sept 11" has been revised to reflect implementation by GIZ as Executing Agency.

4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

2121st of June 2019(cseverin): Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

21st of June 2019(cseverin): No, IDB Grant and loan cofinancing letter is missing, please provide

18th of October 2019 (cseverin): Please ensure that there is coherency between IDB grants listed in project documents and what is mentioned in cofinancing letters. Moreover, please provide explanation as to how (and where) the IDB loans will support the objective of the project objective. Finally it would be good to get a full overview on how far along these investments are in their implementation/disbursement.

28th of October 2019 (cseverin) Partly addressed. Please submit proof of the IDB grant of \$705000.

1st of October (2019 (cseverin): Addressed.

Response to Secretariat comments

The loan and grant co-financing letter from IDB has been included in Annex J. The details of such co-financing are detailed in table in Annex I.

Agency Response October 29:

The amount of \$708,000 corresponds to three documents (TC agreements), including: Costa Rica (\$210,000), Honduras (\$414,000) and Suriname (\$84,000). The approved IDB documents are presented in Annex J as evidence of this IDB co-financing. A letter signed by IDB indicating this Grant Co-financing has been added to Annex J.

A signed letter from IDB indicating the Loan Co-financing has also been included in Annex J.

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

21st of June 2019(cseverin): yes, but project core indicators section may be updated, after the output indicators and the RF in general have been reassessed.

18th of October 2019 (cseverin): Please include relevant core indicator values pertaining to IWLEARN. (core indicator 7, sub indicator 7.4)

28th of October 2019 (cseverin): Please provide relevant indicator values under core indicator 7, both on shared ecosystem and IWLEARN indicator 7.4. This may have been uploaded as an annex, but please fill into online submission.

1st of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

Response to Secretariat comments

As discussed, the nature of the proposed activities and their relevant stress reduction targets, while further defined in the revised logframe, cannot be duly captured in Annex E or Table with Core Indicators which do not provision for reporting on waste water.

Agency Response October 29:

The relevant indicator values for indicators 7.2 and 7.4 have been filled in into the Portal online submission.

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement 21st of June 2019(cseverin): NA

Response to Secretariat comments

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement 21st of June 2019(cseverin): Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement 21st of June 2019(cseverin): Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement 21st of June 2019(cseverin): Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Responses

11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:

GEFSEC

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

21st of June 2019(cseverin): partly, one of the important deliverables of this regional investment is how it will deliver on the ground stress reduction. This was mentioned at PIF, but seem to only have been addressed partly.

23rd of July 2019 (cseverin): Partly addressed, but it will be needed to be able to see the costed results framework from IADB , to understand the weight wastewater management versus water management will be getting. This is important as the main objective of the project is to built on the wastewater investment under the CREW project, by particularly demonstrating low tech solutions for dealing with wastewater in local communities.

12th of September 2019 (cseverin): Addressed, but please ensure to forward baselines with quantitative stress reduction indicators during the initial year of implementation.

Response to Secretariat comments

Please refer to the above responses.

Agency Response 01/08/2019

The IDB TC Document has been updated and included in this re-submission. The list of annexes and links that are listed at the end of the document shows the annexes that have been added in this re-submission (marked in Yellow). Those annexes include:

(File: IDB – Results Matrix)

(File: IDB – Procurement Plan)

(File: IDB – Detailed Budget)

Annex “IDB-Annex I. Results Matrix” included in the previous submission establishes the indicators for IDB delivery during the implementation period.

These annexes show the weight given to each of the intervention, through technological and management solutions in wastewater management, and their intersections with water sustainability. The rest of the annexes (not marked in yellow) are already included in the main CReW+ annexes.

Regarding the budget allocations for water and wastewater, these were originally defined in the PIF document. This package for CEO Edorsement is fully aligned with PIF, and maintains the focus on wastewater treatment targets originally planned for.

The team Agencies will forward baselines with quantitative stress reduction indicators during the initial year of implementation.

STAP

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement 21st of June 2019(cseverin): Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Council

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

21st of June 2019(cseverin): Partly, the initial part of the question from Germany, is not answered in specific terms. Please provide a detailed list of which investments (including technological solution to be deployed) will be undertaken where.

23rd of July 2019 (cseverin): Addressed, however, please forward during the initial year of implementation an overview table that will clearly identify which of the technologies, presented in Annex AD, that will be implemented/demonstrated in which countries and at which georeferenced positions.

Response to Secretariat comments

An new **Annex AD** has been compiled with a summary account of the various technologies and added to the CEO document. Please also refer to the National packages for additional information.

Agency Response 01/08/2019

In Annex A (Results Framework), a note has been added after output 3.3.1 that states “** An overview Table will be presented every semester, identifying the type of technologies being implemented and the geo-referenced location for demonstration projects and watershed being addressed under these outputs. “

In Annex A (Results Framework), a note has been added after output 3.3.1 that states “** An overview Table will be presented every semester, identifying the type of technologies being implemented and the geo-referenced location for demonstration projects and watershed being addressed under these outputs. “

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

21st of June 2019(cseverin): No, please address above comments.

23rd of July 2019 (cseverin) Please address above comments.

12th of September 2019 (cseverin): please address above comments

18th of October 2019 (cseverin) Please address comments

28th of October 2019 (cseverin): Please address comments

1st of November 2019 (cseverin): Yes, CEO Endorsement is recommended.

Response to Secretariat comments

All comments provided to our team on July 23, 2019 have been addressed

All comments provided to our team on October 28th, 2019 have been addressed

Review Dates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The discharge of partially and untreated domestic wastewater continues to be one of the greatest threats to freshwater and marine ecosystems in the Wider Caribbean Region. The degradation of the Caribbean environment negatively impacts on the ability of these ecosystems to continue to provide ecosystem goods and services for the region.

The main objective the project “CReW+: An integrated approach to water and wastewater management using innovative solutions and promoting financing mechanisms in the Wider Caribbean Region.” is to build on the frameworks and lessons of earlier projects including CReW, to implement small-scale, local, rural, peri-urban, and community-based technological solutions for integrated water and wastewater management. The project aims to implement low tech/green infrastructure solutions for the improved management of wastewater that can be up-scaled and replicated so as to significantly reduce the negative impact of domestic wastewater on the environment and people of the Wider Caribbean Region and to similarly implement appropriate solutions at selected watersheds and freshwater basins to ensure greater water security for vulnerable rural communities.

The regional project includes following countries: Barbados, Belize, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Panama, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago