

Additional Caribbean Regional Project

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10472

Countries

Regional (Bahamas, Cuba, Dominica)

Project Name

Additional Caribbean Regional Project

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

6/17/2021

Review completed by PM

8/18/2021

Program Manager

Anil Sookdeo

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

Project Type

FSP

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, the project is aligned with the PFD as well as the sister projects in the region.

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 design follows the design of the overall program.

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

Please provide the missing co-financing letters.

Aug 18, 2021 - letters provided - comment cleared.

Agency Response

16 Aug 2021: The missing co-financing letters are now uploaded to the portal. Co-financing amounts were adjusted accordingly.

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 The core indicators are realistic.

Agency Response

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, articulation with alignment of the chemicals and waste focal area are well elaborated.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

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. The components are aligned with the global coordination project as well as with the other child projects in the program.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the**

implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

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.

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, risks related to climate and the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic are taken into account.

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

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

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

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 YEs

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1. Please include, in Table B, expected outcomes and outputs for component 5 monitoring and evaluation.

2. On co-financing:

- a. Kindly describe the co-financing categorized as investment mobilized
- b. The co-financing provided by UNEP FFEM does not seem to be a recurrent expenditures. If the 2 Million Euros will be in some sort of project, depending on how it materializes we believe this could fall into the category of Investment Mobilized or Public Investment ? please consider revising.

3. On Table D: Table D from the Child Project stipulates that the total amount is 10 Million. Nonetheless, when looking at the table of the Parent Program and looking at the countries included in this Child Project, the sum adds to 8 Million ? please revise.

4. On M&E: in absence of a consultant as the responsible party, it looks like UNEP will be providing some executions functions. If so, a letter of support signed by the OFPs is needed . If not, clarify.

5. On the budget:

- a. Note that the Budget is off margins. When extracting the CEO Endorsement from it will not be readable ? please amend (columns representing the years of disbursement can be eliminated so the table would be slimmer and would fit within the margins).
- b. HR Procurement and financial officer is partially charged to component 4 ? being this a project's staff position, it should be charged to PMC (both portions: GEF funds and co-financing funds)
- c. Budget item ?Alternatives? for \$200,000 requires further explanation.
- d. Translation / interpretation cost \$347,000 ? please consider covering these costs with co-financing resources (nearly 30 million of co-financing are represented in Grants and 2 million are allocated to PMC).

6. On Environmental and social safeguards: We note that UNEP classified the project ESS risk as moderate, and have attached the Safeguard Risk Identification Form and Risk Management Plan along with the stakeholder engagement plan, gender action plan and COVID19 measures. The projects in Dominica will focus on the Kalinago territory, where an indigenous population is living predominantly, and the risk management plan mentioned that activity 2.2.2 will address communication with indigenous population. However, there is no detailed plan of how they communicate and secure Free, Prior, Informed Consent with indigenous peoples in Dominica in the activity 2.2.2. The Table 9: Stakeholder Assessment for Project Implementation also mentioned about indigenous communities as key stakeholder (page 81-86 of CEO Endorsement), but there is no clear action plan here neither. We note that the CEO Endorsement also mentioned ?8.0 Concerns and Constraints for Chemical Management in Indigenous people? as a part of Gender Analysis (page 963 of CEO Endorsement). However, there is no clear action to address these concerns and constraints. Please provide clear action plan and process to address these indigenous people related concerns and constrains with Free, Prior, Informed, Consent, and clear budget to ensure these action plan and monitoring activities.

7. On Core Indicators: Please consider cross-referencing the use of Core Indicators in Table B and Annex A. It can be done by just stating ?Core Indicator 9? next to the related indicators. This helps locate them in the project's logic of intervention.

Sept 27, 2021 (AS) - Comments cleared.

Agency Response

1. The expected outcomes and outputs for Component 5 ?Monitoring and Evaluation? have been added to Table B.
2. On co-financing:

- a. The co-financing categorized as 'investment mobilized' has been described below Table C. These co-financing funds describe new investments made by Carnival Cruise Line and Iberostar Group respectively that they will be collaborating on with ISLANDS.
 - b. The co-financing provided by UNEP FFEM has been re-categorized as 'investment mobilized'. This reflects a project being developed on the management of plastics in the tourism industry in Antigua and Barbuda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, and Saint Lucia. A close collaboration with ISLANDS is already underway to ensure there are synergies between the projects and no duplications, and that lessons learned are shared between the two projects.
3. As described in the child project submission, this project is constituted of 8mil\$ of project funds for the country activities and 2mil\$ as additional support for the global/regional coordination. Table D has been reflected to provide these details. Note, the Global option is not available in table D dropdown.
4. The M&E budget is constituted of Monitoring activities (inception workshop and steering committee meetings) which budget goes to the executing agency and evaluation components (MTR and TE) which budget are used to hire independent evaluators. Details on the M&E budget is provided in section 9.
5. On the budget:
 - a. Budget has been reformatted to fit the window
 - b. HR costs have been charged to the support the recruitment of the large number of technical consultancy contracts in the respective components. The finance officer is charged to the PMC to report on these expenditures. Component 4 has an important activity on working with youth associations in the participating countries and this work requires the issuance of many contracts.
 - c. The budget item 'Alternatives' has been renamed to 'Sustainable/Non-regrettable Alternatives to Harmful Chemicals for National Pilot Projects' for clarity.
 - d. The translation/interpretation costs have been reduced by \$75k. The budget cannot be reduced further as the largest participating country (Cuba) will need considerable efforts to be made in translation and interpretation. While it is expected that co-financers will help support translation/interpretation efforts, this only applies to component 3, as the private sector is minimally involved in the other components. Component 4 (communications, coordination and knowledge management) will require the largest translation/interpretation efforts and Components 1 and 2 will also require some translation/interpretation efforts that cannot be co-financed. It is assumed that co-financers will provide translation/interpretation for activities in which they are involved in Component 3; however, it must be kept in mind that the private sector in Cuba is relatively small, and that co-financers will not be involved in all activities under Component 3.
6. An Indigenous Peoples Action Plan was submitted with the project as Annex 11B. In addition, clarification has been added in the alternative scenario, under Activity 2.2.2, as to how the Kalinago people were engaged and how Free, Prior and Informed Consent was ensured. The clarification is as follows:

During the development of the analysis of waste management in the Kalinago Territory (KT), a district of Dominica communally owned by the Indigenous Kalinago people, and the action plan for the KT under the PPG Phase, the Ministry of Environment, Rural Modernization and Kalinago Upliftment (Ministry), Dominica Solid Waste Management Corporation (DSWMC) and the KT Council were consulted to confirm their interest in this activity and to support its development. The analysis found

that although municipal solid waste is collected from the KT in a similar manner as the rest of the country, attention is still needed for the segregation and collection of hazardous waste, which comprises agricultural chemicals and plastics that may emit uPOPs, such as PVC plastics and pesticide containers. Positive responses were therefore received from all parties about the development of a pilot project to address same. The action plan developed in consultation with the KT Council representatives will therefore ensure that their concerns are addressed during the execution of the pilot project. This plan will be amended as necessary, based on further feedback during execution.

Key elements of the action plan include the engagement of KT Council to incorporate the pilot project into their strategic development plan and to discuss the resources required for the project. This will serve to identify and mitigate constraints on the KT's resources and how the project can support the development of sustainable mechanisms. Further, a KT representative will sit on the national working group for Dominica and will also serve as a community liaison officer for the KT. A project committee will also be set up within the KT to steer the development and execution of this pilot project. The community liaison officer will therefore chair this committee, whose objectives will include supporting the development of the project design and project planning, and assisting in the execution of awareness campaigns in the KT prior to and during execution of the pilot project. Not only will this increase the ownership of the pilot project, but it will also mitigate instances of grievances. A grievance redress mechanism will still be developed. Additionally, the project team will also meet with the KT project committee to monitor the progress of the project and their satisfaction with the outcomes. In accordance with the principles of free and prior informed consent, the KT Council will be given the option to withdraw from the project at any time, should they wish to.

Approximately US \$58,000 has been budgeted for the activity in the KT. These funds will support the procurement of a national consultant from within the KT (US \$10,000), national technical workshops (US \$15,000) and the consolidation, packaging and disposal of the hazardous waste (US \$33,000).

7. Annex A has been modified to indicate the corresponding core indicator contribution but there is no space in Table B for that.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request All council comments have been addressed.

Agency Response

STAP comments

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

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request PPG has been accounted for.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Provided in the documents

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 upload the co-financing letters that are missing.

Aug 25, please see PPO comments in the section on GEF SEC comments that needs to be addressed.

Sept 27, 2021 - All comments have been cleared and the project is recommended to CEO endorsement,

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	8/4/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/18/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/25/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/27/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations