

## Implementing Sustainable Low and Non-Chemical Development in SIDS (ISLANDS)

GEF Secretariat Review for Program Framework Document (PFD) entry – GEF - 7

### Basic Information

**GEF ID**

10786

**Countries**

Regional (Cabo Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Sao Tome and Principe)

**Project Title**

Implementing Sustainable Low and Non-Chemical Development in SIDS (ISLANDS)

**GEF Agency(ies)**

UNEP

**Agency ID**

UNEP: 10185

**GEF Focal Area(s)**

Chemicals and Waste

**Program Manager**

Anil Sookdeo

# PIF

## Part I – Project Information

### Focal area elements

#### 1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

#### Agency Response

The comments by the Secretariat were included in the recommendation section (far end of this sheet) which does not allocate any editable box for GEF Agency to provide response. The GEF Agency is therefore responding to the those comments at this box.

1. Title in Portal is different than title in all LoEs – please use the title in LoEs – this can be changed throughout the preparation phase .  
Corrected

2. On Program Information: participant countries (Cape Verde, Sao Tome and Guinea Bissau) are missing – please include them.  
Corrected

3. On Table A – Expected Outcomes are missing – please include them.  
Corrected

4. On co-financing: please provide indicative information on co-financing from “bilateral donors”. It is ok to have this level of “general information” on private sector co-financing but there should be indicative information on bilateral donors.  
Additional information provided in the co-financing section

5. On Stakeholder Engagement: It is not clear in the addendum how civil society, IPLC and private sector in the three new countries have been engaged in any consultations about the project. Please ask the agency to describe any consultations with those stakeholders that took place in the identification of the child project (prior to PFD submission)  
Additional details provided in the stakeholders section

6. Annex A – List of Child Projects with the complete information is missing – please include it.  
Annex A Now provided

#### Indicative project/program description summary

**2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

**Co-financing**

**3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

**GEF Resource Availability**

**4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

## Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?



---

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Answer to comments below (provided in justification):

Stakeholder engagement, especially in the Atlantic SIDS context, is key to ensuring project success. Stakeholders include public and private sector actors in chemicals and waste management as well as relevant non-governmental organizations, such as environmental NGOs. Stakeholders also include representatives of relevant vulnerable groups such as women and youth organizations.

The project countries are situated far apart and in different African sub-regions. Hence, despite the common language, stakeholders differ from country to country. Additionally, the countries display variations in public and private sector engagement. For example, research institutes with active projects in the region (such as the University of Lisbon, University of Madeira, and University of the Azores) report varying stakeholder engagement in the three countries, as well Angola and Mozambique.

In examining the various groups of stakeholders, different communication strategies will be required to reflect stakeholders' needs. As the socio-economic scenario of the three countries differ substantially, this may include tailoring communication strategies to each of the countries. For example, Cabo Verde is much more tourism-intensive than the other two countries, and as such tourism sector engagement will focus on stakeholders in Cabo Verde.

Finally, stakeholders have valuable on-the-ground experience and are in a good position to identify gaps, needs and barriers in chemicals and waste management. Through active participation in the project from the design phase up to project execution, stakeholders will play an important role in shaping the priorities, interventions and outcomes of the project.

To this end, the Atlantic SIDS child project will make use of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) developed by the CCKM global child project. The SEP will help to identify and engage the relevant stakeholders as well as link stakeholders to each other, both within and between regions. While face-to-face contact is crucial in some contexts, as long as travel restrictions are in place, stakeholders will be engaged through virtual meetings and webinars.

## **Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

April 22, 2021

---

Answer to comments below (provided in justification):

Gender mainstreaming is also a critical component for the Atlantic SIDS to achieve gender equality; that is, a society where “the interests, needs and priorities of both women and men are taken into consideration” and where “the diversity of different groups of women and men” is recognized. Gender equality is listed as goal 5 of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals.

Men, women, and children, including vulnerable groups, in the Atlantic SIDS are exposed to different kinds of chemicals in varying concentrations in their daily lives. Therefore, efforts to ensure sound management of chemicals, including POPs, have important gender dimensions. Biological factors, notably size and physiological differences between women and men and between adults and children, influence susceptibility to health effects from exposure to toxic chemicals. Social factors, primarily gender-determined occupational roles, also have an impact on the level and frequency of exposure to toxic chemicals, the kinds of chemicals encountered, and the resulting impacts on human health.

It is important that these gender dimensions are reflected at both site and policy level interventions for sound chemical management. Therefore, a gender analysis will be conducted during the PPG phase of this child project. A gender analysis is used to identify, understand, and describe gender differences and the impact of gender inequalities in a sector or program at the country level. A gender analysis is a required element of strategic planning and is the foundation on which gender integration is built. A gender analysis examines the different but interdependent roles of men and women and the relations between the sexes. It also involves an examination of the rights and opportunities of men and women, power relations, and access to and control over resources. A gender analysis identifies disparities, investigates why such disparities exist, determines whether they are detrimental, and if so, looks at how they can be remedied.

Consistent with the GEF Policy on gender mainstreaming and the GEF-7 approach on gender mainstreaming, GEF projects funded under this strategy will not only acknowledge gender differences within their design but determine what actions are required to promote both women’s and men’s roles in chemical management, disproportionate chemical exposure and vulnerability, as well as sustainable alternatives.

The Atlantic SIDS child project will make significant contributions to the gender analysis. Firstly, by adding a whole new language and region to the ISLANDS programme, the scope of the gender analysis will increase considerably. Secondly, adding two LDCs to the programme will ensure that the most vulnerable women in SIDS and their unique perspectives are not left behind in the global push toward sustainable chemicals and waste management. Finally, sharing of experiences and lessons learned via the CCKM global child project, which will also grow thanks to the contribution of this project, it is hoped that women, children and vulnerable groups beyond the participating countries will benefit from the findings in this programme.

## **Private Sector Engagement**

**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

## Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

### Agency Response

#### Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

## Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

### Agency Response

April 22, 2021

Answer to comments below (provided in justification):

The global risks to the project were identified under the Caribbean and Pacific child projects and include risks related to the COVID-19 pandemic in the short term, and the effects from climate change in the medium to long term.

Direct risks from the COVID-19 pandemic to the project include travel restrictions and the generation of additional single use plastic waste. Some SIDS have indicated plans to close their borders until 2022, while other SIDS continue to be subject to rolling lockdowns. Restrictions on traveling to and within SIDS will impact project execution activities.

SIDS are also importing COVID-specific medical equipment, leading to increased pressure on medical waste management. These medical wastes include single use plastics and other impact-heavy waste streams that the ISLANDS programme seeks to reduce.

Indirect risks and decreased resilience from the COVID-19 pandemic include decreased local support due to shifted priorities and impacts to SIDS economies. SIDS governments have had to prioritise their COVID-19 response over other management issues, including waste management. Tourism-dependent countries in particular, such as Cabo Verde, are facing significant decreases in GDP and sharp increases in state debt.

SIDS are also highly vulnerable to climate change, facing increased natural disasters and rising sea levels in the present and future. In particular, low-lying island regions are at high risk of damage to infrastructure and the economy due to rising sea levels and more frequent storm surges. SIDS globally are also at risk of more frequent and more intense natural hazards such as floods and droughts that may result in infrastructure damage, disaster waste, shifts in political priorities, and delays in project outputs.

Vulnerability to natural hazards poses risks to project activities. Consideration must be given to storage sites for waste, and also of the need for climate-proofing waste management infrastructure. Without such consideration, project gains in waste management improvements are at significant risk of being undermined or destroyed by climate change.

All three Atlantic SIDS face COVID-19 and climate change related risks. Nationally specific mitigation measures will be designed in the project preparation phase to adequately address specific national vulnerabilities.

## **Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?  
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

## **Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

## Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

## Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

### art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

### Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

## Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2021 - Please address and add to the justification the following elements:

1. How, with the addition of these countries adds to gender inclusion and how will this be incorporated into the overall gender plan for the program.
2. Please add information on the how the stakeholders will be engaged in the project development.
3. Please add information on risks due to Covid-19 and climate change
4. Please include the missing OFP endorsement letters.

The following comments have been received from the Minamata Convention Secretariat. Please address in the response to this review:

We would note, however, that the table of performance targets includes none for mercury for two of the countries. The mercury target for Sao Tome and Principe, which reads as “phasing out import of mercury-containing products by 10 percent by 2025,” is not fully in line with Article 4 of the Convention (which is phase-out, not reduction, of manufacturing, import and export of listed products by 2020). While this seems to reflect the country’s initial thinking on this topic, it will be important that all three countries gain a full understanding of the requirement and move quickly to fully implement it. We would like the governmental action on mercury-added product import and export in all three countries to be fully addressed in project implementation within the existing components. This could include implementation of Convention obligations with respect to mercury-added products through training of customs officials, for example.

April 22, 2021 - All technical comments have been addressed, please see the following policy, operational comments:

1. Title in Portal is different than title in all LoEs – please use the title in LoEs – this can be changed throughout the preparation phase .
2. On Program Information: participant countries (Cape Verde, Sao Tome and Guinea Bissau) are missing – please include them.
3. On Table A – Expected Outcomes are missing – please include them.
4. On co-financing: please provide indicative information on co-financing from “bilateral donors”. It is ok to have this level of “general information” on private sector co-financing but there should be indicative information on bilateral donors.
5. On Stakeholder Engagement: It is not clear in the addendum how civil society, IPLC and private sector in the three new countries have been engaged in any consultations about the project. Please ask the agency to describe any consultations with those stakeholders that took place in the identification of the child project (prior to PFD submission)
6. Annex A – List of Child Projects with the complete information is missing – please include it.

April 29, 2021 - All comments have been cleared and the project is recommended for technical clearance.

### ADDITIONAL COMMENTS



Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/8/2021	4/22/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/22/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/27/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/29/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval