



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9601		
Country/Region:	Regional (Barbados, Belize, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Jamaica, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, Mexico, Panama, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, St. Vincent and Grenadines)		
Project Title:	CReW+: An Integrated Approach to Water and Wastewater Management Using Innovative Solutions and Promoting Financing Mechanisms in the Wider Caribbean Region		
GEF Agency:	UNEP and IADB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-2 Program 3; IW-2 Program 4; IW-3 Program 5; IW-3 Program 6; LD-1 Program 1; LD-1 Program 2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$300,000	Project Grant:	\$14,943,938
Co-financing:	\$148,112,617	Total Project Cost:	\$163,056,555
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	Rodrigo Riquelme

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	10th of August 2016 (cseverin): The document needs to provide a stronger rationale for potential C&W and IW funding and better alignment with the Strategic objectives and results frameworks. 10th of March 2017 (cseverin): As	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>part of strengthening the rationale, please provide an objective that is more directed towards implementation.</p> <p>29th of March (cseverin) Addressed, For CW the rationale is not aligned.</p> <p>13th of September 2017 (cseverin): Yes.</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>10th of August 2016 (cseverin): This will be revisited when the alignment with the focal areas results frameworks are clearer and the suggested activities are more clearly defined.</p> <p>10th of March 2017 (cseverin) Partly, it is understood that there may be an opportunity to include an additional Caribbean countries remaining STAR allocation in the project. Please explore this opportunity and revert soonest if this is an opportunity.</p> <p>3rd of October 2017 (cseverin): Addressed.</p>	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	10th of August 2016 (cseverin): The section on drivers of global environmental degradation needs to be strengthened to focus more on the scenarios that the proposed	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>investments will be targeting while at the same time specifically being more inclusive of drivers pertaining to Chemicals and Waste.</p> <p>10th of March 2017 (cseverin):Yes</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>10th of August 2016 (cseverin):The incremental reasoning needs to consider Chemicals and Waste too. At the time when the proposal will include a better alignment with the strategic objectives and the focal areas results frameworks the incremental reasoning will need to be adjusted too.</p> <p>10th of March 2017 (cseverin):The arguments on the incrementality are not clear. Please make it more apparent what will happen with/without the GEF investment</p> <p>29th of March 2017 (cseverin): Incremental reasoning is supposed to outline the baseline investments that the GEF and co-financing will be building on. Please rewrite this section.</p> <p>6th of April 2017 (cseverin): Sufficiently addressed.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the	<p>10th of August 2016 (cseverin): No. The main reason for initiating discussions on this potential new</p>	<p>29th of March 2017 (cseverin): At time of CEO Endorsement it is essential to have more quantifiable stress reduction</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>GEBS?</p>	<p>investment, named CREW+ were to primarily extend the application of innovative technological solutions coupled with innovative financing (decentralized treatment systems will likely be the most appropriate solution) into the small and medium size villages and cities in the Caribbean SIDS. Based on the general assumption that most capitals and larger cities have a better sewerage network coverage compared to more remote non-urban settlements, villages, smaller cities. This underlying premise needs to be more clearly included in the proposed activities.</p> <p>Impact, especially on stress reduction, from CREW as well as from this proposed CREW+ needs to be included in proposal.</p> <p>It is essential that this investment focus on innovative small-scale decentralized investments. The description of component 3, mentions small scale/local investments, but mentions nothing about scale of effort. Please elaborate.</p> <p>There is a general need to better understand impact of this potential investment. Please elaborate.</p>	<p>estimates included in the project RF. Further, please refine measurement of capacity building instead of merely counting numbers of persons trained.</p> <p>6th of April 2017: It is imperative to stress that the focus on innovative wastewater treatment solutions to be tested in small communities and villages is considered the main rationale for the GEF IW investment. IDBs responds as of 31st of March 2017, stating following "In some cases higher costs of application, lack of systems providers and/or difficulties for rural applications (especially in the Caribbean) prevent the full application of these technologies, which explains the use of more conventional and moderate-cost technologies for part of the financing", can not be accepted as an argument for investing in standard conventional wastewater treatment solutions. If this is proposed from IDB, the investments will not be eligible for GEF IW funding.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>The document in its current form does not identify and describe eligible activities for C&W funding. The document needs to provide a stronger rationale for potential C&W and IW funding.</p> <p>Indicated scale of funding needs to be discussed with the GEF Secretariat</p> <p>It is assumed that the hard loans are fully blended with the GEF financing, please confirm.</p> <p>10th of March 2017 (cseverin):The document has been improved, but still lack including stress reduction from CREW (N, P, BOD). The same goes for the proposed on-the-ground investments under CREW+, as they only refer to amounts of water treated. Hence, it is not possible to fully appreciate the impact of the potential investments.</p> <p>There are a couple of references in the results framework, under Outcome 3.1 (b) and Output 4.1.2 (c), however, it is not clear what these references refer to, please clarify.</p> <p>Component 3 and 4 has an overall financing envelope of roughly \$235</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>mio, that is a considerable amount of funding going into wastewater investments in the Caribbean and will tremendously boost the sector, particular the small scale, local, rural, peri-urban and community- based scales. Please explain the dynamics between the GEF grants and the IADB loans and what they will deliver in relation to stress reduction and furthering the overall objective.</p> <p>It seems highly appropriate to set up a micro-credit facility to finance the small, innovate, local investments. Please elaborate on what mechanisms will be deployed to support the 14 small scale investments and how these will link to the large IADB co-financing.</p> <p>Please consider include as an output an exercise leading to a mapping of national coverage of the wastewater infrastructure.</p> <p>Please include activities in countries to further development of tariff structures for wastewater and supportive activities leading to enforcement of these.</p> <p>Please include activities leading to all participating countries ratifying the</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Cartagena Protocol on LBS (potentially to be included under 1.2.1)</p> <p>Please include more quantifiable output indicators, at this time, as well as at time of CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>The results framework includes some quantifiable output indicators, with a focus on numbers of persons trained. Two issues with this indicator. Training is important but a # of trained persons will not be able to quantify impact of the training. Please explore if there are other relevant parameters that can increase the understanding of the impact. Secondly a total of 441 persons trained in 18 countries, average 26 persons per country, which considering the size of financing seems remarkably low.</p> <p>The submission mentions relevant SDGs, but omits relevant Aichi targets, please include (maybe on pp 24, in second para)</p> <p>The interventions described in the document, is being described as innovative, but offers very limited information as what they will be. Please provide more detail.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>On pp 27, please include the WB CROP project, that focuses on Marine Spatial Planning, too.</p> <p>On pp 34-35 the main results from CREW has been listed, please provide more information on the stress reduction (N, P and BOD) reached through the CREW investments. Only m3 amounts of treated wastewater is mentioned, but no estimation of impact on N, P and BOD.</p> <p>Please include mentioning of the fact that 1% of the GEF grant will be going to support IWLEARN activities such as participation in relevant regional IWLEARN hosted events as well as IWCs, with representation from PCU and some country representation too. Further, the project will also produce atleast two Experience Notes, one results note and establish a website following IWLEARN guidance.</p> <p>It is unclear from which industries the reductions of POPS will occur. The project does not provide any documentary evidence that POPS are emitted into sewage sludge. In this regard please provide an indication of</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>which specific industrial sources that are being looked at in regard to POPs emissions in sewage sludge. Additionally it is unclear how the project would propose to prevent future emissions of POPs.</p> <p>29th of March 2017 (cseverin): Partly.</p> <p>Annex 3 outlines IADB investments ongoing, out of which some parts will be supporting the CREW+, however, a number of these investments will be finished before the CREW+ project will be endorsed, hence please make sure to exclude investments that fall into this category from the co-financing.</p> <p>Please ensure that during PPG the impacts of this investment, both on stress reduction as well as on capacity building is refined and extended. The guesstimated stress reduction numbers included are VERY low considering the scale of effort.</p> <p>The project document still do not have any information on what technical interventions that are being planned, naming them to being "innovative" is simply not enough.</p> <p>It is unclear from which industries the</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>reductions of POPS will occur. The project does not provide any documentary evidence that POPS are emitted into sewage sludge. In this regard please provide an indication of which specific industrial sources that are being looked at in regard to POPS emissions in sewage sludge. Additionally it is unclear how the project would propose to prevent future emissions of POPS. The uncertainty raised by the lack of a clear response to this topic needs to be addressed. Without a clear response to the concerns raised on CW, it would be difficult to justify a GEF investment on CW.</p> <p>6th of April 2017 (cseverin):Sufficiently addressed, however it is imperative to stress that the focus on innovative wastewater treatment solutions to be tested in small communities and villages is considered the main rationale for the GEF IW investment. IDBs responds as of 31st of March 2017, stating following "In some cases higher costs of application, lack of systems providers and/or difficulties for rural applications (especially in the Caribbean) prevent the full application of these technologies,</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>which explains the use of more conventional and moderate-cost technologies for part of the financing", can not be accepted as an argument for investing in standard conventional wastewater treatment solutions. If this is proposed from IDB, the investments will not be eligible for GEF IW funding.</p> <p>13th of September 2017 (cseverin): Addressed.</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>10th of August 2016 (cseverin): The description provided is very generic. considering that the CREW is currently ongoing, more specificity would be needed (eg under "other key ministries/agencies", "businesses" and Financial Sector". Further, if the proposal is to attract funding from other GEF focal areas, interest groups, private and public interest groups needs to added to the lists of stakeholders too.</p> <p>10th of March 2017 (cseverin): Description needs to make proper reference to the GEF gender strategy, please include these. Further, please reintroduce the annexes that carried much more detail on key stakeholders.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		29th of March 2017 (cseverin): addressed	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	<p>10th of August 2016 (cseverin): The requested LD funds are available according to PMIS.</p> <p>10th of March 2017 (cseverin):The requested LD funds are still available according to PMIS</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	<p>10th of August 2016 (cseverin): No, the indicated amounts from IW and CW are not available for activities as proposed.</p> <p>10th of March 2017 (cseverin):Yes, the amounts from IW will be available, the requested funding from CW needs to be further discussed with the GEF SEC.</p> <p>29th of March 2017 (cseverin): The FA allocation is subject to the projected shortfall of the GEF Trust Fund. Availability of the FA allocation will have to be reviewed at the time of potential future work program inclusion.</p> <p>13th of September 2017 (cseverin): Yes the requested amount of IW funding is available.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>10th of August 2016 (cseverin): No, please consult with the GEF Secretariat.</p> <p>10th of March 2017 (cseverin): No, Please address comments and resubmit.</p> <p>29th of March 2017 (cseverin): No, please address comments and resubmit</p> <p>Please also in the revised submission address the following errors in the template: ERROR - Programming of FUNds missing in FInance Breakdown ERROR IN PIF - For Chemicals and Waste Projects, programming of Funds is Missing or has wrong entry ERROR in PPG - Finance Breakdown and Finance Overview PPG / PPG Fee totals differ</p> <p>6th of April: The arguments being made to include chemicals resources do not demonstrate a clear link to the Stockholm Convention and there is a high uncertainty as to whether or not</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>this project can deliver reductions of POPS from the waste stream being targeted. Additionally given the shortfall in resources, it is unlikely that there will be resources from chemicals and waste.</p> <p>13th of September 2017 (cseverin): No, please respond to query on additional Country STAR funding.</p> <p>3rd of October 2017 (cseverin): Yes, the PIF is technically cleared and recommended for inclusion into a Work Program.</p>	
Review Date	Review	August 10, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 10, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 29, 2017	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	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)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.