



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	<b>5558</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Regional (Antigua And Barbuda, Barbados, Bahamas, Belize, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, St. Vincent and Grenadines)</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Development and Implementation of a Sustainable Management Mechanism for POPs in the Caribbean</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNIDO</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>POPs</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CHEM-1; CHEM-4;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$200,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$8,839,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$19,040,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$28,079,000</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>September 19, 2013</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>November 01, 2013</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Anil Sookdeo</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Carmela Centeno</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Yes	
Resource Availability	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	Pending	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
Resource Availability	• the STAR allocation?		
Resource Availability	• the focal area allocation?		
Resource Availability	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
Resource Availability	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
Resource Availability	• the Nagova Protocol Investment		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCE/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	Yes	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	Yes	
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	Yes	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	Yes	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	Yes	

	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Yes	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, This project is designed to be complimented by an FAO project dealing with the safe handling and disposal of obsolete pesticides and PCBs	
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	The project will help to bring the capacity of the participating countries to a level where they can cooperate on dealing with harmful chemicals on a regional basis. This is particularly important in SIDS and LDCs where the economies of scale cannot be achieved on an individual basis. This will help this region manage wastes more effectively moving forward.	

	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	The co-financing will be confirmed during the PPG phase.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	Yes	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	PPG is being requested within the limits set.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of	N/A	

Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Yes	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	September 04, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**