



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

GEF ID:	5407		
Country/Region:	Regional (Antigua And Barbuda, Barbados, Bahamas, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Guyana, Jamaica, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, St. Vincent and Grenadines)		
Project Title:	Disposal of Obsolete Pesticides including POPs, Promotion of Alternatives and Strengthening Pesticides Management in the Caribbean		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	POPs
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CHEM-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,357,500
Co-financing:	\$26,368,739	Total Project Cost:	\$30,726,239
PIF Approval:	February 05, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	March 21, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Anil Sookdeo	Agency Contact Person:	Mark Davis

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Grenada is not a party to the Convention and Haiti has not ratified. These countries are not eligible to receive funding. Sept 3, 2013 - The non-eligible countries have been removed. Comment cleared	All countries included in the project have ratified the Stockholm Convention and have submitted their national implementation plans. The US and Canada at the time of work program inclusion requested the GEF secretariat to confirm that all NIPs have been submitted. This is confirmed.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	8 of the 14 countries have endorsed the project. The remaining endorsements need to be submitted. Sept 23 - All endorsements have been submitted	No additional comment required at CEO endorsement

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Resource Availability	3. 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? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	This project is not consistent with CHEM 3. Sept 3, 2013 - CHEM 3 resources have been removed. - Comment cleared	Yes
	<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"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <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>	The project is not aligned to CHEM 3. Funding from this source cannot be provided for the objectives of this project. Revisions are required. Sept 3, 2013 - Comment addressed	The project has not changed since the PIF. The project is aligned with the objectives of CHEM 1
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	Since a number of countries have not completed their NIPs it is not possible to determine the consistency with these NIP Sept 3, 2013 - Comment cleared	Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>The baseline project has not been described. The project proponent have described a number of ongoing activities and past activities but the linkage to the GEF incremental financing is not evident.</p> <p>Sept 3, 2013 - Comment addressed</p>	Yes
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>The project components as described are sound and appropriate in that they deal with both the legacy of chemicals and introduces techniques and practices to prevent new stockpiles from being created, however the project proposes to collect and ship 200 tonnes of chemicals at a cost twice that of what is usually required for similar projects. Would it be more cost effective and practical to investigate the options of disposal at a facility located in the region?</p> <p>Sept 3, 2013 - Comments addressed</p>	Yes
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>There is a clear benefit from removing 200 tonnes of stockpiled POPs from these countries.</p> <p>The incremental reasoning is not sound. Have there been efforts to deal with hazardous/harmful waste in this region and if so how can this be built on by GEF financing to dispose of these chemicals? The major cost of disposal will come from the GEF.</p> <p>Sept 3, 2013 - Comments addressed</p>	Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, 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?</p>		Yes
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	Yes	Yes
	<p>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)</p>	Yes	YEs
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>How will the project be coordinated with the project being developed in the Caribbean to deal with the wider issues related to POPs?</p> <p>Sept 3, 2013 - Comment addressed.</p>	<p>Yes. The project is closely aligned with the already CEO endorsed Regional Caribbean project that deals with POPs management.</p>
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency 	<p>The project is narrow in the areas it attempts to address including the legislative aspects. There is no apparant attempt to examine the management of harmful chemicals more generally in order to achieve better handling of harmful chemicals and their waste. In this regard the sustainabilty of the project does not hold.</p> <p>The proponents argue that GEF financing is necessary to do the activities in the</p>	No additional comments

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>project since there is a general lack of funds and capacity. In this regard how can scale up be achieved? What mechanisms will be used to allow for uptake of these approaches being developed/used in the project?</p> <p>Sept 3, 2013 - Comments addressed</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		Yes
	<p>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?</p>		Yes
Project Financing	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>No. CHEM 3 resources cannot be used for this project. The cost for disposing 200 tonnes of chemicals is twice the maximum amount per tonne that similar projects receive. Other than the shipment costs why are these costs so excessive?</p> <p>Sept 3, 2013 - Comments addressed</p>	Yes.
	<p>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?</p>	<p>The co-financing is adequate however the link to the baseline project is not clear and the type of co-financing is not clear.</p> <p>Sept 23, 2013 - Now that there has been a clarification of the type of co-financing the amounts of in-kind financing is significantly higher than cash. There is a need for cash in many of the components and it is unclear how an in-kind structure will facilitate the implementation of the</p>	Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		components. Additionally the co-financing of the disposal component is much lower than the other components where the distribution is much higher. October 25, 2013 - Comment Cleared	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes	No additional comments
	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?	Yes PPG is being request at \$150,000.	Please provide the report on the use of the PPG funds.
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	No	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		The targets for pesticides are included but not those for PCBs. Please include and re-submit August 11, 2015 - addressed
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		Yes. The STAP comments have been adequately addressed.
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		The comments of the US, Canada and

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Germany have been adequately addressed during the project preparation.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Pending revisions and clarifications. September 23, 2013 - Pending clarification October 25, 2013 - The project is technically cleared and can be included in a future GEF 5 work program.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		Please address the tracking tools and the report on the utilization of the PPG funds. August 11 - Addressed
	First review*	April 25, 2013	July 13, 2015
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	September 23, 2013	August 11, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)	October 25, 2013	

* **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.**