



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

GEF ID:	5558		
Country/Region:	Regional (Antigua And Barbuda, Barbados, Belize, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, St. Vincent and Grenadines)		
Project Title:	Development and Implementation of a Sustainable Management Mechanism for POPs in the Caribbean		
GEF Agency:	UNIDO	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; CHEM-4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$8,839,000
Co-financing:	\$21,124,103	Total Project Cost:	\$29,963,103
PIF Approval:	September 19, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	November 07, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Anil Sookdeo	Agency Contact Person:	Carmela Centeno

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?	Yes	<p>The PIF was approved on the basis that all the countries would have submitted a NIP or a draft NIP by the time of CEO endorsement. We note that the Bahamas has dropped out as a result but St. Vincent and the Grenadines, which has not submitted a NIP is included in the project. Since there is no NIP or draft NIP for St. Vincent and the Grenadines this country will need to be removed from the project.</p> <p>May 26, 2015 (AS) - The Government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines has officially transmitted its NIP to the</p>

*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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Convention Secretariat - Comment cleared.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes	Yes
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• 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>	Yes	Yes
	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?	Yes	Yes, with the exception of St. Vincent and the Grenadines which has not submitted a NIP May 26, 2014 - St. Vincent's NIP articulates the priorities in this project - Comment cleared.

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?	Yes	Yes
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	Yes	Yes
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes	Yes
	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?		Yes
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes	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	Yes
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country	Yes, This project is designed to be complimented by an FAO project dealing with the safe handling and disposal of	Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	or in the region?	obsolete pesticides and PCBs	
	<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 experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>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.</p>	<p>The Caribbean SIDS have limited experience in dealing with chemical and waste issues and this project will assist in improving the capacity of the region to be able to effectively deal with chemicals and waste and implement the relevant chemical conventions. The project does this through mainstreaming sound management of chemicals into national policies and plans and demonstrating effective interventions related to reduction of UPOPs from poor waste management practices and development of environmentally sound management of PCBs.</p>
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		There has been realignment of components that were proposed in the PIF that has improved the project design.
	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?		Yes
	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?		The co-financing will be confirmed during the PPG phase.	The co-financing letters, except that from UNIDO, have not been submitted.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		May 26 2015 - Confirmed co-financing letters have been submitted. - Comment cleared
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes	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.	Yes
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes
	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:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> STAP? 		Yes, with the exception of the comments related to the submission of the NIP for St. Vincent May 26, 2015 - The NIP for St. Vincent has been submitted. Comment cleared.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		None received
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council? 		The proposal has addressed all of the comments from Canada, the US and Germany
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		None received
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?		The submission package is incomplete. Please submit the co-financing letters and respond to the comments raised in the review. May 26, 2015 - All issues with the NIP of St. Vincent and co-financing letters have been resolved. The project is cleared.
	First review*	September 04, 2013	April 01, 2015
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		May 26, 2015
	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.**