



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

10387

Countries

Regional (Bahamas, Cuba, Dominica)

Project Title

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

GEF Agency(ies)

UNEP

Agency ID

UNEP: 01759

GEF Focal Area(s)

Chemicals and Waste

Program Manager

Anil Sookdeo

PIF

Part I – Project Informatics

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

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

In response to the comment received on 31 October, we have reduced the component 4 budget to only reflect the additional funds for the global coordination. The funds for the internal communication between the 3 countries have been moved to component 1. Please note that the child project originally submitted had 2 outputs under component 4, splitting the 1 mil\$ for project coordination and reporting and 2mil\$ for additional support to the global knowledge component. Because the outputs do not appear on the portal, it created confusion. The output for project coordination and reporting has now been moved to component 1 as output 1.3 as reflected in the child project attached.

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

In response to the review submitted by GEF SEC on November 8 2019 the following text has been included in the text below the co-finance table:

"It should be noted that the in-kind contribution from the private sector is identified as investment mobilized. This has been discussed with the GEF and these are cash resources that will be set aside from the tourism industry in the Caribbean to do activities directly related to achieving the objectives of the program. It has been identified as in-kind since the resources will be spent by the private sector."

It should be noted that at this stage of submission the co-financing is very conceptual and will be confirmed formally by the usual letter of commitment at the time of submission for CEO endorsement of the individual child projects.

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 correspondent 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

art 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

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

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

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

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

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

In response to the secretariat's comments below, the number of countries is confirmed as 3 and the letters are attached. Additional changes have been made in line with review from GEF PPO - See response under Item 2

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

Please provide the OFP endorsement letters and please check that the number of countries is four and not three as indicated in the text.

October 31, 2019 - Table D correctly reflects that 2M will be going to coordination, however the component on knowledge management and communications in Table B is 3M. Please adjust the budget lines so that the value for KM and communications is consistent with the request for the regional coordination.

November 1, 2019 - Comments cleared. All three countries to be added to the ISLANDS program have provided co-financing letters and the justification for including these additional countries is sound. The level of resources provides significant additional global environmental benefits particularly on the emissions of UPOPs. The amendment to the ISLANDS PFD is being recommended for technical clearance.

November 8, 2019 - The GEF PPO having reviewed the submission have provided the following comments to be addressed:

PPO reviewed the resubmission of ID 10387 – ISLANDS. The only remaining issue is one in-kind co-financing categorized as investment mobilized:

Private Sector	Tourism Industry	In-kind	Investment mobilized	8,000,000
----------------	------------------	---------	----------------------	------------------

The explanation on how this “in-kind” co-financing was identified as “investment mobilized” does not exist. As this co-financing represents nearly 30% of the co-financing resources, please ask the Agency to either provide a clear explanation which is acceptable or to modify the selection for “recurrent expenditures”.

November 11, 2019 - Comments from the PPO have been addressed. 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

/view Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/16/2019	10/31/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/31/2019	11/1/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval