



---

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

### Basic Information

**GEF ID**

10185

**Countries**

Global (Africa, Asia/Pacific, Latin America and Caribbean)

**Project Title**

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

**GEF Agency(ies)**

UNEP, IADB, FAO, UNDP

**Agency ID**

UNEP: 01700

**GEF Focal Area(s)**

Chemicals and Waste

**Program Manager**

Anil Sookdeo

## PIF

### Part I – Project Informatic

#### 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

Yes, the program directly responds to program 3 under the chemicals and wastes GEF-7 programming directions and seeks to implement a low and non-chemical development pathway in three SIDS regions.

##### 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

Yes. The program seeks to reduce harmful chemicals and wastes within the territories of SIDS through the following: Preventing the Future Build-Up of Chemicals Entering SIDS, Safe Management and Disposal of Existing Chemicals, products and materials, and Safe Management of Products entering SIDs/Closing Material and Product loops for Products. These activities will be amplified through south-south knowledge exchange and communications inter and intra regionally. In this way the program is creating the enabling environment and conditions to unlock resources from the private and public sector including regional development banks to sustainably transform how chemicals and materials are sourced, procured, managed and disposed. As a result of this the program sets an ambitious target of 15% of

the UPOPs target in core indicator 10 and 16% of the marine litter target in core indicator 5. Additionally, the program seeks to safely manage 355.10 metric tons of pure chemicals (POPs and Mercury) which is contained in approximately 23,027 metric tons of materials and products.

On core indicator 9 there appears to be a difference in the amounts indicated in the section on GEBs and what appears in core indicator 9. Further sub-indicator 9.6 only has an expected amount of 23.03 MT of materials, products etc that are contaminated by POPs and Mercury. On the mercury target in core indicator 9, please clarify what this reduction will be coming from and assuming that the participating countries meet their 2020 phase out of products covered under Annex A of the Minamata Convention is this number realistic?

Please note that Core indicator 9 is a mix of additive and contextual sub-indicators. Only the amounts of tons of pure chemical is to be entered in 9.1, 9.2, 9.3 as these are the ones that we sum to get the GEBs for the project. So, for example, if you have one ton of medical waste, then we need to know how much mercury is in that one ton. That is the number you enter 9.2 (mercury). Similarly, for PCB contaminated oil you are required to calculate the weight of the PCB in the oil and enter that into 9.1 (POPS). In both cases since the chemical that accrues the GEB is contained within a larger tonnage we want to understand what those tonnages are, hence the need for you to input a number for 9.6 which at this stage we are only monitoring and will use for reporting and reconciling the resources being requested. This will not be the case however in cases where in ASGM for example you are phasing out the mercury and similarly, projects that dispose of stockpiles of pure chemicals such as HCH, Lindane etc.

From the description of the project highly hazardous pesticides will be dealt with. Please estimate an amount to be included in core in 9 under sub-indicator 9.1 where there highly hazardous pesticides appears in the drop down list of chemicals.

For core indicator 10 we need to see your assumptions on how you arrive at the amount you enter for this indicator, so for example for POPs emission from health care waste for example, the usual method would be number of beds multiplied by the emission factor and so on. We need these calculations in the project template so that the results colleagues of the GEF can assess the methodologies for consistency etc.

A comparison of the core indicators in the child concepts do not match the PFD as below:

	From Child Projects	In PFD
Core Indicator 9	6475	355
Sub Indicator 9.6	7000	23
sub Indicator 5.6	2000	8000
Core Indicator 10	197	197
Core Indicator 6	310-	
Core Indicator 11	7359064	3680047

In this regard please revise the core indicators as appropriate in both the child concepts and the PFD so that they match at the aggregate level. Please also note that core indicators for 9 and 10 use metric tons and gTEQ and not liters as some child concepts have.

April 24, 2019 - The responses and revisions addresses the comments. Comment Cleared.

### Agency Response

Regarding the core indicators. We have collated a table, outlining the indicators by child project. This has been shared with GEFSEC and will also be uploaded in the resubmission. The PFD has been revised and the indicator amounts are now consistent between the PFD and the child projects.

Regarding methodologies, the following has been included in the revised PFD: For mercury, the data for products is extrapolated from the results of the MIA projects and calculated over the 5 years of the project. For liquid mercury, the estimation is taken from available ASGM data and the expectation that the legislation and customs capacity building will avoid the import of 5t of mercury yearly in each Guyana and Suriname for the last 3 years of the project, and 1.25t in PNG for the last three years of the project.

For PCB, this this the amount identified in the NIP inventories and which needs to be eliminated by 2025. As instructed these amounts have been revised to include only the PCB contaminated oil. Amounts for PBDEs are calculated on the basis of a 30% reduction based on the data from the NIP update projects. PFOS has a reduction target of 20% over the NIP update data.

For uPOPs, the target reduction is 30% on the 2016 data for the last 2 years of the project.

For 5.3 – marine litter estimates are based on available country baseline data in term of marine litter generated. It is noted that some of these studies are dated and the figure will be confirmed, and hopefully increased during PPG.

As for the population, it is estimated, as for the other projects that 20% of the population (at minimum) will benefit from the project's activities.

## 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

The program has an overall co-financing ratio of 1:7 of which 1:6.86 is described as investment mobilized. Please describe the definition/ approach used to differentiate between "investment mobilized" and "recurrent expenditures". For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines ([http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing\\_Guidelines.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf)).

April 24, 2019 - Comment cleared.

### Agency Response

The following definition has been used: "Investment mobilized are confirmed grants which have been secured and will be operating during the lifetime of the project. Further investment will be identified during the PPG." This definition is included under Table C in the PFD. Recurring expenditures are in-kind contribution from Governments.

### GEF Resource Availability

**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**

Yes. The resources requested is in line with GEF policies and guidelines. The agency fee of 9% (as stipulated for PFDs) has been applied, however the PMC costs are higher than 5%. The justification on the need for the global coordination grant, which is an MSP, to be able to fully achieve its goals requires a 10% PMC is adequate.

May 1, 2019 - While the amounts are cleared there are errors in the figures of the child projects listed in Annex A. Please split the Indian Ocean budget lines into the respective regions and correct and resubmit.

May 2, 2019 - Comments addressed.

**Agency Response** Indian Ocean numbers have been disaggregated to provide the data in the format requested by GEFSEC

**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

Yes, however, on core indicator 9 there appears to be a difference in the amounts indicated in the section on GEBs and what appears in core indicator 9. Further sub-indicator 9.6 only has an expected amount of 23.03 MT of materials, products etc that are contaminated by POPs and Mercury. On the mercury target in core indicator 9, please clarify what this reduction will be coming from and assuming that the participating countries meet their 2020 phase out of products covered under Annex A of the Minamata Convention is this number realistic?

Please note that Core indicator 9 is a mix of additive and contextual sub-indicators. Only the amounts of tons of pure chemical is to be entered in 9.1, 9.2, 9.3 as these are the ones that we sum to get the GEBs for the project. So, for example, if you have one ton of medical waste, then we need to know how much mercury is in that one ton. That is the number you enter 9.2 (mercury). Similarly, for PCB contaminated oil you are required to calculate the weight of the PCB in the oil and enter that into 9.1 (POPS). In both cases since the chemical that accrues the GEB is contained within a larger tonnage we want to understand what those tonnages are, hence the need for you to input a number for 9.6 which at this stage we are only monitoring and will use for reporting and reconciling the resources being requested. This will not be the case however in cases where in ASGM for example you are phasing out the mercury and similarly, projects that dispose of stockpiles of pure chemicals such as HCH, Lindane etc

For core indicator 10 we need to see your assumptions on how you arrive at the amount you enter for this indicator, so for example for POPs emission from health care waste for example, the usual method would be number of beds multiplied by the emission factor and so on. We need these calculations in the project template so that the results colleagues of the GEF can assess the methodologies for consistency etc.

A comparison of the core indicators in the child concepts do not match the PFD as below:

	From Child Projects	In PFD
Core Indicator 9	6475	355
Sub Indicator 9.6	7000	23
sub Indicator 5.6	2000	8000
Core Indicator 10	197	197
Core Indicator 6	310-	
Core Indicator 11	7359064	3680047

In this regard please revise the core indicators as appropriate in both the child concepts and the PFD so that they match at the aggregate level. Please also note that core indicators for 9 and 10 use metric tons and gTEQ respectively and not liters as some child concepts have.

April 24, 2019 - Comment cleared

### Agency Response

As noted above, core indicators have been revised.

### 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

No- Please add IW-pollution-plastics in the list, and highly hazardous pesticides

April 24, 2019 - Comment cleared

**Agency Response**

IW pollution and HHP (Pesticides) added in the taxonomy

**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**

Yes. The program very well elaborates on the global environmental problems facing the SIDS in terms of the management of chemicals and wastes and cites several recently published studies on this including the Global Chemicals Outlook 2 and the SIDS waste publication. The program also looked at lessons learned from previous projects and clearly identifies the barriers and issues that need to be addressed in the context of SIDS.

However please enter into the portal the diagram showing the theory of change and strengthen the description of the role that the global coordination child plays in justifying the programmatic approach.

April 24, 2019 - Comment Cleared.

**Agency Response**

ToC has been added in section C (the proposed alternative scenario) within Part II. Programmatic Justification

**2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes, the baseline projects occurring in each region as well as global projects are well identified and explained on how the program will build on these.

**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**

The program describes well how the outcomes and components will be achieved which hinges on inter and intra-regional corporation and knowledge management and communications, however the logic is unclear for four single country child projects in the Indian Ocean which does not fit with the program logic. In this regard a revision of the projects in the Indian Ocean is needed to follow the programming logic.

April 24, 2019 - The revisions to the Indian Ocean interventions have significantly strengthened the logic of the program. Comment Cleared.

**Agency Response**

The Programme now includes a single Indian Ocean project

**4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

This program is aligned with the overarching objectives of the chemicals and waste focal area including helping shift to lower hazardous materials and products being used and disposed of and by so doing prevents a build of hazardous and harmful waste in the environment.

The program also works across the Conventions covered by the focal area and as such accrues benefits for all the Chemical and Waste Conventions. Additionally, this program elaborates on program 3 of the chemicals and waste programming directions.

### 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

Yes, the description provided is very detailed and clearly shows how the GEF resources will be used to build on and align and integrate priorities in a manner that will minimize trade-offs in generating GEBs, while achieving sustainability and development goals across all three regions.

### 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

Yes, the program sets an ambitious target of 15% of the UPOPs target in core indicator 10 and 16% of the marine litter target in core indicator 5. Additionally, the program seeks to safely manage 355.10 metric tons of pure chemicals (POPs and Mercury) which is contained in approximately 23,027 metric tons of materials and products. Please however note the issues with the difference in the aggregations of the core indicator information found in the child concepts versus the values entered in the PFD.

April 24, 2019 - Comment cleared.

**Agency Response**

This has been addressed.

**7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes, this programme aims to build a sustainable model for the sound management of chemicals and wastes in order for SIDS to continue to sustainably develop without a build-up of toxic and hazardous substances in their territories. This will be achieved through creating the enabling environment to allow for sustainability which will require, among other things, harmonizing procurement practices, standards and labelling and capacity building which can only be accomplished at the global/regional level in the context of SIDS. The programme will also create and support long term cooperation among SIDS to achieve this goal. While working at the global/regional level to harmonize practices the programme will identify, incubate and accelerate SIDS appropriate technologies and practices to manage chemicals and wastes so that much needed action at the national level can be done and lessons learned at the national level can be scaled at the regional and global level through the coordination mechanism developed by the programme. This programme will leverage additional support to SIDS and identify opportunities for future investment into the public and private sector is a key element in the programme design. This will include assistance from development banks, national resources, as well as the private sector through incubation and acceleration of entrepreneurship in these regions.

While the above gives a good overview of the innovation, sustainability and scalability of the program to and within SIDS some thought should be given to how for example lessons learned from this program can be applied to LDCs which often have similar issues as SIDS, though at a larger scale. Additionally, lessons from this program can be applied for example to cities which given their discrete geography can have similar approaches to those being tested in the SIDS.

April 24, 2019 - The revisions to the program respond adequately to the comment. Comment cleared.

**Agency Response**

Noted. Text has been added in the innovation section of the PFD.

## 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

Yes, the geo-referenced maps are included in the submission.

### 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

At this stage, the description of the stakeholder engagement is adequately articulated. The PDF includes a detailed account of the consultations that have taken place so far. In terms of other requirements, although at this stage there isn't a clear description of the roles of CSOs, IPS and other stakeholders even though a description of how they will be engaged has been provided. In this regard in the PPG phase please ensure that a clear description of the roles is articulated including the roles of the various stakeholders.

As special mention to Indigenous Peoples has been made, it's important to consider their participation during PPG.

### Agency Response

Noted

## 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

At this stage the information and descriptions are adequate. The proposal provides a well described plan on how a programmatic gender action plan to support the considerations of gender in the coordination, knowledge management and communications components of the program, which will be coordinated by the coordination child project is to be developed. This will help promote a consistent and coherent approach to gender in the design, implementation, and monitoring (reporting) and evaluation of the child projects and ensure that lessons learnt related to gender can be shared with all SIDS. In addition, direct beneficiaries dis-aggregated by gender have been estimated in core indicator 11.

Considering that the gender-specific context of the program is still not very clear from the description as expected at this stage, during the PPG phase some additional effort to more clearly articulate the specific activities and outputs that are expected on gender across the different components is required.

### Agency Response

Noted

## Private Sector Engagement



**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes. The private sector in the waste management, chemicals importation etc is unevenly developed among the SIDS the program aims to address this by identification, incubation and acceleration of SMEs at the regional/national level and engagement with already established larger regional enterprises.

The coordination, knowledge management, and communications child project will also play an important role in developing relationships with original equipment manufacturers supplying equipment to SIDS, and other key private sector partners such as shipping lines (for export of waste) and re-insurers (on the issue of environmental insurance).

**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**

The program describes well the risks for objectives not being addresses and proposes a mitigation plan for each, however while climate change risks have been mentioned in the main text it has not been identified in the risks table which in the case of SIDS in hurricane/cyclone prone areas and those at risk of sea level rise have not been considered. Please address in the revision.

April 24, 2019 - The revisions respond adequately to the comment. Comment cleared.

**Agency Response**

Noted. Climate change is now included in the risk table.

## 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

The program is lead by UNEP which will be responsible for global level coordination of the program including program level monitoring and evaluation. At the regional level there will be coordination in the case of the Caribbean and Pacific by regional centers of excellence while in the Indian Ocean a hub in Mauritius with technical backstopping from UNDP's Regional centers in Bangkok and Istanbul. The project is also fully coordinated with projects at the regional level and will cooperate with knowledge hubs of the GEF GOLD program in respect to the countries that have ASGM in the ISLANDS program (Guyana and Suriname) and with the global SAICM project knowledge hub.

While there is clearly defined regional coordination mechanism for the Indian Ocean component the presentation of four single country child project concepts does not fit the logic of the program. In this regard please revise this to a single regional project.

In revising the child concept also strengthen the links between then including with the global coordination project.

April 24, 2019 - the revisions to the program and the child concepts adequately responds to the comments. Comment cleared.

### Agency Response

Noted. The Programme now includes a single Indian Ocean project and links to the global coordination has been added to all child projects

## 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

Yes. A well-presented description and tables containing convention reports and national strategies is provided.

### 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

Overall, the treatment of KM in the proposal looks good for this early design stage, including lessons learned from related/previously funded projects and explained how these lessons inform the current program proposal. This has been done quite well.

It is good that the proposal is looking to strengthen regional presence of project staff and now proposing a regional project communications officer for the Pacific. However, one clarification that we would like to request here is "why is this not being proposed for the other two regions?" We would think that it would be important to do this for the other two regions as well.

We do not yet see any mention of connections/partnership with local/regional academic institutions/CSOs in terms of knowledge exchange and learning. We think this program offers an opportunity to link with an academic institution (or similar organization) – other than executing agencies - in each region and help build local/regional capacity and also strengthen local outreach/communication/advocacy in this fashion as well. So, it would be good to give some thought to such partnerships at the local/regional level and mention them in the KM section. (The knowledge flow schematic in the KM section does include box titled “academic institutions”; but it is not clear what these institutions are or if these are regional or local and what the nature of interaction will be.)

Finally, it is great that the proposal now includes a schematic that illustrates the proposed knowledge (information and data) flow will occur among the key stakeholders. The schematic is quite comprehensive; yet it does not include the GEF Secretariat as a knowledge exchange partner. This is important to include since we are now requesting that all GEF projects and programs submit key Knowledge Products, Best Practices and Lessons Learned generated during their implementation, as they become available. The PIRs, MTRs and TEs will be the venues for this reporting. This knowledge flow will then enable the GEFSEC to capture, store and make these important program/project outputs available for further learning and knowledge exchange across the GEF partnership, including the GEF Council, donors, etc.

April 24, 2019 - Comment cleared.

### **Agency Response**

Regarding communications, regional communications personnel are now included in Caribbean, Pacific and Indian Ocean.

Regarding work with academic institutions, this will be at both the national and regional levels. Text has been added to the KM section and will be further elaborated during the PPG phase.

Regarding the knowledge management schematic, GEF Secretariat has been added.

### **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

Please address the comments below in the revisions.

Country	Focal Point on GEF website	Endorsement provided by	Compliant (Y/N)
Antigua and Barbuda	Her Excellency Diann Black Layne Operational Focal Point	Document in portal cannot be opened	N – agency needs to re-upload
Barbados	Ms. Daphne Kellman Operational Focal Point	No letter in portal	N- please provide endorsement letter
Belize	Dr. Perceival Cho Operational Focal Point	Dr. Perceival Cho Operational Focal Point	Y
Comoros	Mr. Youssouf Elamine Operational Focal Point	Mr. Youssouf Elamine Operational Focal Point	Y
Cook Islands	Mr. Nga Puna Operational Focal Point	Mr. Nga Puna Operational Focal Point	Y
Dominican Republic	Ing. Patricia Abreu Fernandez Operational Focal Point	No document in the portal	N – please provide endorsement letter
Fiji	Mr. Joshua WYCLIFFE Operational Focal Point	Mr. Joshua WYCLIFFE Operational Focal Point	Y

Guyana	Dr. Vincent Adams Operational Focal Point	Dr. Vincent Adams Operational Focal Point	Y
Kiribati	Mrs. Nenenteiti Teariki Rua tu Operational Focal Point	Mr. Puta Tofinga OIC – Environment and Conservation Division has signed on behalf of the GEF OFP	N – the agency should clarify if the assignment of Mr. Tofinga to the role of acting GEF OFP has been communicated to the GEF SEC?
Maldives	Ms. Miruza Mohamed Operational Focal Point	Ms. Miruza Mohamed Operational Focal Point	Y
Marshall Islands	Mr. Clarence Samuel Operational Focal Point	Mr. Clarence Samuel Operational Focal Point	Y
Mauritius	Mr. Dharam Dev Manraj Operational Focal Point	Mr. D.D Manraj Operational Focal Point	Y
Micronesia	Honorable Mr. Andrew Yatiman Operational Focal Point	Mr. Andrew Yatiman Operational Focal Point	Y
Nauru	Mrs. Berilyn Jeremiah Operational Focal Point	Mrs. Berilyn Jeremiah Operational Focal Point	N- in the text of the LoE of Nauru it says that “in my capacity as GEF OFP for Niue, ....” As this is an official document, the LoE needs to be amended.

Niue	Mr. Haden Talagi Operational Focal Point	Mr. Haden Talagi Operational Focal Point	Y
Palau	Mr. King SAM Operational Focal Point	Mr. King SAM Operational Focal Point	Y
Papua New Guinea	Mr. Gunther Joku Operational Focal Point	Mr. Gunther Joku Operational Focal Point	Y
Samoa	Mr. Ulu Bismarck Crawley Operational Focal Point	Mr. Ulu Bismarck Crawley Operational Focal Point	Y – please note there are duplicate files in the portal
Seychelles	Mr. Will Agricole Operational Focal Point	Mr. Wills Agricole Operational Focal Point	Y
Solomon Islands	Mr. Chanel Iroi Operational Focal Point	Mr. Chanel Iroi Operational Focal Point	Y
St. Kitts and Nevis	Ms. Lavern Queeley Operational Focal Point	Ms. Lavern Queeley Operational Focal Point	Y
St. Lucia	Ms. Caroline Eugene Operational Focal Point	Ms. Caroline Eugene Operational Focal Point	Y
Suriname	Ms. Nataly PLET Operational Focal Point	Ms. Nataly PLET Operational Focal Point	Y

Tonga	Mr. Paula MA'U Operational Focal Point	Mr. Paula MA'U Operational Focal Point	Y
Trinidad and Tobago	Mr. Hayden ROMANO	No document in the portal	Please provide endorsement letter
Tuvalu	Mr. Soseala Tinilau Operational Focal Point	Mr. Soseala Tinilau Operational Focal Point	Y
Vanuatu	Mr. Jesse BENJAMIN Operational Focal Point	Mr. Jesse BENJAMIN Operational Focal Point	Y

Please note that the agency certification from the IDB is missing. Please upload.

April 24, 2019 - All endorsement letters and agency certifications have been provided. Comment cleared.

### Agency Response

All letters have been crossed-checked and uploaded and IDB certification added.

### 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



Yes. All comments have been addressed and the program is being recommended for technical clearance.

Cover Note:

1. The environmental challenge

SIDS across the Caribbean, Indian Ocean and Pacific regions face ongoing and serious challenges to the sound management of chemicals and wastes. SIDS are largely import based economies typically lacking systems to ensure end of life management for goods. This results in the accumulation of wastes over time on islands that lack of physical space, technical capacity and infrastructure to address issues in an environmentally sound and effective / efficient manner. Individually, islands lack a critical mass to trigger investment in sectors linked to recycling and waste management. The ISLANDS programme proposes that by creating the enabling legislative environment it will be possible to unlock resources from private and public sector investments including regional development banks. This will in-turn stimulate entrepreneurship in the management of chemicals, waste and materials and products. At the same time the investments will enable SIDS to identify and develop appropriate alternatives to harmful materials and substances thus allowing SIDS to develop without the negative impacts from poor chemicals and waste management.

2. Objectives of the program and how this will meet the challenge laid out in 1 above

The objective of the ISLANDS programme is to prevent the build-up of materials and chemicals in the environment that contain POPS and Mercury and other harmful chemicals in SIDS and, to manage and dispose of existing stockpiles of harmful chemicals / materials that have and continue to accumulate across the SIDS regions.

Because of developing systems and approaches to preventing the buildup of POPs, mercury and other harmful chemicals and wastes, SIDS will be able to develop without the environmental impacts of poor chemicals and waste management. Information and knowledge exchange will foster a global approach based on lessons learnt across the three regions. The ISLANDS programme will:

- Control the imports into SIDS by harmonizing customs codes, standards and labelling, introduction of green procurement, identification, incubation of SIDS appropriate alternatives to products etc. This will include working with major waste generating sectors including tourism, agriculture and health care and original equipment manufacturers.
- Safely manage and dispose of chemicals, products and materials, unlock resources to manage harmful and hazardous materials in SIDS, and close material and product loops by simulating private and public sector action. This will include identifying appropriate mechanisms to handle chemicals and waste including regional level disposal, creating regional hubs for difficult waste to ensure economies of scale are maximized. This will also extend to products and materials such as electronics, plastics that are needed but cannot be easily handled in/by SIDS which necessitates closed loop mechanisms and an provide an opportunity to increase the level of circularity in the management systems for these products.

- The programme will amplify results through global coordination and knowledge exchange intra and inter region. This will allow SIDS to quickly adopt proven solutions that have been developed by other SIDS. The Programme will work across SIDS regions to ensure all regional projects are executed to the highest possible standard, bringing greater overall benefit to SIDS through a general raising of minimum operating standards across all regions based on lessons learnt and knowledge transfer.

3. Description of how the program is structured, what are the strategies that will be used, which countries are participating, what each one brings, etc.

The programme is based on five child projects: two in the Caribbean (Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Belize, Dominican Republic, Guyana, Saint Lucia, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago); one in the Indian Ocean (Comoros, Maldives, Mauritius, Seychelles); one in the Pacific (Cook Islands, Fiji, FSM, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, PNG, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu); and, a global coordination, knowledge management and communication child project.

Each child project is structured around the following four components:

- Component 1: Preventing future build-up of chemicals in the SIDS environment;
- Component 2: Safe management and disposal of existing chemicals, products and materials. That are historically produced wastes posing an immediate risk to people and natural resources;
- Component 3: Safe management of products entering SIDS/Closing material and product loop for products. This will include promoting systems for future management of wastes and chemicals entering SIDS by adopting and putting into practice 4R approaches including increased recovery of resources from wastes by adopting the principles of sustainable consumption and production;
- Component 4: sharing knowledge and experience across all regions to address issues common to all SIDS and to stimulate inter regional cooperation to combat major global level challenges posed by wastes such as plastics, electronics and other major pollutants.

The ISLANDS programme is based on the following core principles:

Operational Effectiveness:

- By developing / strengthening legislative and policy frameworks promoting equivalence and where possible harmonization of regulations at the global level. The programme will also develop a series of tools and systems at the global level which will benefit all regions;

Knowledge management and exchange:

- By promoting the sharing of lessons learnt between regions and facilitating access to information and experience;

Using the programme as a vehicle for change:

- By working with industries such as importers of electronics / cars, plastics manufacturers and sectors such as tourism across regions to improve environmental performance and wider corporate support to reduce impacts in SIDS;

Alignment of activities with other initiatives operating at the global / cross regional level:

- Several other major funds are coordinating efforts at the global and inter-regional levels. These include the EC ACP Secretariat and European Investment Bank. This provides the opportunity to link GEF activities with other development partners coordinating the work at the global level, facilitating alignment of work flows and economies of scale. Several other major sectors such as climate change and plastics management are also operating across the three regions and provide opportunities to build on and link with existing structures for improved coordination;

Linkages to global agreements and initiatives:

- Bodies such as the BRS and Minamata Conventions, SAICM and the S.A.M.O.A. Pathway and the WHO work in SIDS operate and coordinate at the global level. They also provide existing platforms for coordination across regions to achieve global impacts, knowledge exchange and policy dialogue;

Cost effectiveness:

- Will be achieved because of delivering on all the above. Regions will share the costs of development of products, knowledge and standards which can be applied across all regions. By linking with existing global platforms, the programme will also increase the visibility of the issues in SIDS and the impacts of the programme in a cost-effective way.

4. Description of the global/regional component/platform, what is its objective, what is will bring, how it will ensure that the program outcomes are more than the sum of the parts, etc.

A medium sized coordination global child project has been proposed for overall coordination of the regional child projects. The global child project will act as the mechanism to ensure the programme benefits from the collection, synthesis and dissemination of best practices among the regions, including countries not participating in the program. The global project will also synthesize and aggregate results and other indicators of program success (that will be developed during the PPG) to ensure programmatic reporting at the global, regional and national level. The level of institutional and technical capacity is uneven among the SIDS and the knowledge exchange facilitated by the global child project is expected to bring up the level to equivalence in key areas.

The global child project will also facilitate the entire group of SIDS to work with, for example, original equipment manufacturers, exporters to SIDS and other suppliers from sectors such as vehicle importers, electronics suppliers and agricultural inputs in order to have product and material lines that can be either easily managed in SIDS or easily returned. The ability to do this as a group will have the scale required to be of interest particularly to the private sector. Through knowledge exchange and regular communications with the regional projects the global child will be able to identify opportunities across regions for private sector engagement.

Achieving critical mass and economies of scale in SIDS to attract investment capital is a challenge and key barrier which needs to be overcome if the countries are to have sustainable chemicals and waste management in the future. A global programme has the advantage of leveraging more resources than single countries or regions and stimulating the necessary public and private sector investments which are more sustainable at a scale. In this regard a programmatic approach is desirable to bring much needed resources to SIDS to remove the

are more sustainable at a scale. In this regard a programmatic approach is desirable to bring much needed resources to SIDS to remove the stress on the environment caused by the unsustainable use of chemicals, materials and products. The programme looks to build on the principle of “think globally, act locally” through a combination of interventions and initiatives which address specific needs at country level but at the same time reinforce regional and global cooperation and address the challenges facing SIDS. The exchange of information and knowledge amassed at national level will be shared between regions to achieve impacts at the global level. Working with SIDS at a global level also ensures that when legislation and standards are introduced through the projects, no loopholes are created in the regions and countries which wouldn't be covered in a traditional approach. The program also seeks to surface regionally appropriate technologies and best practices for the management of chemicals and wastes in SIDS and incubate and accelerate these through catalyzing entrepreneurship in the small and medium enterprises across all regions. This will ensure that solutions to challenges from chemicals and wastes are appropriate to the needs of the needs of specific SIDS but fall within a larger framework build around knowledge exchange and transfer.

#### 5. Engagement with partners and with the private sector

Coordination and engagement with partners across the programme will adopt a multi-layered approach based on dialogue at community, national, regional and global levels. The programme will ensure linkages with existing fora at regional and national level and will engage with the Secretariats of multilateral environmental agreements such as Stockholm and Minamata to demonstrate impacts at the global level. Targeted communications, outreach and awareness campaigns will be developed across the regional child projects based on materials and formats developed at the global level.

The programme will also target private sector partners in the key chemicals and waste producing sectors including industries such as tourism, electronics, plastics, tyres, vehicle importers, agriculture input companies and associations to develop sector-based plans to reduce impacts from existing practices and also to adjust current import and waste management models to ensure sustainability and access to less polluting alternatives. Providing companies in these sectors with access to investment capital to improve production and waste management practices in line with internationally accepted best practice is seen as a major contribution to ensuring long term sustainability and improved environmental protection across SIDS.

The waste management sector is unevenly developed among the SIDS. The programme therefore also aims to address this by identification, incubation and acceleration of SMEs at the regional/national level and engagement with already established larger regional enterprises.

The coordination, knowledge management, and communications child project will also play an important role in developing relationships with original equipment manufacturers supplying equipment to SIDS, and other key private sector partners such as shipping lines (for export of waste) and re-insurers (on the issue of environmental insurance). These global level relationships will be developed during the PPG.

## 6. Summary

There have been many initiatives on chemicals and waste across SIDS in the past. A common feature of many of these has been the failure to learn from experience (both positive and negative) and, to build on results and successes. Under the ISLANDS programme the GEF resources will be targeted to address both deficiencies, thus ensuring true incrementality. GEF resources will supplement significant levels of existing and forecast grant and investment co-finance across the three regions ensuring that all interventions are coordinated and targeted to achieve maximum impact. This catalytic effect to ensure the needs of SIDS are addressed is only possible if all partners work in a coordinated and mutually beneficial manner, working towards common objectives in a spirit of true international cooperation. The ISLANDS programme is in a unique position to offer this overall global coordination.

Identifying where GEF resources can supplement and build on existing or past work will be a major task completed under the PPG. The ISLANDS Programme will therefore use GEF resources to create an enabling environment and strengthen regulatory controls; unlock resources from the private and public sector, including regional development banks; stimulate entrepreneurship in the management of chemicals and wastes thus facilitating SIDS' development without the harmful impact of poor chemicals and waste management.

GEF ISLANDS is intended to the following global environmental benefits which represent a major contribution to the overall GEF 7 results framework:

- 185,400 t of plastic pollution prevented
- 656 t of toxic chemicals reduced
- 23,236 t of products, material etc. addressed
- 38 metric tons of Hg avoided
- POPs emissions to air reduced by 197gTEQ

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please note that the co-financing of the PMC is less than the GEF amount. In the majority of projects the practice is for the co-financing to be equal or greater than the GEF amount.

**Review Dates**

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/12/2019	4/23/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/24/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/1/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/2/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)		