Global Development, Review and Update of National Implementation Plans (NIPs) under the Stockholm Convention (SC) on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)

GEF Secretariat Review for Enabling Activity – GEF - 7

Basic Information

GEF ID
10785

Countries
Global (Bahamas, Bolivia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cote d'Ivoire, Dominica, Gambia, Georgia, Guinea, Kenya, Madagascar, North Macedonia, Peru, Senegal, Seychelles, Uganda, Uruguay, Zimbabwe, Montenegro)

Project Title
Global Development, Review and Update of National Implementation Plans (NIPs) under the Stockholm Convention (SC) on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)

GEF Agency(ies)
UNEP

Agency ID
UNEP: 01868

GEF Focal Area(s)
Chemicals and Waste

Program Manager
Anil Sookdeo

Non- Expedited Enabling Activity req (PIF)

Part 1: Project Information

Focal area elements

Is the enabling activity 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. This umbrella enabling activity will update the national implementation plans of 28 countries up to the COP 9 amendments of the Stockholm Convention.

Agency Response

Project description summary

Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, however it would be good to also include the chemicals currently under consideration for listing as these are likely to be added and enter into force during the implementation of this project. In updating the National Implementation Plans please also conduct a review of past and ongoing interventions that seek to manage/dispose POPs so that inventories developed from this project will take into account chemicals that have already been managed and disposed.

April 23, 2021 - Comment cleared.

Agency Response April 22:

Activities related to chemicals that are currently under consideration for listing in the Convention are now included in the project under components 2 (training) and 3 (national inventory). Reviews of past and ongoing interventions that seek to manage/dispose POPs in each country have been included in component 3 of the project so the updated inventories will reflect the chemicals that have already been managed/disposed.

Co-financing

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

For enabling activities co-financing is not required, however as the project has identified co-financing please correct errors in the table including missing amounts and type of co-financing.

April 23, 2021 - comment cleared.

Agency Response April 22:

Co-financing table has been updated and corrected.

GEF Resource Availability

Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes.

Agency Response

Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes

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

Is the financing presented adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes, the project seeks to cost effectively manage several countries as a group through sharing best practices, using common databases to upload information etc.

Agency Response

Part 2: Enabling Activity Justification

Background and Context.

Are the achievements of previously implemented enabling activities cited since the country(ies) became a party to the Convention?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes and the project seeks to avoid the lessons that were not ideal from previous projects.

Agency Response

Goals, Objectives, and Activities.

Is the project framework sufficiently described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes.

Agency Response

Stakeholders.

Does the PIF include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, in terms of national stakeholders please also include Ministries of Planning. At the national level also consider the formation of permanent inter-ministerial working groups that would facilitate collection of information and data for future amendments of the Stockholm convention. Finally the Special Program has now funded several 'chemical units' in recipient countries. Please ensure these units are engaged in this project.

April 22, 2021 - comment cleared.

Agency Response April 22:

National stakeholder list has been updated to include Ministries of Planning. Also the recommendation to form permanent inter-ministerial working groups for future amendments has been added. The chemical units will also be invited to join the national coordinating mechanism to streamline the national chemical management process.

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 The project proposes a plan at the implementation phase to ensure gender is well defined and implemented in the project. As this is an enabling activity there is no PPG so this work can only be done during the implementation.

Agency Response

Part III. Endorsement/Approval by OFP

Country endorsement

Has the project been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please provide the endorsement letters.

April 23, 2021 - Comment partially cleared. Please provide the three missing letters.

Agency Response April 22:

Endorsement letters are now part of the submission.

April 28 (addressing Secretariat's Comments included in Recommendation section below)

Secretariat comment 1- In Project information – the list of participant countries is missed – please include all of them

List of participating countries are now included under Project Information

Secretariat comment 2- Table D requires a breakdown per participant country, so each country will know how much has been allocated to them [once the countries are included in point 1- (above), the Agency will be in a position to include the allocation for each Country in Table D]

Table D has been updated with country specific allocations

Secretariat comment 3- The LoEs of Dominica, Dominican Republic and Paraguay are needed [if not available, the documentation has to be adjusted accordingly by removing the countries with no LoE].

LoE for Dominica is now part of the project submission. Dominican Republic and Paraguay are replaced by Bolivia and Uruguay and these LoEs are attached as part of the submission. Project documents have been updated accordingly

Response to Comments

Are all the comments adequately responded to? (only as applicable)
Gef Secretariat comments?

GEF Secretariat Comment

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO clearance/approval recommended?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2021 - Please respond to the questions raised in the review.

April 23, 2021 - Please see the following comments:

1- In Project information – the list of participant countries is missed – please include all of them

2- Table D requires a breakdown per participant country, so each country will know how much has been allocated to them [once the countries are included in point 1- (above), the Agency will be in a position to include the allocation for each Country in Table D]

3- The LoEs of Dominica, Dominican Republic and Paraguay are needed [if not available, the documentation has to be adjusted accordingly by removing the countries with no LoE.

April 29, 2021- All comments have been addressed and cleared by the PM. 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

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/8/2021	4/23/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/23/2021	4/28/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/27/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/29/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval