

Review and Update of the National Implementation Plan for the Republic of Moldova under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10354

Countries

Moldova

Project Name

Review and Update of the National Implementation Plan for the Republic of Moldova under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

10/7/2019

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Evelyn Swain

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

Project Type

EA

Expedited Enabling Activity req (CEO)

Part 1: Project Information

Focal area elements

Is the enabling activity aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, this is an enabling activity under the Stockholm Convention.

Agency Response

Project description summary

Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Table B component 1 refers to the wrong country, Guyana not Moldova. Please correct this error.

ES, 6/1/20: This issue has been corrected. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

17/03/2020

The error has been corrected. Table B refers to the Republic of Moldova.

Co-financing

Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified [and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?]

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This is an EA and does not require co-financing.

Agency Response

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:
The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

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, this is the standard amount for this type of EA.

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.

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 project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Figure 1 on the institutional framework shows funding flowing to the UNEP Chemicals and Waste Branch. It is expected that UNEP should not be executing this project without adequate justification as to why this should be an exception to normal practice of not having self execution by an Implementing Agency.

ES, 6/1/20: The institutional arrangements have been adjusted. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

17/03/2020

Institutional arrangements have been amended.

Gender equality and women's empowerment.

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please provide details on Gender.

ES, 6/1/20: Details on gender have been included. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

17/03/2020

Information on gender has been added to section A and additional activities have been added in component 2 in line with other enabling activities and in coordination with GEF SEC gender experts

Monitoring and Evaluation.

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

In the M&E plan project budget should not be allocated to UNEP.

ES, 6/1/20: Minimal budget is requested for a terminal review. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

17/03/2020

UNEP, as IA is responsible for the terminal review of this project. As nationally executed project, a terminal review is requested.

Cost Effectiveness.

Is the project cost effective?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Cost Ranges

If there was a deviation in the cost range, was this explained?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**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

Yes.

Agency Response

Response to Comments

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

GEF Secretariat Comment

NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

STAP Comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO Endorsement/approval recommended?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Not at this time.

6/1/20: Issues have been addressed. CEO Endorsement is recommended.

Review Dates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

This project will enable Moldova to update and review its National Implementation Plan (NIP) and allow it to meet its obligations under the Stockholm Convention. A revised National Implementation Plan will be prepared and submitted to the Stockholm Convention COP due to the addition of new chemicals to the list of POPs.

The project will help conduct a preliminary inventory, establish a coordination mechanism for the management of the project, and allow Moldova to review its priorities for POPs management and plan the implementation of meeting its obligations under the Convention.

The NIP process is a key step in the implementation of the Stockholm Convention since it establishes the national situation, plans, and priorities for the country to map its activities. It is also an opportunity to bring together all relevant stakeholders and build the capacity of the Government to respond to chemical and waste management which is an important step not only for the implementation of the Convention but also helps in the long term process of mainstreaming chemicals and waste management in national development plans and priorities.

Parties to the Stockholm Convention are required to review and update their NIPs to account for the new chemicals added under the convention.