



Global Chemicals Monitoring Programme to support implementation of Stockholm and Minamata Conventions (GCMP)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11534

Countries

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

Project Name

Global Chemicals Monitoring Programme to support implementation of Stockholm and Minamata Conventions (GCMP)

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

3/20/2024

Review completed by PM

3/29/2024

Program Manager

Evelyn Swain

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

Project Type

PFD

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Program Information

a) Is the Program Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat's Comments

Please include complete list of participating countries in child projects as well as in the PFD entry - just listing regions (Africa, Asia/Pacific, Latin America and Caribbean) doesn't complete the key information section required for programs and child projects.

ES, 4/26/24: This project will be regional and global. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

April 23, 2024: The child projects will be implemented at regional and global level, and the resources are allocated at regional or global level and not at country level. Although we have the list of participating the countries for each regional child projects, the portal won't let us list countries in the information section and let the budget in regional without showing an error message 'Country of Finance breakdown should match with Country of projects?', preventing us to validate the programme. Therefore, we propose to keep it as regional approach for which portal allowed to validate. This response is also linked to comment in section 9.1.

Please, also see response to comment 9.1 ? a) 'Non-STAR Focal Area Allocation' justifying the regional financial breakdown rather than country allocation.

b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

2. Program Summary

- a) Does the program summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the program objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?
- b) Is the program's geographical coverage explicit, as well as the covered sectors? Does the summary explain how the program is transformative or innovative?

Secretariat's Comments

It is not clear in the program summary what regions this program will cover. Please strengthen the program summary.

ES, 4/26/24: Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

April 23, 2024: Summary updated with regions to be covered under the programme within the word limit. All updates in red.

3 Indicative Program Overview

- a) Is the program objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
- b) Are the components and outcomes sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the program objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the program components and appropriately funded?
- d) Are the GEF program Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 5%? If above 5%, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat's Comments

Gender is an important aspect of any monitoring program. Gender dimensions are not well included in the components of the program.

PPO comment: We agree with the PM's comment on the need for further strengthening gender equality and women's empowerment components of the project and would like to add the following to the PM's comment: In all activities engaging stakeholders, please ensure that gender experts and representative of women's groups are involved (for example, the GEF Gender Partnership, the Gender and Chemicals Partnership). Please ensure that institutional arrangements, collaboration mechanisms, strategies, monitoring workplans, etc. developed are gender-responsive. Please ensure that all KM and communications products feature good practices and lessons learned on gender mainstreaming/women's empowerment, and are widely disseminated (i.e., consider communications media and language that reaches communities, rural areas) to different groups of women and young people.

ES, 4/26/24: This has been addressed. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

April 23, 2024: Thank you for the very relevant comment. Various sections of the PFD including component narratives have been updated appropriately with gender integration aspects covered. Detailed gender action plan will be prepared during the PPG. All updates are in red font in the updated document for easy review.

4 Program Outline

A. Program Rationale

- a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the program design?
- b) Has the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other program outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?
- c) Is the baseline situation and baseline projects and initiatives well laid out and how the program will build on these?
- d) Have lessons learned from previous efforts been considered in the program design?
- e) For NGL, is there a brief description of the financial barriers and how the program ? and the proposed financial structure- responds to these financial barriers.

Secretariat's Comments Yes, the program rationale is well developed and includes the necessary information.

Agency's Comments

5 B. Program Description

- 5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the program logic, including how the program design elements are contributing to the objective, a set of identified key causal pathways, the thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust solution and listing the key assumptions underlying these?
- b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences?

c) Are the program components described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the program approach has been selected over other potential options?

d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Have the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline programs been described? Is the program incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)?

e) Are the relevant levers of transformation identified and described?

f) Is there an adequate description on how relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) will contribute to the design and implementation of the program and its components?

g) Gender: Does the description on gender issues identify any differences, gaps or opportunities linked to program objectives and have these been taken up in component description/s?

h) Are the proposed elements to capture, exchange and disseminate knowledge and lessons learned adequate in order to benefit future programs? Are efforts for strategic communication adequately described?

i) Policy Coherence: How will the program support participating countries to improve, develop and align policies, regulations or subsidies to not counteract the intended program outcomes?

Secretariat's Comments

Gender, stakeholders, policy coherence should be strengthened in the program description.

ES, 4/26/24: Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

April 23, 2024: The program description section has been updated accordingly.

Gender and policy coherence has been updated in the proposal. The project mainly responds to the COP decisions for supporting the generation of essential data for evaluating effectiveness of the conventions, therefore the updates have been made accordingly within the limitation of scope. Further detailing will be carried out during PPG. The stakeholder's mapping as well as their coordination such as regional organization groups, global coordination group, expert labs and other monitoring networks etc. has been highlighted. Detailed stakeholder engagement plan will be developed during the PPG. All updates are in red font for easy reference and review.

5.2 Program coherence and consistency

a) How will the program design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and allow for adaptive management needs and options?

b) Is the potential for achieving transformative change through the integrated approach adequately described? How is the program going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

c) Are the countries or themes selected as child projects under the program appropriate for achieving the overall program objective?

d) Are the descriptions of child projects adequately reflective of the program objective and priorities as described in the ToC?

e) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate to meet the program objectives?

Secretariat's Comments Yes, the program is well designed.

Agency's Comments

5.3 Program Governance, Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Programs

a) Are the program level institutional arrangements for governance and coordination, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has a program level organogram / diagram been included, with description of roles and responsibilities, and decision-making processes?

b) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed initiatives, projects/programs (such as government, private sector and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the program area, e.g.).

Secretariat's Comments

Institutional arrangements are defined as well as coordination with the former GMP projects and ongoing monitoring efforts. However, Please make sure the executing entities are the same between child projects and the PFD entry ? Information Section.

ES, 4/26/24: Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

April 23, 2024: Noted and updated. Thanks.

5.4 Program-level Results, Monitoring and Reporting

a) Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified? Does the PFD describe how it will support the generation of multiple environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF program?

b) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01/GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

c) Are the program's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) / adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

d) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the program at the global, national and local levels sufficiently described?

e) Is the described approach to program level M&E aiming to achieve coherence across child projects and to allow for adaptive management?

Secretariat's Comments Program results and M&E are adequate.

Agency's Comments

5.5 Risks to Achieving Program Outcomes

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks and impacts adequately screened and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments Risks are identified. At the time of CEO Endorsement the new risk template should be applied.

Agency's Comments April 23, 2024: Many thanks, noted for the update of risk template.

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 a) Is the program adequately aligned with Focal Area and IP Elements, and/or LDCF/SCCF strategy?

***For IPs: is the program adequately aligned with the Integrated Program goals and objectives as outlined in the GEF 8 programming directions?**

Secretariat's Comments The program is well aligned with the GEF CW focal area.

Agency's Comments

b) Child project selection criteria: Are the criteria for child project selection sound and transparently laid out?

Secretariat's Comments

Child project selection criteria is missing.

ES, 4/26/24: Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

April 23, 2024: Clarified in the PFD, in the regional priorities section. Many thanks.

6.2 Is the program alignment/coherent with country / regional / global priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)?

Secretariat's Comments Yes, this project is aligned with the Stockholm and Minamata Convention.

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

7.2 Environmental and Social Safeguards

Have safeguard screening document and/or other ESS document(s) attached and been uploaded to the GEF Portal? (annex D)

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

8 Other Requirements

Knowledge Management

8.1 Has the agency confirmed that a project level approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been included in the PFD?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

9 Annexes

Financing Tables (Annex A and Annex H)

9.1 GEF Financing Table:

a) Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Country STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

Non-STAR Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

In the GEF financing table and PPG table for child projects, please ask the Agency to include individual participating countries and their allocation from the Program budget in accordance with each country's LoE. We will review completeness and accuracy of countries' LoEs against these financing tables and PPG tables in the next resubmission.

ES, This is a regional and global program. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

April 23, 2024: The GCMP is a global and multi regional programme and does not endeavor to have GEF funded activities at country level. The programme aims at contributing to the effectiveness evaluation of the Stockholm and Minamata Conventions through strengthening capacity of labs associated with global monitoring. Since monitoring activities do not yield GEBs, these activities are only exceptionally eligible for GEF funding due to the relevant COP decisions (see project rationale section) which requested the GEF to support the global monitoring plan. Nonetheless, national monitoring projects are still not eligible, and the programme been developed as a global / regional intervention that goes beyond countries' borders. Therefore, child project allocations as presented in the financing table and PPG table are regionally based no national budgets are currently proposed.

To avoid confusion, we propose to remove the LoEs from the portal as they are not technically required and attach them as letters as support. We have kept them in the current submission as a standalone pdf Annex to confirm the support from countries (but not entered in the main Endorsement section of the Portal).

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

IP Set Aside

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

IP Contribution

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

For Child Project Financing information (Annex H)

b) Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? Are the IP contributions aligned with the Program? The allocated amounts (including Agency Fee) match those in LoE?

The allocated amounts (including Agency Fee) match those in LoE?

c) Project Preparation Grant Table: Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? The allocated

amounts (including PPG Fee) match those in LoE? Is the requested PPG within the authorized limits set in Guidelines? (pop up information?) If above the limits, has an exception been sufficiently substantiated?

d) Sources of Funds Table: Are the allocated sources of funds for each and every one of the three STAR Focal Areas within the Country's STAR envelope by the time of the last review?

e) Indicative Focal Area Elements Table: (For IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area element corresponds to the respective IP?

f) (For non-IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area Elements are aligned with the respective Program?

g) Co-financing Table: Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing provided and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments Yes, the table is appropriate.

Agency's Comments

9.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG): if PPG for child projects has been requested: has the PPG table been included and properly filled out adding up to the correct PPG and PPG fee totals as per the sum of the child projects?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

9.3 Sources of Funds for Country STAR Allocation

Does the table represent the sum of STAR allocations sources utilized for this program?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

9.4 Indicative Focal Area Elements

For non-IP Programs

Does the table contain the sum of focal area elements and amounts as per the sum of the child projects?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

9.5 Indicative Co-financing

Are the indicative amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequate and reflect the

ambition of the program? Has the subset of co-finance which are expected to be investment mobilized been identified and defined (FI/GN/01)?

Secretariat's Comments

Equity is investment mobilized normally. Please revise the 'recurrent expenditures' to 'investment mobilized' for Argentina (\$1,725,500.00) as a source of co-financier.

ES, 4/26/24: Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

April 23, 2024: Many thanks for this comment. The type of co-finance was meant to be 'in-kind', not equity investment. The co-finance table was corrected.

Annex B: Endorsements

9.6 Has the program and its respective child project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat's Comments

This is a global program with regional child projects. No LOEs are provided.

ES, 4/26/24: Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

April 23, 2024: Many thanks for the clarification. Considering them to be regional projects as explained above in 9.1 and first section, LOEs have been removed and the letters are attached as supporting document.

Compilation of Letters of Endorsement Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Program Locations

9.7 a) Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the program interventions will take place?

Secretariat's CommentsYes.

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes* (*only for non IP programs)

9.9 a) Does the program provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the program provide a detailed reflow table to assess the program capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

Additional Annexes

10 GEFSEC Decision

10.1 GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the program recommended for clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

Not at this time. Some issues remain.

ES, The program is recommended for clearance.

Agency's Comments

10.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency(ies) during the child project development.

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

10.3 Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	3/29/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/26/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		