

Assessment of existing and future emissions reduction from the coal sector toward the implementation of the Minamata and Stockholm Conventions

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10748

Countries

Global

Project Name

Assessment of existing and future emissions reduction from the coal sector toward the implementation of the Minamata and Stockholm Conventions

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

12/9/2020

Review completed by PM

2/22/2021

Program Manager

Anil Sookdeo

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

Project Type

MSP

CEO Approval Request

Part I ? Project Information

1. Focal area elements. Is the project 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 CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

2. 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 CEO Endorsement Request Yes. This global project is designed to develop policy and standards for POPs and Mercury emissions from the power and metals sector so that countries can meet their obligations on POPs and Mercury reduction in this sector.

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

4. Co-financing. Are the confirmed 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, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request The project has modest co-financing as it is primarily development of policy standards. T

Agency Response

5. GEF resource availability. 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 CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes. The project is aligned with program 4 of the chemicals and waste GEF 7 programming directions

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response
Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
6. Project Preparation Grant. If PPG is requested in Table E.1, has its advanced programming and utilized been accounted for in Annex C of the document?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request PPG is requested to be reimbursed for this one step MSP.

Agency Response
7. Non-Grant Instrument. If this an NGI, are the expected reflows indicated in Annex D?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
8. Core Indicators. Are the targeted core indicators in Table E calculated using the methodology in the prescribed guidelines? (GEF/C.54/Infxxx)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request The project does not have associated GEB's as the project is intended to set the enabling conditions in future projects.

Agency Response
9. Project taxonomy. Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as in Table G?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response
Part II ? Project Justification

1. Project Description. Is there sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes. The project is designed to develop policy actions for reduction of mercury and POPs from the power generation sector and industrial processes.

Agency Response

2. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

3. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there more clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

4. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

5. Project Description. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

6. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

7. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

8. Project Map and Coordinates. Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request The project is global and not limited to specific geographies. That being said the project states that during implementation any work done in national jurisdictions will be reported.

Agency Response

9. Child Project. If this is a child project, an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

10. 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 CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

11. 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 CEO Endorsement Request Yes. As the project is on policy design gender considerations will be taken into consideration during the implementation phase and will be reported on.

Agency Response

12. Private sector engagement. If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

13. Risk. Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes. The project considers all relevant risks including COVID-19 and climate change.

Agency Response

14. Coordination. Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

15. Consistency with national priorities. Has the project described the consistency of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request The project is consistent with the Minamata Convention and Stockholm Conventions and work done will be relevant for countries to meet their obligations under these conventions.

Agency Response

16. Knowledge management. Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes. A main feature of the project is on the development of knowledge and identifying suitable solutions in the power generation and industrial sectors.

Agency Response

17. Monitoring and Evaluation. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

18. Benefits. Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

19. Annexes:

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

20. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS):

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Comments from PPO:

1. PPG use: \$16,000 were utilized in a ?contract with Macquarie University?, but it does not specify what this contact entailed ? please clarify the type of activities covered with this funds

2. On the budget:

(i) \$35,000 are meant to provide some kind of administrative support from Macquarie University (from the PMC). However, it does not specify what ?administrative support? meant ? please clarify what this activity means.

(ii) \$45,000 are meant to be used to sub-contact the Clean Coal Center which ?will manage the overall project budget, supervise project execution, and conduct the required monitoring missions.? (see page 23 of the CEO Approval request document). Hence, one would understand that the Executing Agency (Macquarie University) is

subcontracting a third party (Clean Coal Center), which is charging nearly 10% of the GEF financing to ?manage the overall project budget, supervise project execution, and conduct the required monitoring missions?. Please revise.

(iii) The Project Manager and the Project Assistant are meant to be covered to Outcome 1 and 2 instead of by PMC. Having \$74,000 of co-financing in cash, once some of the funds mentioned in (i) and (ii) above are removed from the unclear administrative support, one would expect that PMC (GEF and Co-financing portion) will be used in covering the costs associated with managing the project.

3. Gender : this is technical assistance project focusing on supporting analysis of the coal sector to support POPs emissions reduction potential from coal-fired power plants. A full scale gender analysis for this kind of project does not make much sense. The project could, however, have made some additional effort to identify some few entry points to consider gender in the different project activities. The project mentions that it will engage a gender expert to provide advice in implementation. It would have been better if they had engaged the gender expert earlier in the design of this project. Please provide some additional information of the role of the gender expert in the implementation and possibly highlight some key gender considerations in the most relevant project activities.

4. Core indicators : proposal says ?Reduction potential for the coal sector to be determined during the project for core indicator 6 and 10. For core indicator 11, the project will propose an assessment tool to estimate direct beneficiaries based on the size of the plants and surrounding communities?. However, as per our result guidelines, these estimates need to be provided by CEO Approval and the estimates can?t be revised later. In addition, each project must include target for at least one Core Indicator (e.g. Core Indicator 11 on beneficiaries).

5. Co-financing : Co-financing letter from UNEP does not specify the type

April 8, 2021 - Comments cleared.

Agency Response

Response: April 1, 2021

1. PPG use through a contract to Macquarie University has been clarified in Annex C.
2. (i) Description of the \$35,000 administrative costs for Macquarie University is included in Section 6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination.
(ii) In the CEO endorsement document, it states that Macquarie University will be the executing agency, working in collaboration with the IEA Clean Coal Center. The roles of Macquarie University and IEA Clean Coal Center have been clearly delineated in Section 6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination.
(iii) The two project personnel posts are not tasked to do project management, they are recruited to oversee and perform technical tasks. Roles have been better defined in Annex 6.
3. Unfortunately, funds were not sufficient at the project preparation stage (as PPG funds have to be pre-financed) to recruit a gender expert to perform detailed analysis. A more detailed description of gender considerations has been included in Section 3. Gender Equality and Women?s Empowerment. In addition, activities that contribute toward gender mainstreaming are also explicitly explained in the alternative scenario section.

4. Core indicator on beneficiaries has been estimated and now included in the CEO endorsement document.
5. Co-financing letter from UNEP is in-kind contribution. A new letter is included in the re-submission.

All changes in green highlight in the portal and supporting documents.

Council comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request While none have been received the Minamata Convention Secretariat provided inputs into the project.

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request PPG has been requested to be reimbursed for this one step MSP.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Part III ? Country and Agency Endorsements

1. 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 CEO Endorsement Request N/A for global projects

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

1. RECOMMENDATION.

Is CEO endorsement/approval recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please see comments from the PPO above.

April 8, 2021 - The project is recommended for CEO approval.

Review Dates

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	2/22/2021	4/1/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/8/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations