

# Reducing Pollution from Harmful Chemicals and Wastes in Mediterranean Hot Spots and Measuring Progress to Impacts

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

9684

**Countries**

Regional (Turkey, Albania, Libya, Montenegro, Morocco, Tunisia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Egypt, Lebanon, Algeria)

**Project Name**

Reducing Pollution from Harmful Chemicals and Wastes in Mediterranean Hot Spots and Measuring Progress to Impacts

**Agenices**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

3/29/2019

**Review completed by PM**

11/4/2019

**Program Manager**

Steffen Hansen

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

**PIF**

**CEO Endorsement**

**Project Design and Financing**

**1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

SH (24.4.19): Justifications have been provided.

**Response to Secretariat comments**

## 2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

SH (24.4.19): Please address the below points:

– In the portal entry fields, please populate the "Executing Partner Type" entry-field.

- Endorsement letters are included in the project submission for Algeria and Turkey (new to the program), but the LOEs seem to be missing for the remaining countries. Please include.

Shansen (04.9.19): addressed

- Questions related to output 2.3 and output 2.4:

- Other CPs also work on IMAP related issues. Please provide a short overview of the differences between support for IMAP in this project vs other CPs?

Shansen (04.9.19): addressed

- As part of the envisioned off-shore development strategy and during project inception, please make sure that experiences from the GEF/UNDP West Indian Ocean SAPPHIRE project (GEF ID: 5513) are considered. The SAPPHIRE project has worked closely with the World Ocean Council and with the purpose of involving the shipping industry in the monitoring of ocean health.

Shansen (04.9.19): addressed

- Please in the project document describe how the project intends to work towards securing long-term funding for the envisioned national off-shore monitoring stations, including the establishment and long-term operationalization of consistent sub-regional networks capable of supporting the collection of data of relevance for future regional assessment products?

Shansen (04.9.19): addressed

Shansen (25.11.19):

o - According to text in the Portal Submission and the PRODOC this project includes the following countries: Albania, Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Egypt, Lebanon, Montenegro, Morocco, Tunisia and Turkey. However, the portal submission Part I list of countries includes Libya but does not include Turkey. The

PRODOC Part I list of countries includes Turkey, but not Libya. While it is noted that Libya will not take part in the chemicals related activities, it is still GEF's impression that the country will form part of the regional TDA update activity (as currently stated in PRODOC Part I table D). Please clarify?

Please note the following:

- If Libya will take part of in the regional TDA update activity then please add Libya to the PRODOC Part I list of countries (note that Libya already features in the PRODOC Part I table D).
- Please send a request to GEF (via email) specifying if Turkey should be added to the portal submission Part I "Countries" section and/or if Libya should be removed.
- Note that all tables and figures throughout the portal and PRODOC submissions should reflect the final list of participating countries. As an example, currently the Portal and PRODOC Part I table C submissions include Libya's co-finance contribution.
- Please note that by project inception the PRODOC should be updated with the estimated co-finance contribution from all countries in which national level activities will take place, including Turkey. The updated co-financing numbers should be reflected in the portal by mid-term.
- Finally, please check all relevant text sections throughout the Portal and PRODOC submissions and make sure that any changes are duly reflected (including the correct mentioning of beneficiary countries throughout the text).

SH (26.11.19): addressed

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

#### **•Agency Response 29/07/2019**

- Portal entry fields for the "Executing Partner Type" are not editable by the Implementing Agency in the portal. The GEF IT team is kindly requested to set this to 'Other' in the menu in the resubmission.
- An updated Annex G has been uploaded in the portal to include the endorsement letters of all countries. These were originally submitted with the Programme Framework Document.

Outputs 2.3 and 2.4:

- Text has been added at page 63 of the GEF CEO ER to explain the differences between support for IMAP in this project vs other Contracting Parties.
- Noted. Text is added in the Proposed Alternative Scenario section under the description of Output 2.1 in the GEF CEO ER to make reference to the SAPPHIRE project (GEF ID: 5513) and to ensure adequate consultation during the inception phase.

- Text has been added at page 64 of the GEF CEO ER to explain how the project intends to work towards securing long-term funding for the envisioned national off-shore monitoring stations.

- 

**UNEP(26/11/2019)**

**Comments addressed.**

**3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** SH (24.4.19): YEs, the IW elements of the project contains adequate financing and demonstrates a cost-effective approach. In fact, the envisioned TDA upgrade, along with the wider distribution of its results, is both innovative and effective.

**Response to Secretariat comments**

**4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** SH (24.4.19): Yes

**Response to Secretariat comments**

**5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

SH (24.4.19): Yes, however, please confirm that there is no double counting of co-finance across CPs? As an example, Lebanon has contributed large co-finance contributions across several CPs.

Shansen (04.9.19): addressed

Shansen (04.9.19): Please note that the time frame over which the co-financing is provided should be reasonable given the intended duration of the GEF project. In the portal, please provide a reasonable co-financing amount for the actual contribution to the project's objectives. When doing this, please use the same methodology as applied when reviewing the co-financing for CP 9717 and 9687 (note that no new co-financing letters are needed). Further, and as needed, please adjust the different

tables in the portal submission and CEO Endorsement Approval request document. Finally, please provide an explanation in the portal comments field as to how you arrived at the final portal number(s).

Shansen (8.10.19): addressed.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

#### **•Agency Response 29/07/2019**

The co-financing pledges of the Countries have been carefully checked, discussed and verified with the Countries OFP – NO double counting of co-financing across CPs has been found. However, these commitments will be monitored by the MedPCU and executing partners as well as discussed and analysed at the inception meeting and following annual project Steering Committees.

#### **Agency Response 01/10/2019**

Response to the comment of (04.9.19): The co-financing pledge of Lebanon has been re-discussed with the government. A new update figure has been provided with a precise indication for the time frame to deliver it. The Government of Lebanon will support national and regional initiatives and actions in support of the MedProgramme's Child Project 1.1 (GEF ID 9684): Reducing Pollution from Harmful Chemicals and Wastes in Mediterranean Hotspots and Measuring Progress to Impacts. The Government of Lebanon will contribute to Child Project 1.1 through a set of initiative that will be deployed during the 5 years lifespan of the project's execution. These actions are supporting the sound management and safe disposal of harmful chemical and waste. During the preparation phase of Child Project 1.1, Lebanon made a pledge of 189,059,000 USD in support of national initiatives on the management of POPs/mercury and diagnostic analysis of the Mediterranean Sea and coastal ecosystems of Lebanon. As indicated in the co-financing letters these investments should materialize in the period 2019-2024. However, due to the time passed between the approval of the MedProgramme (October 2016), and the finalization of the preparation phase for Child Projects 1.1, the country agreed on providing an update on its commitment with the view of reporting new figures for the co-financing to be monitored during the execution of the Project.

As of 30 August 2019, the level of delivering of the above-mentioned initiatives is approx. 2 M USD. By applying the same ratio and considering usual challenges to be tackled in this kind of complex investment at national level, the commitment of Lebanon for this initiative is updated to 15 M USD to be delivered during the 5 years execution period of Child Project 1.1 – GEF ID 9684.

Figures have been updated in the portal.

#### **6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

SH (24.4.19):

- Please fill out indicator 7 and 11. It is understood that the indicator 11 # might only be a rough estimate at this stage.

Shansen (04.9.19): addressed

- CCA Rio Marker: Please note that the IW TDA update is closely linked to CCA and resilience and amongst other elements will incorporate the impacts of climate change on coastal aquifers. The CCA Rio Marker features the value “0”. Please consider if “0” is the correct value?

Shansen (04.9.19): addressed

for Core Indicator 9 under 9.1 there are two chemicals listed in the template that do not have a value associated with them. Please either remove these chemicals or indicate a number of tons. On 9.6 can a value be included here?

Please note that the explanation provided on the calculation of the core indicators cannot be evaluated since they are not included in the text of the CEO endorsement template. References to attached documents are not formal documents and will not be reviewed. In this regard, please revise and resubmit.

AS (Sept 11, 2019) Comments have been addressed.

## Response to Secretariat comments

### •Agency Response 29/07/2019

- Indicators 7 and 11 have been added in the Core Indicators and related worksheet.

- Rio marker: Noted. Indeed, the project will directly/indirectly contribute to climate change adaptation, via the TDA which strongly includes elements of CC Adaptation. The value is duly changed to 1 for adaptation.

- Indicator 9: The POPs target of 2,000 metric tons has been broken down between the PCB wastes to be disposed and the two chemicals to be prevented (new POPs). This breakdown is estimated based on the baseline quantification completed and summarised in Table 9 of the project document. Over 3,000 tonnes of PCB and other POPs wastes were identified and will form the bulk of the reduction target. Since the project first steps under prevention will be to confirm the inventories of these new POPs from NIPs and other sources, a conservative estimate has been used of only 50% of the initially scoped quantities for prevention.

- Indicator 9.6: a prevention target of mercury-containing equipment is estimated and has been added to the total global target. The estimate of 300 metric tons is based on a conservative assessment of the estimated 600 metric tons of mercury containing equipment scoped during the PPG in the medical sector in the three countries where pilots will be implemented.

**7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** NA

**Response to Secretariat comments**

**8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** SH (24.4.19): Yes

**Response to Secretariat comments**

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

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** SH (24.4.19): Yes

**Response to Secretariat comments**

**10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** SH (24.4.19): Yes

**Response to Secretariat comments**

**Agency Responses**

**11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:**

## **GEFSEC**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** SH (24.4.19): Yes

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

## **STAP**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

SH (24.4.19): No. ANNEX B should contain the responses to project reviews (including responses to comments from Council and STAP at work program inclusion). Currently ANNEX B contains a figure which seems misplaced. As relevant, please include responses to comments from the GEF council and STAP and migrate the figure to its correct place.

Shansen (04.9.19): addressed

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

•Agency Response 29/07/2019

- Noted. The figure has been migrated to Annex A with the logframe, and Annex B is re-numbered as the responses to reviews table.
- A new table has been prepared and inserted in Annex B, with the detailed comments and responses, including the summarized comments of the STAP and GEF Council member comments. This table is common across all the Child Projects.

## **GEF Council**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

SH (24.4.19): No. ANNEX B should contain the responses to project reviews (including from Council and STAP at work program inclusion. Currently ANNEX B contains a figure which seems misplaced. As relevant, please include responses to comments from the GEF council and STAP and migrate the figure to its correct place.

Shansen (04.9.19): addressed

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

Agency Response 29/07/2019

- Noted. The figure has been migrated to Annex A with the logframe, and Annex B is re-numbered as the responses to reviews table.
- A new table has been prepared and inserted in Annex B, with the detailed comments and responses, including the summarized comments of the STAP and GEF Council member comments. This table is common across all the Child Projects.

### **Convention Secretariat**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

**Recommendation**

**12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

SH (24.04.19): Please address comments and resubmit.

Please include the countries that are participating in this project in Part I of the template.

Please clarify if mercury funds were used in the PPG.

Please note that all required information needs to be included within the CEO endorsement template and we cannot accept references to attached documents. Please revise the CEO endorsement to ensure compliance with this requirement and resubmit to enable a complete review.

AS (Sept 11, 2019) - All chemicals comments have been addressed.

SHansen (11.09.19): Please address the comment specific to project co-finance contribution and resubmit.

SHansen (8.10.19): Please provide a justification for the increased project management cost and resubmit.

Shansen (24.10.19): Please address the below points and resubmit the project:

- Upload to the GEF portal submission the complete table 15
- Upload the updated GEF-6 Request for Project Endorsement/Approval word document and
- Upload the consolidated PDF containing all relevant annexes

Shansen (17.11.19): With reference to the conversation between GEFSEC and UNEP, please attach a document in the portal titled PRODOC which is used internally for decision purposes at UNEP.

SHansen (25.11.19): Please address comments provided in review box 2 and resubmit.

Shansen (26.11.19): CEO Endorsement is recommended.

Please note that by inception the PRODOC should be updated with co-financing contributions from all countries in which national level activities are taking place. Please include in the PIR submissions all updated co-finance numbers, while making sure that all co-financing is duly reflected in the portal by project mid-term.

- 

## **Response to Secretariat comments**

•Agency Response 29/07/2019

- The participating countries field in the Portal is not editable by the Implementing Agency. The GEF IT is kindly requested to add the following countries in Part I of the Portal: Albania, Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Egypt, Lebanon, Montenegro, Morocco, Tunisia and Turkey.
- The PPG funds did include mercury funds. The request for PPG and the PPG approval letter include a 'Chemicals and Waste (POPs and Mercury)' contribution of USD 228,000 and an International Water contribution of USD 72,000. This is clarified in Annex D.
- Noted. All relevant information is now included in the CEO endorsement template, notably with the Core Indicators values and further detailed information included in the main document, not as an annex.

Agency Response 01/10/2019

Comments on project co-finance contribution addressed.

**Agency Response 11/10/2019**

The justification for the project management cost, and a new table clarifying the distribution of PMC and technical support costs between all child projects, has been inserted in the Institutional Arrangements section.

**Agency Response 25/10/2019**

Table 15 updated and two revised documents uploaded.

Agency Response 19/11/2019

Previously submitted CEO Form and separate Annexes have been combined and uploaded as '9684 (UNEP): Project Document 19.11.19.pdf'.

UNEP(26/11/2019)

Comments addressed

**Review Dates**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**Response to Secretariat comments**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**Response to Secretariat comments**

<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

**Background:** The continuing degradation of the Mediterranean coastal zone and marine environments, including by POPs and Mercury, coupled with the urgent growing impacts of climate variability, the loss of livelihoods and dramatic deterioration of social conditions along critical sections of the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean shores, prompted the development of the Mediterranean Sea Programme (GEF ID 9607). It is in this context that this project (one of several projects under the Mediterranean Sea Programme) will make a significant contribution in providing disposal options (for POPs) and long-term containments (for mercury), while raising the awareness on new POPs (in products) and mercury (in the healthcare sector) through targeted pilot activities to introduce alternatives.

The project comprises the following components:

**Component 1 outcome (Chemicals and Waste):** Reduction of wastes and hazardous chemicals (POPs and mercury) in coastal hotspots and catchment areas

**Component 2 outcome (International Waters):** Littoral countries enabled to identify trends and progress to impacts

**Component 3 outcome (Monitoring and Evaluation and information dissemination):** Project results and knowledge are effectively disseminated and used to adaptively manage the project

**Innovation, Sustainability and Scaling up:** From an innovation and sustainability angle, the POPs prevention pilots are highly innovative in that this is first time that new POPs are being addressed. This again has prompted the project to choose diverse approaches, spanning across legal mechanisms (import restrictions, water quality standards) and technical support (demonstration of alternatives, support to modifying production processes), using procurement as a lever for change. The budgeting for the demonstration of alternatives has been done in a two-phase approach, allowing the results of initial pilots to be demonstrated and the most successful approaches to be replicated in the region and other countries. The pioneering gender focus will bolster the fledgling attention paid to the crosscutting nature of socioeconomic and gender factors within the larger chemicals and waste arenas.

Similarly, component 2 innovative elements are linked to implementation of project activities that will go beyond prevailing assessment and monitoring practices to include foresight scenarios, improving the assessments of climate change impacts and vulnerabilities, promoting the value of ecosystem services and potential for blue economy development, upgrading knowledge on the impacts of pollution on marine biodiversity, gender equality conditions, refining and improving IMAP implementation and availability and usability of data at national and regional levels, and similar.

Replication and scaling up potential on the regional level is primarily identified through sharing of best practices with IMAP implementation/management and sharing of data. Sustainability of project interventions will be ensured through extensive work towards upgrading the assessment capacities across the region. Moreover, the strengthening of the science policy interface represents an opportunity to ensure that results of the existing (and forthcoming) scientific projects are integrated in policy making, thus contributing to sustainability.

**Global Environmental Benefits:** GEF IW GEBs are associated with the strengthening of the regional transboundary institutional arrangements and priority setting. The Chemicals & Waste activities are anticipated to result in the reduction of land-based pollutants in Mediterranean countries, through the disposal of over 2,000t of POPs and over 50t of Mercury waste.