GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

Review and Update of the National Implementation Plan for Niue and Vanuatu under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10512

Countries

Regional (Niue, Vanuatu)

Project Name

Review and Update of the National Implementation Plan for Niue and Vanuatu under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

3/18/2020

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Yuki Shiga

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 for 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 Yes.

Agency Response

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 No co-financing is required for this EA.

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

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes. It is within the recommended budget of $250k.

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.

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 Both countries have developed their initial NIP. Both initial NIPs are sufficiently cited in the proposal.

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 Yes.

Agency Response

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 Yes.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation.

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes.

Agency Response

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

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response
STAP Comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO Endorsement/approval recommended?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes. This PIF is recommended for technical clearance pending inputs from PPO.

Review Dates

	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