



Sustainable Mercury Management in Non-ferrous Metal Industry

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10864

Countries

China

Project Name

Sustainable Mercury Management in Non-ferrous Metal Industry

Agencies

World Bank

Date received by PM

12/8/2022

Review completed by PM

11/27/2023

Program Manager

Anil Sookdeo

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

Project Type

PIF ☐
CEO ☐

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

2. Project Summary.

a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

3. Project Description Overview

a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?

b) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?

d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

4. Project Outline

A. Project 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 project design?
- b) Have 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 project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?
- c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

5 B. Project Description

- 5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?
- b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?
- c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project 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? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?
- e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?
- f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?
- g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?
- h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?
- i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?
- j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?
- k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

- a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?**
- b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?**
- c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

5.3 Core indicators

- a) 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)?**
- b) Are the project'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?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request The increase in the core indicators is welcomed.

Agency Response

5.4 Risks

- a) Are climate and other main risks relevant to the project identified and adequately described (e.g. including these related to work in fragile locations and/or countries)? Are mitigation measures outlined and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- b) Are the key risks that might affect implementation assessed and adequately rated?**
- c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

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

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

7.4 Have required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: 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):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Not provided.

Agency Response

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?? Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines? e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Please upload the missing co-financing letter.

Agency Response

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:

Has the 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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Provided

Agency Response

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Provided

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.8 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 5, 2023 - Please see comments that were not addressed.

June 16, 2023 - comments addressed. The project has passed its cancellation deadline. Please provide a detailed justification for proceeding and upload into the portal.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please address the following policy compliance related comments:

1. Knowledge Management: the agency needs to include a KM section as part of the CEO Endorsement document, providing a summary of the project's KM approach as well as the timeline and budget for planned KM deliverables, making a reference to Annex H where more details are provided. Also, this KM section should include a description of the project's communication strategy, including its timeline and budget.

2. Stakeholder engagement: It is well noted that the project has attached a stakeholder engagement plan. However, it is unclear from the submission what stakeholder consultations were carried out in project development. Please further clarify stakeholder consultations during project development.

3. Co-financing:

- Please provide the co-financing letter in English or the translation in English for those not in English.

- Please provide the official signed co-financing letters and not an unofficial draft letter without signature.

- Please provide missing co-financing letters.

4. Gender: The project document noted that "A gender analysis was conducted as part of the ESIA for the first pilot identified during project preparation." At this stage, a more detailed description of gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities is expected to be included in the project document, based on the gender analysis undertaken. A gender action plan would lay out gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results. Kindly provide more details on how gender inequalities identified will be addressed in relevant project components.

5. Project Description Summary includes one component namely "Project Management" (US\$ 100,000), which includes outputs (i.e., day-to-day management, technical support) that must be covered by PMC, not by the components. Please modify the name of the component, and remove such activities and associated costs. Instead, include and charge them under PMC (nearly 7.0 million dollars from co-financing allocated to PMC).

May 5, 2023 -

Co-financing: The agency has NOT addressed the comments in respect to the co-financing. In general, none of the co-financing support letters for this project meet the requirements included in the GEF co-financing policy/guidelines. Please note that while a letter has been provided indicating FECO will cover the bulk of the co-financing until the enterprises are identified the letter which is not on an official letterhead from FECO is also unsigned.

Please provide the co-financing official letter of support signed and with FECO's letterhead and change the name of co-financier to FECO until the enterprises are identified.

o Please provide the official signed co-financing FECO support letter for the 600,000 in-kind as the submitted letter is an unofficial draft letter without signature.

o Please provide the co-financing letter for the ecology and environment departments Shaanxi and Sichuan? it is not submitted. Otherwise, please remove it.

o Please remove the co-financing indicated as FECO investment mobilized as they are repetitive in the first line for 137,900,000.

o Please revise "recipient country government" to "Donor Agency" for FECO.

- Project description summary still has the component namely "Project Management" which includes outputs (i.e. day-to-day management, technical support) that must be covered by PMC, not by the components. Please modify the name of the component, and remove such

activities and associated costs ? instead, include and charge them under PMC (nearly 7.0 million dollars from co-financing allocated to PMC).

- Gender: The proponent has uploaded a document responding to the comment on gender. The Agency noted:

?Thanks for your comments. The gender analysis has been updated in related sections (Section 3.2.6, Section 4.3.4, Section 4.6, Section 5.1.2 and Section 5.2), especially at Section 5.1.2 with a more detailed gap analysis. In addition, a dedicated Gender Action Plan(GAP) was added in Section 5.2. Here below please see the GAP.?

Please reflect the above changes in the Portal as well, as part of our gender mainstreaming practice.

June 16 2023 -comments cleared

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	2/28/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/5/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/16/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		