

Reduction of industrial persistent organic pollutant chemicals in manufacturing and recycling sectors through life-cycle approaches in Georgia

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11005

Countries

Georgia

Project Name

Reduction of industrial persistent organic pollutant chemicals in manufacturing and recycling sectors through life-cycle approaches in Georgia

Agencies

UNIDO

Date received by PM

4/13/2022

Review completed by PM

6/14/2022

Program Manager

Evelyn Swain

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, the structure and project design is appropriate.

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 NA

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

One co-financing letter is missing for REC Caucasus Equity.

ES, 5/26/22: Comment cleared

Agency Response Co-financing letter from RECC has been provided with the submission. Upon request, we have now uploaded it to both entries (in-kind and equity).

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 NA

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

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 No PPG is requested.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

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

Is it possible to calculate the tons of POPs containing material in indicator 9.6?

ES, 5/26/22: 9.6 has been updated. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

The Project would target the reduction of 1,290 tonnes of HBCDD-containing material, 500 tonnes of SCCP-containing material, and 5 tonnes of PBDE-containing material. These targets are reflected in indicator 9.6 and complementary data has been added in the explanation section of Core indicators.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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 problems and causes are well elaborated.

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, the baseline is clear.

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, the alternative scenario and the expected outcomes are clear.

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, the project is aligned with the CW strategy.

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, incremental reasoning is clear.

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, the GEBs are clear.

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, innovation, sustainability and scale-up are elaborated.

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 Yes.

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 NA

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, stakeholders are provided.

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, a gender analysis is provided.

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, private sector is a key partner.

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, risks, including COVID and climate risks are addressed.

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, the implementation arrangements are clear. The project will be executed by the Regional Environmental Center (REC) for the Caucasus.

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 Yes, the project is in line with national priorities, including the Stockholm Convention NIP.

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.

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

Agency Response

Response to PPO comment June 15, 2022

ES, 6/15/22: PPO has the additional comments:

Project to be returned to the Agency because while the two comments provided on June 2 were addressed, we have now seen a new issue under the budget table: Office supply, banking costs, Office rent, and other services are charged to components but not to PMC. Please note that in the previous

version of the budget table, 46% of these costs were charged to PMC and M&E, the rest to components. These costs are "by definition" linked with execution, reason why they need to charge those operating costs all to PMC (GEF portion and co-financing portion), not to the project's components. Please ask the Agency to amend.

Office supply, banking costs, office rent, and other services are now charged to PMC only. Please see amended summary budget introduced in the CEO Document and uploaded as an annex in excel format (roadmap, documents section).

Response to PPO comments June 13, 2022

1. On Monitoring & Evaluation:

a. Audits have been wrongly added to the M&E budget table. If we look at the project budget table it was charged to the PMC. Please request the agency to correct in the M&E budget table.

Audits removed from the revised M&E table.

b. The budget for M&E is \$160,000, which represent 8% of the overall project budget (\$2,000,000). As per guidelines, we have observed that M&E budget should be around 5% for projects up to 5million. Please request the agency to revise and if the level is maintained please provide a brief explanation.

The M&E budget has been reduced to US\$ 100,000. The reduction is reflected the revised M&E table, Table B and Annex E.

2. On gender (comment provided by Verona): To reflect gender expertise as already indicated in the project description and project components, Agency is requested to also reflect gender expertise (see suggested revisions in red) under Section 3 on Gender Equality, para. 130 of the document:

Project Planning and Activities

? Seek gender parity while setting project management unit;

? Ensure a gender-balanced leadership and decision making, as well as gender expertise, in project planning and implementation, this includes technical teams in various government bodies tasked with developing and implementing the NIP;

? Align project activities with national and regional gender protocols which can be used as benchmarks;

? Build capacity on gender issues among partners and beneficiaries;

? Develop and integrate mechanisms to ensure gender expertise, gender-balanced representation and women's participation in project activities; and

? Capture the voices of women and men, and gender experts, and develop gender-sensitive communication plans.

Paragraph 130 revised as suggested.

3. On the budget:

a. the budget table provided in Annex E is not possible to read. We would suggest the agency to remove the bulk of the text (for the expected outcomes and outputs) and just leave the numbers (i.e. 1.1; 2.3, 3.3 etc) since all the text has already been provided in the Project Description summary in table B.

Done. A summary of the budget table introduced in textbox for Annex E. A more detailed version of the budget is uploaded in the Roadmap, Documents section of the project.

b. Mid-term evaluation, terminal evaluation and inception workshops should be entirely charged to the M&E budget and not across the components. Please request the agency to amend.

Budget revised accordingly.

c. Project director, project coordinator, project admin assistant, financial officer and admin procurement should be charged to the PMC. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC.

Budget revised accordingly.

Council comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

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 Yes.

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

NA

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 NA

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 NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

1. RECOMMENDATION.

Is CEO endorsement/approval recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Not at this time. Some issues remain.

ES, 5/26/22: CEO Endorsement is recommended.

ES, 6/6/22: PPO has the following comments:

1. On Monitoring & Evaluation:

a. Audits have been wrongly added to the M&E budget table. If we look at the project budget table it was charged to the PMC. Please request the agency to correct in the M&E budget table.

b. The budget for M&E is \$160,000, which represent 8% of the overall project budget (\$2,000,000). As per guidelines, we have observed that M&E budget should be around 5% for projects up to 5million. Please request the agency to revise and if the level is maintained please provide a brief explanation.

2. On gender (comment provided by Verona): To reflect gender expertise as already indicated in the project description and project components, Agency is requested to also reflect gender expertise (see suggested revisions in red)

under Section 3 on Gender Equality, para. 130 of the document:

Project Planning and Activities

- ? Seek gender parity while setting project management unit;
- ? Ensure a gender-balanced leadership and decision making, as well as gender expertise, in project planning and implementation, this includes technical teams in various government bodies tasked with developing and implementing the NIP;
- ? Align project activities with national and regional gender protocols which can be used as benchmarks;
- ? Build capacity on gender issues among partners and beneficiaries;
- ? Develop and integrate mechanisms to ensure gender expertise, gender-balanced representation and women's participation in project activities; and
- ? Capture the voices of women and men, and gender experts, and develop gender-sensitive communication plans.

3. On the budget:

- a. the budget table provided in Annex E is not possible to read. We would suggest the agency to remove the bulk of the text (for the expected outcomes and outputs) and just leave the numbers (i.e. 1.1; 2.3, 3.3 etc) since all the text has already been provided in the Project Description summary in table B.
- b. Mid-term evaluation, terminal evaluation and inception workshops should be entirely charged to the M&E budget and not across the components. Please request the agency to amend.
- c. Project director, project coordinator, project admin assistant, financial officer and admin procurement should be charged to the PMC. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC.

ES, 6/15/22: PPO has the additional comments:

Project to be returned to the Agency because while the two comments provided on June 2 were addressed, we have now seen a new issue under the budget table: Office supply, banking costs, Office rent, and other services are charged to components but not to PMC. Please note that in the previous version of the budget table, 46% of these costs were charged to PMC and M&E, the rest to components. These costs are "by definition" linked with execution, reason why they need to charge those operating costs all to PMC (GEF portion and co-financing portion), not to the project's components. Please ask the Agency to amend.

ES, 6/16/22: PPO comments have been addressed. CEO Endorsement is recommended.

Review Dates

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	5/2/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/26/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/6/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/15/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/16/2022	

CEO Recommendation**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

This aims to protect human health and the environment through a lifecycle approach aimed at reducing import, use and build-up of industrial persistent organic pollutants (POPs) in manufacturing and recycling sectors. The project will strengthen policies by integrating a life-cycle approach into the existing legislative framework to comply with the Stockholm Convention (SC) requirements on new POPs and implement national circular economy tools in selected manufacturing and recycling sectors. Life-cycle approaches and best available techniques and best environmental practices (BAT/BEP) for the reduction of POPs in the sector will be implemented. The project will have global environmental benefits, including addressing 50 tons of POPs (HBBOD), addressing 1,795 tons of POPs containing materials, and will achieved climate co-benefits of 8,100 tons CO₂e.