

Review and Update of National Implementation Plans (NIPs) under the Stockholm Convention (SC) on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) for India

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10978

Countries

India

Project Name

Review and Update of National Implementation Plans (NIPs) under the
Stockholm Convention (SC) on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) for India

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

4/12/2022

Review completed by PM

5/19/2022

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 CEO Endorsement Request

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 CEO Endorsement Request

5.18.2022:

Cleared.

04.19.2022:

Please clarify if this project is linked with the global project (10785) at a component level including on knowledge management, and if so, how and to what extend.

Agency Response This project does not have direct link with global NIP project 10785. However, the project will benefit from the learnings from global components in terms of attending webinars, trainings as needed.

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 CEO Endorsement Request 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 CEO Endorsement Request

04.19.2022:

Please see the comment in 'Deviation' section.

Agency Response

The justification is same as provided in the cost deviation section.

Are they within the resources available from:

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

04.19.2022:

Please see the comment in 'Deviation' section.

Agency Response The justification is same as provided in the cost deviation section.
The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Is the financing presented adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

04.19.2022:

Please see the comment in 'Deviation' section.

Agency Response The justification is same as provided in the cost deviation section.
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 CEO Endorsement Request Earlier NIP(s) developed by the country are sufficiently cited in the proposal.

Agency Response
Goals, Objectives, and Activities.
Is the project framework sufficiently described?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 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 CEO Endorsement Request 5.18.2022:

Cleared.

04.19.2022:

This EA does not seem to include any information about the project's overall ESS risk, while Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF) is not attached. Please provide ESS screening information of the project. If the project is exception of ESS policy in UNEP procedure, please provide information about the exception.

Agency Response

The signed SRIF is attached separately as project supporting document.

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

2022.6.2:

Cleared.

2022.5.30:

While gender balance is a way to improve women's participation and voice, it is equally important to ensure that there is gender expertise (to complement gender balance), especially in activities related to developing NIPs, capacity-building activities and related mechanisms, communication plans, developing knowledge products and tool, etc., to ensure that all these are gender-responsive/gender-sensitive. Agency is requested to reflect this in the revised document. Suggestion is as follows (in red).

B.3 Gender Dimensions

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.

Agency Response

May 31, 2022: Thank you for the recommendations. The suggested changes have been made in the project document and portal.

Monitoring and Evaluation.

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Cost Effectiveness.

Is the project cost effective?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

04.19.2022:

Please see the comment in 'Deviation' section.

Agency Response The justification is same as provided in the cost deviation section.

Cost Ranges

If there was a deviation in the cost range, was this explained?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5.18.2022:

Cleared.

04.19.2022:

Justification is provided; however, deviation against the recommended budget

(\$250,000) is not clear. Please deepen the explanation and provide rationale for the \$0.75 million deviation i.e., \$1 million (requested cost) - \$0.25 million = \$0.75 million.

Agency Response

In addition to the justification already provided in the section, following justification has been added.

India is 7th largest country by size in the world and is second most populous country only after China. The country has 28 states and 8 union territories. It is one of the BRICS countries (including Brazil, China, Russia and South Africa) and it is anticipated that the industrial, manufacturing and product sectors would have a large share of several old and new POPs. Further, the chemicals industry in India is highly diversified, covering more than 80,000 commercial products and making the process of the development of an inventory very complex. India is the 6th largest producer of chemicals in the world and the 3rd largest in Asia. India ranks 14th position in the export of chemicals, is 4th largest producer of agrochemicals in the world and manufactures more than 50% technical grade pesticides. In addition to large chemical industries, India also relies on thousands of micro-small and medium enterprises (MSMEs) which are quite diversified and have a huge impact on the country's socio-economic growth.

The initial NIP was completed in 2011 and the update NIPs will cover a huge time gap, while no inventory update activities have taken place in the country. India is also one of the manufacturers of candidate POPs such as Chlorpyrifos, and several pesticides listed/under consideration by the Stockholm Convention and the Rotterdam Convention. There is a need for a holistic approach and coordinated efforts to address the issue of POPs along with the larger chemical management portfolio. The NIP update will provide an opportunity to bring together stakeholders from various levels, such as relevant ministries and departments, centers and state pollution control boards, industries including MSMEs, industry associations, research and academia, and CSOs etc. The expertise and capacity for analysis of new POPs is lacking in the country, creating another barrier for the development of a POPs inventory. This would require more coordination with various stakeholders and work during the execution. India has received a similar amount of funding for its initial NIP and Minamata Initial Assessment, while the proposed NIP will cover more chemicals as it includes old as well as new POPs.

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 CEO Endorsement Request 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 CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO Endorsement/approval recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 6.2.2022:

This EA is recommended for technical clearance.

5.30.2022 /04.19.2022:

Not yet. Please refer to the review items and resubmit for consideration (please highlight the changes).

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	4/19/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/18/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/30/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/2/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations