



# Global replication to eliminate hazardous chemicals from supply chains

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11177

**Countries**

Global

**Project Name**

Global replication to eliminate hazardous chemicals from supply chains

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

4/4/2024

**Review completed by PM**

4/9/2024

**Program Manager**

Anil Sookdeo

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

## 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

Yes

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?**

**c) [If a child project under a program] Does the project summary include adequate and substantive link with the parent program goal and approach?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

**3. Project Description Overview**

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

**b) [If a child project under a program] Is there a project Theory of Change that is aligned and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?**

**c) 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?**

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

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

**f) 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 RequestYes

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 RequestYes

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) [If a child project under a program] Is the Theory of change aligned with and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?**
- c) 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? [If a child project under a program] Does the description include how the alternative aligns with and contributes to the overall program goal and approach?**
- d) 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?**
- e) 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?**
- f) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?**
- g) 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?**
- h) 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)?**
- i) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?**
- j) 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?

**k) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?**

**l) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?**

**m) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? [If a child project under an integrated program] Are the specific levers of transformation identified and described? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

On Gender: As per GEF guidance, please ensure that the gender-specific outcomes and activities developed in the GAP are included in the project description and project components. In addition, please include a budget for the GAP. Under M&E, please ensure that gender-related results, and the GAP, are monitored and reported on.

May 8, 2024 - comment cleared

Agency Response

Agency Response ? 7 May 2024

?

Enhanced the language in the child project description to capture GAP points, in particular in outputs 1.1, 2.1, 2.2 and in the M&E section's output 3.1. Gender budget has been added to the GAP appendix 5a.

**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.).**

**d) [If a child project under an integrated program] Does the framework for coordination and collaboration demonstrate consistency with overall ambition of the program for transformative change?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
The global coordination project can be self executed. In this case a separate unit of UNEP will be executing the coordination project. The institutional arrangements are well defined.

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)? [If a child project under a program] Is the choice of core indicators consistent with those prioritized under the parent program?

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

As the coordination project of the Eliminating Hazardous Chemicals from Supply Chains core indicator are not required, however core indicator 9 has been identified by the project for a reduction of mercury. Please clarify this deviation from the agreed structure of the coordinating project and provide a clear justification for this.

May 8, 2024 - the core indicator value still appears in the portal.

#### Agency Response

Agency Response ? 7 May 2024

Noted. The indicator was erroneously entered, we confirm core indicator 9 is not required for the global coordination project. This is in line with the project result framework. The indicator has been removed in the Core Indicators table.

### 5.4 Risks

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

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

In the Key Risk section: Please consider moving the Moderate rating under the ?Environmental and Social? risk category to Low, in line with the ESS risk category which is already marked as Low. Doing so would be in line with the description of the ?Environmental and Social? risk category in Annex B of the GEF Risk Appetite document (GEF/C.66/13) stating that: ?The rating reported by project under this category is identical to the Overall Safeguards Risk rating provided at PIF, CEO Endorsement, MTR and TE stage.?

May 8, 2024 - comment cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response ? 7 May 2024

Thank you for the reminder on the Risk Appetite document. The discrepancy is noted and the rating for the Environment and Social risks has been changed to low in line with the SRIF.

**5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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?**

**b) [If a child project under an integrated program] Is the project adequately aligned with the program objective in the GEF-8 programming directions?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestThe project is aligned with the IP on Eliminating Hazardous Chemicals from Supply Chains.

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 RequestYes

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 RequestYes

Agency Response

**7 D. Policy Requirements**

**7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

**7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

**7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

**7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

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 RequestYes

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 RequestYes

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 RequestYes

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

Co-Financing letters for Fashion Pact for amount of \$5,890,000 is missing, please upload or remove. The overall level of co-financing is very low and needs to be improved substantially.

May 8, 2024 - comment cleared.

Agency Response

**Agency Response ? 7 May 2024**

The Fashion Pact letter has been added and additional letters have since been secured bringing the total cofinance to within the level approved in the PFD Concept stage. Various contacts



have been made with a number of additional partners and it is expected that their involvement will result in further mobilised co-financing during execution

**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 RequestN/A

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?**

**e)[If a regional/global coordination child project under an integrated program] Does the results framework reflect the program-wide result framework, inclusive of results from child projects and specific to the regional/global coordination child project? [If a country child project under an integrated program] Is the child project result framework inclusive of program-wide metrics monitored across child project by the Regional/Global Child project?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

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 This is a coordination project for an IP so no project maps are required.

#### Agency Response

##### **Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating**

**8.8 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?**

#### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

On Environmental and Social Safeguards: On ESS, it is noted that the project's overall ESS risk category in the ESS screening report is classified as low. In the portal risk table, the environmental and social risks are classified as moderate. Please ensure that these risks ratings are consistent and revise if needed.

May 8, 2024 - Comment cleared

#### Agency Response

Agency Response ? 7 May 2024

As per earlier response, the ESS classification has been changed in the portal to align with the UNEP Environmental and Social Safeguards rating (SRIF).

##### **Annex G: GEF Budget template**

**8.9 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

Please upload a budget that is readable, as an annex or a table that we can review each time line. Once the budget is provided it will be reviewed.

May 8, 2024 -

1. Please clarify what is being funded under the following two budget lines and how are they relevant to the objectives of the program:

a) UNDP guidance material development

b) UNIDO technical support

2. Please clarify why two separate consultancies are being proposed for a communications specialist and a social media and outreach as the same consultant can do both, similarly for a knowledge materials consultant and a knowledge management specialist.

3. Please provide a ToR for the expected consultancies for this project.

### Agency Response

Agency Response ? 7 May 2024

The budget has been uploaded in the field for Annex G as a table. We hope it is now legible. We have also uploaded the excel as an attachment in the same Annex G field, as it contains more detailed worksheets and annotations.

#### Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

**8.10 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 RequestPlease respond to the review.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

##### 9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>First Review</b>	4/9/2024	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	5/8/2024	

**CEO  
Approval**

**Response to Secretariat  
comments**

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