

Review and Update of the National Implementation Plan for the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in Ethiopia, Malawi and Zambia

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10977

Countries

Regional (Ethiopia, Malawi, Zambia)

Project Name

Review and Update of the National Implementation Plan for the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in Ethiopia, Malawi and Zambia

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

4/12/2022

Review completed by PM

5/20/2022

Program Manager

Satoshi Yoshida

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.

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

May 20, 2022: Comment cleared.

May 19, 2022: On the executing entity, Africa Institute does not appear in the LOEs. Please delete or update LOEs. Also, please amend descriptions on the executing entity in C.2 Institutional Framework for Project Implementation.

April 14, 2022: On Part I, please address the below.

Please fill out the executing entity.

The completion date is the same as the submission date of NIPs while a terminal evaluation and KM activities are expected. Please address.

Agency Response

Name of the executing agency has been added on the portal. The dates have been modified.

May 20, 2022: The endorsement letters received from participating countries mentions that the project will be executed by Stockholm and Basel Convention Regional Centres. The executing agency for the project is Africa Institute, which is a Stockholm Convention Regional Centre, South Africa[1]¹. The institutional framework part has been amended wherein Africa Institute as an EA has been described. The updated SRIF has been attached.

[1]

<http://chm.pops.int/Implementation/RegionalCentres/TheCentres/AIMHWPretoria,SouthAfrica/tabid/805/Default.aspx>

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 There is no co-financing expected.

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

Please see the comment on the additionally requested resources.

Agency Response The justification is same as provided in the cost ranges 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

Agency Response

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 Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request This is related to the justifications for additional resources.

Agency Response The justification is same as provided in the cost ranges 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 Yes.

Agency Response

Goals, Objectives, and Activities.

Is the project framework sufficiently described?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes, this is sufficient for this EA project (cited GEF document C.39/inf.03 is not the latest one, which was issued in 2020).

Agency Response

The reference to recent GEF document has been modified at appropriate section.

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, to be finalized at the implementation.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

May 29, 2022: Additional comments from Gender Policy: please revise the section as in the below (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 30, 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

May 19, 2022: Comment cleared.

April 14, 2022: Please add narrative descriptions of the M&E plan (briefly). Budgeted M&E is not required for EA projects.

Agency Response

Following brief has been added to the document and portal.

The project will carry out periodic monitoring by IA and EA to ensure the timely implementation of project activities. Project manager will be responsible for day-to-day monitoring and a detailed work plan, budget and detailed monitoring and evaluation plan will be finalized during the inception phase in consultation with key stakeholders. The EA will submit quarterly financial and progress reports necessary reports to UNEP including challenges faced and remediation plan in place. Periodic calls between the EA and the IA will be agreed upon if the project is not progressing according to the work plan. The terminal report and final statement of accounts developed by the EA at the end of the project closes the EA monitoring activities for this project. The final financial audit will review the use of project funds against budget and assess probity of expenditure and transactions. An independent terminal review (TR) will take place at the end of project implementation, latest 6 months after completion of the project. More detailed information about project monitoring and evaluation can be consulted in the project Component 5 - monitoring and evaluation.

Cost Effectiveness.

Is the project cost effective?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request This is related to the justifications for additional resources.

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

Cost Ranges

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 19, 2022: We note the justifications.

April 14, 2022: Some justifications for higher costing are provided. However, please address the below.

The requested funding is \$313,000 per country, when compared with the maximum costing of \$250,000.

Geographical balance in this regional project may be relevant to the global project, not this regional project.

The main justifications are about the global project 10785 ("for additional funding request towards the global component in order to minimize decrease in funding at the national level"). Justifications necessary for this project are about the increased cost for the NIP update (i.e. Component 3). As such, please revise and provide relevant justifications for increased cost of NIP update.

Some justifications are irrelevant to the project objective, which is updating NIP, including "Opportunity to provide travel support to COP meetings either to extend the stay of focal points or an extra participant" and "Recruitment of designated knowledge sharing platform (e.g. GGKP) to ensure information generated from the project is managed and disseminated properly."

Agency Response This project is considered to be an extension of the global NIP project (GEF ID 10785) and therefore is a global project, correction on portal has been done. The project budget was designed to align with the recently approved global NIP project including country allocation of USD 294,000 + 12,300 per country PMC. In addition, USD 5000 per country was added for the expert review of NIPs and is incorporated in Component 2. The cost deviation can be justified due to following

reasons a) enhanced coordination requirements due to linkages with global project, coordination among countries for uniformity in execution; b) candidate POPs will be covered in addition to the listed chemicals; c) global tools to be used for effective reporting, the project will also be using the toolkit developed under the 9884 BRS toolkit project for NIP submission and reporting; d) contribute to the establishment of regional data hub under the global NIP project; e) organize meetings and consultations along the side-lines of COPs or immediately before/after COPs thus paying for extra days to maximise resource utilization; f) online management of inventories of the POPs to support countries in accessing the accurate data. More information on cost deviation has been provided in **Section F (deviation from typical cost range)** of the project proposal.

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

May 29, 2022: The previous comments cleared. Please address the additional comment on gender. Also, please change the category of the project from "Global" to "Regional" on the portal.

May 19, 2022: Please address the comments on executing entity. Also please replace ESS document with the correct one as the current one is for another project.

April 14, 2022: Please address the comments above.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review

4/14/2022

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 5/19/2022 |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | |

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations