



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9771		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Global Best Practices on Emerging Chemical Policy Issues of Concern under the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM)		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Chemicals and Waste
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CW-1 Program 1; CW-2 Program 3; CW-2 Program 6;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$8,190,000
Co-financing:	\$20,580,000	Total Project Cost:	\$28,970,000
PIF Approval:	April 28, 2017	Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 2017
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Anil Sookdeo	Agency Contact Person:	Eloise Touni

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	Yes	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,	Yes	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	market transformation, scaling, and innovation?		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	For the most part. The components on e-waste management are poorly articulated and will not be able to adequately address the issues it is proposing to. This component should be dropped from the project. March 23, 2017 - the component has revised appropriately - comment cleared	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Same as 4 above	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes	
	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? • The focal area allocation? • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? • Focal area set-aside? 	Yes	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	Please drop the component on e-waste and resubmit a revised proposal.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>March 23, 2017 (AS) - The project is technically cleared and can be included in a future work program.</p> <p>April 18, 2017 (AS) - While the project was technically cleared, the projected shortfall required a reduction in the GEF amount. The agency has resubmitted the proposal which is technically cleared.</p>	
Review Date	Review	March 16, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 23, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 18, 2017	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.