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

GEF ID:	**9046**		
Country/Region:	**China**		
Project Title:	**Reduction and Phase-out of PFOS in Priority Sectors in China**		
GEF Agency:	**World Bank**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**152959 (World Bank)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Chemicals and Waste**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**CW-2 Program 3;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$300,000**	Project Grant:	**$24,250,000**
Co-financing:	**$145,300,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$169,850,000**
PIF Approval:	**April 28, 2015**	Council Approval/Expected:	**June 01, 2015**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Ibrahima Sow**	Agency Contact Person:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
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. China has initiated an update of its National Implementation Plan (NIP) to cover new POPs, including PFOS
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	The draft concept note indicates that PFOS is the greatest challenge the new POPs are posing to China and provides some data on the production and major uses of PFOS. The document mentions a 2012 survey as the source of this information. However, no reference is made to the NIP update which is supposed to provide official information concerning the production and use of POPs as well as measures envisaged by the country to address them. It would be difficult for the GEF to pass a

[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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		judgment on the importance of PFOS and other new POPs in China without seeing an updated NIP. Could you please explain why China has not updated its NIP after the amendment of the Convention in accordance with the provisions of article 7 of the Stockholm Convention? - Following the amendments of the Stockholm Convention to list new additional chemicals as persistent organic pollutants, parties have to review and update their national implementation plan and transmit the NIPs two years following the entry into force of the amendments to the COP (August 2012). The updated NIP should provide a framework for a country to develop and implement, in a systematic and participatory way, priority policy and regulatory reforms, capacity building, and investment programs - Project component 1 will target PFOSF producers as well as downstream producers of PFOS related chemicals and applications. Proposed actions include technology transfer and research and development on non-PFOS alternatives. Please elaborate on TT opportunities related to PFOS and initiatives already undertaken in that regard and on the current status of the development of alternatives in the country. 19 MArch 2015 Comment addressed
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Please provide a comprehensive description and rationale of the project activities that will be supported by GEF. Also provide an indicative financing (GEF/Private industry, Government) breakdown. 19 March 2015 Comment addressed
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes.
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• The STAR allocation?	NA
	• The focal area allocation?	Yes
	• 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?	Yes.
Review Date	Review	March 16, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
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?	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	Yes.
	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. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* 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 PIF[3] stage from:	
	• GEFSEC	
	• STAP	
	• GEF Council	
	• Convention Secretariat	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	
Review Date	Review	

[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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
	Additional Review (as necessary)	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	