



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

GEF ID:	9562		
Country/Region:	Maldives		
Project Title:	Eliminating POPs through sound management of chemicals		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5918 (UNDP)
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:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$3,675,000
Co-financing:	\$19,899,771	Total Project Cost:	\$23,574,771
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Anil Sookdeo	Agency Contact Person:	Jacques Van Engel

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, market transformation, scaling, and	Please clarify the following: 1. Other than UPOPs and PCB, the proposal refers to hazardous	

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
	<p>innovation?</p>	<p>chemicals and hazardous waste. Please elaborate on what these are and what is the relevance to the GEB's for this project and how much of the GEF resources will be channeled to it.</p> <p>2. What consultations have been made with the World Bank and what would be the expected impacts on the investments on waste management that is being made by the World Bank.</p> <p>3. Please clarify if the identified PCBs are the only expected PCB contamination in the Maldives.</p> <p>4. Please clarify the import export of chemicals, are POPs chemicals being imported into the Maldives, if so please provide a list and the quantities.</p> <p>5. Please clarify if a hazardous waste disposal facility is envisioned in this project or as a result of this project and if so what chemicals would the facility be disposing?</p> <p>Feb 2017 - The agency and the country have satisfactorily addressed the comments and have made the required changes to the document. - Comments cleared.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>It is unclear how the World Bank and other loans on waste management are being leveraged by this project. To what extent has there been a discussion/consultation with the Bank and others on how this project will influence for example technology choices for disposing of waste.</p> <p>Feb 2017 - The agency has conducted detailed discussions with the World Bank and the loans to develop a municipal waste system will be leveraged and will work with this project to bring out sound management of POPS producing/containing waste. Comment cleared.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>Please clarify the questions above.</p> <p>February 2017 - Comment cleared.</p>	
	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?		
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? • Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>Not at this time. Please provide a response to the review.</p> <p>Please note the following errors in the PIF:</p> <p>ERROR in PIF - FASF and Project Objective Cofin Amounts by Trust Funds Differ.</p> <p>ERROR in PIF - The sum of the cofinance as given per source differs from PF's total cofinance</p> <p>ERROR in PPG - Finance Breakdown for this PPG required but missing</p> <p>Feb 2017 - Comments have all been addressed satisfactorily, the project is recommended for technical clearance and can be included in a future work program.</p>	
Review Date	Review	August 03, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 20, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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?		
	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?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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		
	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.