



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

GEF ID:	9080		
Country/Region:	Regional (Ethiopia, Gabon, Kenya, Madagascar, Mali, Senegal, Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe)		
Project Title:	Integrated Health and Environment Observatories and Legal and Institutional Strengthening for the Sound Management of Chemicals in Africa (African ChemObs)		
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:	\$10,500,000
Co-financing:	\$20,352,000	Total Project Cost:	\$31,052,000
PIF Approval:	April 28, 2015	Council Approval/Expected:	June 04, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ibrahima Sow	Agency Contact Person:	Kevin Helps

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	CW1, Programs 1 and 2 are relevant to this project and should be reflected in table A. 26 March, 2015 Comment cleared	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes. African Health and Environment Ministers have adopted the Libreville Declaration on Health and Environment in Africa. In 2010, they adopted the Luanda Commitment in	

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)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>which they committed to accelerate the implementation of the Libreville Declaration and identified chemicals management as one of the continental health and environment priorities to be addressed for the years to come.</p>	
<p>Project Design</p>	<p>3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>No. The integrated Health and Environment observatories should be established in existing institutions, adequately evaluated and well positioned to implement the mandates of ChemOBs as defined in the project document; Furthermore, the role of BCRCs as presented in the project is very vague. We expect the project to strengthen the capacities of these centers so they can support participating countries in their efforts to implement the BRS Conventions. To justify the amount requested from GEF, component 3 should be more elaborated to include tangible activities, such as clean-up operations or relevant pilot activities based on countries priorities identified in the action plans. Accordingly the section on global environment benefits would need to be reworked.</p> <p>26 March 2015</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Comments cleared	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?		
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	See comments in question 3. Elaboration of component 3 requested.	
	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	NA	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	Not at this time. Please address comments above 26 March 2015 Comments addressed. The PIF is recommended for WP inclusion.	
Review Date	Review	February 23, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 26, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<p>Project Design and Financing</p>	<p>1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?</p>	<p>The PIF indicated that the Stockholm and Basel regional centers will be used as key partners, in particular to support components 1 and 2 of the projects.</p> <p>It's quite surprising that at CEO endorsement, only the Africa Institute is identified as key partner for the implementation of the project while there is no justification for not involving other Stockholm and Basel regional Centers in the implementation of the project as planned in the PIF. Please explain why, in particular the Basel Convention Coordinating Center in Nigeria and the Basel and Stockholm Regional center for French speaking countries in Africa have been removed from the project.</p> <p>2 March 2017 The option to involve the Nigeria and Senegal Basel/Stockholm Regional Centers remains and will be assessed on a case-by-case basis. Comment cleared.</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	<p>2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>The design follows very closely past work on mainstreaming and health and environment linkages work. The project is highly dependent on international consultants to do the majority of work and a small network of national consultants. There is however no articulation of how the national capacity in the countries will be built as a result of these interventions. The reliance on consultants without a clear mechanism to have the institutional capacity of the countries developed requires a significant re-think and revision of the project design in order to ensure that the capacity of institutions are built and can be sustained after the project ends. Why are more local/regional universities not involved? Without knowing how the university of Cape Town relates to provision of training for a broader country participation, why are universities in the project countries not involved? In the UNEP implemented global monitoring plan for example the University of Nairobi has developed significant capacity in measuring and monitoring both POPs in both human and environmental samples. Is such capacity being leveraged? If not why?</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>The project is heavily focused on identifying needs and defining them with very confusing activities such as reporting on gender balance of stakeholders. The lack of articulation of what these activities leads to is worrying. Furthermore the design does not demonstrate a step ahead of what has been previously done on a smaller scale.</p> <p>On the monitoring of changes in exposure to chemicals and waste, how exactly will this be done? Are sample populations going to be monitored from birth? What would be the indicators to be monitored? Such an undertaking seems very far away from the mandate of the GEF. Does the Global Monitoring plan not do exactly the same? How is this different? Does the project propose to do parallel monitoring of health indicators to the GMP and if so why and if not, what are the key differences?</p> <p>On the activities related to reporting by the BRS, we are aware that UNEP and the BRS secretariat are developing specific projects on this topic with a view of creating online platforms with the relevant training to facilitate reporting the improvement</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>of the NIP updating process. Has there been a discussion of the clear overlaps this presents?</p> <p>On Output 3.2 it would be useful to understand what is envisioned by providing communities about local level public health risks of chemical exposure. What is the expected outcome in the local community and how does the project provide or point a way forward on taking action to prevent these risks. This is a key element that is missing from the design.</p> <p>The country reports present some discrepancies. Few reports are detailed (example Ethiopia) while others are very basic and missing key information to inform the implementation phase. For example in Mali, there are a lot of data and initiatives from the GEF/PASP/Mali (pesticide registry, contaminated sites, legislation, regulations, etc...) that are not reflected in the country brief. Furthermore, we were expecting to see clear proposals on Institutions dedicated to host the Chemicals Observatories in all participating countries as a result of</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>the assessment undertaken during PPG. Please explain how the PPG has been used and why host Institutions for the observatories could not be clearly identified during that PPG phase.</p> <p>Sustainability of Observatories: Please elaborate more on how countries are taking ownership on the established observatories: mainstreaming the observatories in the Ministries of health or Environment, budget planning, potential donors supporting these units, operational aspects, role of civil society (private sector, NGOs, Academia, etc.)</p> <p>How does the proposal articulate sustainability of results. For example, reporting to the conventions is an obligation by Parties, however in spite of being an obligation this does not happen in the majority of countries. What is tis project proposing to do in strengthening this capacity and specifically how will the institutions be strengthened to be able to sustain this work beyond the life of the project.</p> <p>On the proposed observatories it is unclear how these will continue</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>without GEF support. What success has UNEP had in the past work on mainstreaming the sound management of chemicals and waste into national development plans in keeping these initiatives alive after project funds have been exhausted? Are there examples that can be shared where a government, municipality or local government specifically included resources in it's national budgets for SMC? If not, what design elements have been included and elaborated in this project that would result in a different outcome?</p> <p>Outputs 1.1 should have been the basis of the project and should have been elaborated during the PPG. Please explain why this was not done and what will be the impact on the implementation timescale given that this key piece of work is yet to be done.</p> <p>The disposal of 1300 or so tons of POPS is welcomed however it is oddly placed in this projects since the project itself has no relation to these chemicals. A better link between the two would be useful.</p> <p>Overall the project design provides</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>information but does not seek to develop the mechanisms and influencing models to take action on this information. There also appears to be a repeat of work already done by UNEP on the cost of inaction for example. That work should form the basis of more realistic activities in terms of the influencing model that would be useful for changing the behaviors of not only the public at large but also of Governments and the private sector. The most concerning aspect of the project is the execution model that relies on deploying an army of international consultants without a clear pathway for involving key regional and national institutions nor CSOs and NGOs who would have a great reach into communities. The model of deploying consultants have not proven to be effective in developing and strengthening capacity. A re-think of this approach is necessary to go forward.</p> <p>Please update the table on page 20 (Summary of subregional projects): Under MIA and NAP, country projects marked as pipeline should be corrected as all these projects have been already funded by the GEF.</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		2 march 2017 Comments cleared	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	See comment under section 2	These seem not to have been taken up during the project preparation. Please respond to the Council Comments. 2 march 2017 Comment cleared
	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)	Major risks described	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	All co-financing confirmed.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	Yes	
	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?	Yes.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	Yes	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge	Yes.	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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?	<p>Not at this time. Please address comments on the regional centers, process related to the identification and sustainability of observatories.</p> <p>2 March 2017 All comments adequately addressed. PM recommends CEO clearance of the project.</p>	
Review Date	Review	December 20, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 02, 2017	
	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.