

## ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS

**STAP Review:** In its review dated 4 May 2015, the STAP noted that the project has the potential to be the springboard for detailed technical reporting and knowledge capture for those countries involved.

This comment has been taken into account during the detailed design phase, in order to ensure that the design facilitates effective implementation, which leads to the aforementioned outcomes.

**Response to GEF Council members:** In its review dated June 2015, Germany and Canada provided comments on the project. These are addressed below.

**Comments from Germany:** *Suggestion for improvements to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal: Component 1: The regional centres of Basel /Stockholm Conventions are mentioned as leading institutions for the development of health and environment observatory in each country involved in the mentioned project. From our experience, the regional centres of BRS Conventions need assistance and support to actively operate in the given regions. Hence, the executing partners should ensure that the regional centres have the necessary capacities to carry out the planned development of health and environment observatory.*

**UNEP Response:** This is consistent with UNEP's findings during the PPG. Capacity of the three BCRCs in Africa was assessed, and it was concluded that the Africa Institute has the capacity to execute project activities in Anglophone countries. Activities in Francophone countries will be executed by WHO Africa, as BCRC Senegal, and BCRC Nigeria, were not found to have adequate capacity.

**Comments from Canada:** *Canada supports this project, which provides regional benefits for nine African states and could strengthen the capacity of the regional relevant Basel/Stockholm Regional Centre. We note and welcome that all nine African states have submitted their Stockholm Convention National Implementation Plans, showing their commitment to the Convention.*

- *We welcome that project components include: strengthening capacity of selected existing relevant national government departments and institutions to monitor pollution; development of action plans to promote sound chemicals management to be executed in partnership with the relevant Basel/Stockholm Regional Centre, and, targeted development of integrated waste management approaches at national level.*
- *We request that the following comments and questions about some aspects of the proposal be addressed before the project proceeds to CEO endorsement:*
  - *We note that of the total project cost of \$33.5M, \$7M is proposed for the preparation of all national action plans, while \$18M is proposed for delivering the plans. The cost to prepare plans seems high and further justification should be provided and/or the costs re-examined.*
  - *Please add clarity to the outcome for Project Component 1. Specifically, it is unclear how barriers will be identified and what kind of sound data would be made available. In addition, on page 6, it states that Component 1 will lead to "removal" of barriers preventing adequate management of harmful chemicals, whereas the outcome statement refers to "reducing". The language should be consistent throughout the proposal (reduce vs remove).*

- *In terms of stakeholder engagement, the related section notes how civil societies and indigenous people will be involved; however, the document provides limited specificity with respect to organizational name and engagement approaches. Given the importance of stakeholder engagement, this section should be expanded in the subsequent document to ensure full and meaningful inclusion of relevant stakeholders, including CSOs and indigenous people.*
- *Regarding the section on knowledge management (page 9), please identify how the project will draw from lessons learned from other relevant/ similar initiatives. This specificity is important to help ensure project success.*

**UNEP Response:** As requested the total project cost has been reexamined and the cost for development of action plans reduced significantly. Component 1 has been revised. A full stakeholder analysis is now included, together with a complete section on the approach to knowledge management.