



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

GEF ID:	9379		
Country/Region:	Vietnam		
Project Title:	Application of Green Chemistry in Vietnam to Support Green Growth and Reduction in the Use and Release of POPs/Harmful Chemicals		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5723 (UNDP)
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 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$1,999,800
Co-financing:	\$8,400,000	Total Project Cost:	\$10,449,800
PIF Approval:	May 12, 2016	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Anil Sookdeo	Agency Contact Person:	Mr. Jacques Van Engel

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	The use of Green Chemistry principles in manufacturing supports sustainable consumption and production and will in the long term be a sustainable solutions to the emissions and releases of POPs and mercury. The GEF 6 Strategy articulates Green Chemistry approaches as a means of reducing POPs and Mercury.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the	Yes. The Government of Vietnam	

<sup>1</sup> 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
	recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	has been implementing a number of policies aimed at a green economy and sustainable production and consumption. Developing a strategy for Green Chemistry will further advance Vietnam's drive to reduce harmful chemicals and waste from their productive sectors.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Yes	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Yes	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Yes	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	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		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or		

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Technology Transfer)?		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	The PPG is within the ceiling for the project size. The PIF for the two step MSP is being recommended for CEO approval.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	May 05, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	The project has not been changed since PIF approval	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	Yes	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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)	Yes	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	Yes	
	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 management plan?	Yes - Since this is one of the very limited green chemistry projects that have been funded by the GEF it is important that all lessons and knowledge from this project be transparently and widely shared.	
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		

<sup>3</sup> 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.

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEFSEC</li> <li>• STAP</li> <li>• GEF Council</li> <li>• Convention Secretariat</li> </ul>	N/A	
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	Yes	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	April 24, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		