



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4962		
Country/Region:	China		
Project Title:	Pilot project on the development of a mercury inventory in China		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	POPs
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CHEM-3; Others;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,000,000
Co-financing:	\$3,146,265	Total Project Cost:	\$4,146,265
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ibrahima Sow	Agency Contact Person:	Jorge Ocaña

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?		Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. The project has been endorsed by the OPF of China, Mr Jiandi Ye.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?		Yes. UNEP has developed the Standardized Toolkit on Identification and Quantification of mercury releases for national mercury inventories and applied this toolkit in a number of countries.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?		Yes. UNEP has Chemicals and POPs related staff in China and in the Regional Office for Asia (Bangkok).
Resource Availability	6. 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?		na
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		Yes.
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?		Yes.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?		Yes.
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?		Yes. A Special Policy Study of Mercury Management has been carried out in China through the China Council for International Cooperation on Environment and Development (CCICED). China has also taken a series of actions to reduce mercury usage and emissions and is participating in relevant work concerning the UNEP Global mercury partnership.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?		The project will provide a first inventory on mercury in China and will provide a baseline for China's national mercury pollution control and will

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			build national capacity management.
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?		The baseline project and issues to address are adequately described.
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		The project will be implemented in two provinces but will make sure that the output obtained can be replicated in other provinces and other countries with similar situation.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?		Yes. Without GEF support, It is likely that China's mercury releases will not decrease and the development of a standardized inventory on mercury in China, as a first step to develop a national mercury reduction plan, will not be possible.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?		Yes.
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?		Yes.
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		Yes. In particular, the project will advocate for a national regulatory framework targeting the protection of vulnerable groups including women and children.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?		Yes. All relevant stakeholders have been identified and their roles specified.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)		Yes.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		Yes, in particular with Norwegian Ministry of Environment and the Italian Ministry for the Environment and Territory for two projects on mercury pollution prevention and control.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?		Yes.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?		The PMC (PROJECT MANAGEMENT COST) under table A which is estimated at \$ 55,000 does not match with the PMC indicated under table F (\$95,000). Same comment for the co-financing of the PMC (\$200,000 vers 220,000). Please clarify and correct as necessary.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	On table 3: Project budget by component, under 5.1 the cost for the "Development of a final report including lessons learned and future recommendations appears too high. Please provide a clear justification of this budget component or reduce it at a reasonable level.	Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.		Yes. co-financing is confirmed.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?		UNEP is providing \$ 250,000 as in-kind co-financing. 22 June 2012. UNEP's contribution has been increased to \$ 1,146,265
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		na
	• Convention Secretariat?	na	na
	• Council comments?		na
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?		
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		Pending submission of a revised document addressing the issue of PMC and clarification of the budget component under table 3..

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>14 May 2012 The co-financing appears small for this project and for a country like China. UNEP is requested to work with the GoC to increase the co-financing to at least of 1:4</p> <p>22 June 2012 The co-financing has been increased to 1:3 following discussion between GEFSEC and UNEP. PM recommends approval of the proposal</p>
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 24, 2012	April 24, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	May 14, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.