



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

GEF ID:	<b>5662</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>China</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Defining and demonstrating best practices for exchange of information on chemicals in textile products</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>POPs</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CHEM-1;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$1,000,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$4,395,205</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$5,395,205</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Evelyn Swain</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Jorge Ocana</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Yes.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	Yes.	
<b>Resource Availability</b>	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	NA	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes. Chem 3.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	

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

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

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	NA	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	Yes, Chem 3.	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	This is in line with the priorities under SAICM.	
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	Yes, the baseline is clear.	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>Please clarify how end-of-life management will be included in the project. Best practices should include end-of-life. Will the demonstration pilot project (component 3) include end-of life management, especially if chemicals of global concern are found to be in textile products.</p> <p>ES, Feb 10,2014: It was clarified that EOL managers will be informed through</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		the process, but they be targeted in the project. - Comment cleared	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>Are the global environmental benefits quantifiable? For example, will you be able to quantify how many hazardous substances have been designed out of products?</p> <p>ES, Feb 10, 2014: UNEP clarified that the project will quantify how many products do not contain harmful substances, and if a product does contain a harmful substance what actions were taken to reduce it. - Comment cleared</p>	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	<p>CSO participation is built into the project.</p> <p>Gender is not included in the project. It the textile industry there is expected to be a strong gender dimension. Please address gender issues.</p> <p>ES, Feb 10, 2014: Gender is addressed. - Comment cleared.</p>	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g.,	Yes, risks are accounted for.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes.	
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	This is the first Chemicals in products project and it is innovating. It will demonstrate best practices in the textile industry in China, and will be able to used as a model for other industries and countries resulting in scale.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to	Yes.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	There is no co-financing letter from the Ministry of Environmental Protection yet it is listed in Table C. For this project it is expected that there would at least be in-kind support from the MOE since they are the executing agency.  ES, Feb 10, 2014: A letter from MEP was provided. -Comment cleared	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	Yes.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	PPG not requested.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	Not at this stage, several issues listed above need to be addressed.  ES, Feb 10, 2014: All issues have been addressed. PIF clearance is recommended.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	January 15, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	February 10, 2014	
	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.**