



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

GEF ID:	5307		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Global Project on the Updating of National Implementation Plans for POPs		
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-4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,965,753
Co-financing:	\$5,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$10,465,753
PIF Approval:	April 24, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2013
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	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	<p>Oman is not eligible for GEF funding. All other countries are eligible.</p> <p>There was an agreement that the English speaking countries in Caribbean will submit NIP updates under the UNDP project being developed in the Caribbean region. Please remove the English speaking countries from this project and reduce the budget accordingly.</p> <p>ES, 4-15-13: Comment cleared. Oman and English speaking Caribbean countries have been removed.</p>	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	<p>Not all endorsement letters are provided. Endorsement letters should be provided at the time of CEO endorsement.</p> <p>ES, 4-15-13: 17 countries have submitted endorsement letters, the rest are still</p>	

Resource Availability	3. 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	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <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>	Yes, this is a NIP update project.	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	Yes, this is a NIP update project.	
	6. 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	This is an Enabling Activity project for multiple countries.	

Project Design			
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	Please clarify why component 1 is needed. ES, 4-15-13: Clarification provided. Comment cleared	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes.	
	9. 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Yes, risks are accounted for.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes.	

	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>This project will develop NIP updates for multiple countries. NIP may include innovative plans for the new POPs. The NIPs will develop sustainable plans for POPs management. The project will provide the ground for implementation and possible scale up.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>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?</p>		
<p>Project Financing</p>	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>The totals in Table A and table B do not match.</p> <p>GEF funding is too high and some amounts listed in Annex B are too high for the countries. Please reduce the following countries to the corresponding amounts: Gambia-\$140,000, all pacific countries doing NIP updates except Papua New Guinea \$120,000-130,000, Solomon Islands- \$200,000.</p> <p>The amount for component 1 seems high. Please decrease or justify the amount for</p>	

		ES, 4-15-15: Comment cleared	
	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?	UNEP brings \$500,000 inkind	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	PMC is 1%, which is low. The agency fee is too high and should not exceed 9.5%. In table A it states "IA fees included in project budget", please clarify what it meant by this. ES, 4-15-13: PMC should be reduced to 5%. Fees have been fixed.	
	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?		
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	23. Has the Agency adequately		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>Not at this time. Several issues need to be addressed, including removing ineligible countries, project budget, agency fee, and PMC.</p> <p>PIF clearance is recommended pending reduction of PMC and submittal of missing endorsement letters.</p> <p>ES, 4/18/13: Letters have been submitted for the 26 countries that will participate in the project. Clearance is recommended.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	February 22, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 15, 2013	
	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.**