



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

GEF ID:	4881		
Country/Region:	Regional (Antigua And Barbuda, Argentina, Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Jamaica, Mexico, Peru, Uruguay)		
Project Title:	Continuing Regional Support for the POPs Global Monitoring Plan under the Stockholm Convention in the Latin American and Caribbean Region		
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-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,636,000
Co-financing:	\$13,375,401	Total Project Cost:	\$17,011,401
PIF Approval:	October 02, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	November 15, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Evelyn Swain	Agency Contact Person:	Kevin Helps

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?	<p>All countries are parties to the Stockholm Convention. Brazil's NIP is in development and is expected by December 2012. Brazil's NIP or draft NIP should be available at the time of CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>ES, September 7, 2012: Brazil's draft NIP will be available December 2012.</p>	<p>Brazil's NIP has not been delivered to the convention secretariat yet. However since this is a GMP project which is global in nature and important for monitoring the effectiveness of the convention Brazil should be included.</p> <p>One country, Cuba, was not approved in the PIF and it is included in the CEO endorsement. Please remove any countries that were not included in the approved PIF.</p> <p>ES, 12/11/14: Country not included in</p>

*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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			PIF is removed. -Comment cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	No. Endorsement letters are missing for several countries, including Brazil, Chile, Columbia, Ecuador, Jamaica, and Cuba ES, September 7, 2012: All endorsement letters are provided. - comment cleared	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes, UNEP's comparative advantage is clear.	Yes, UNEP is implimenting all GMP projects.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	NA
	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 the Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean in Panama City, Panama.	Yes.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	NA	NA
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes	Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	NA
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	NA
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	NA
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	NA
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes	Yes
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes	Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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 it is consistent with country NIPs and convention guidance.	Yes
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes, the project will use the lessons learned from the first Global Monitoring project and apply them for this round and to the 10 new chemicals, this will help ensure sustainability, in addition to training and strengthening capacity of participating laboratories.	Yes, this is a follow up to the first round of GMP for POPs.
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?	Article 16 of the Stockholm Convention calls for Effectiveness Evaluations which includes a Global Monitoring Plan (GMP). It is clear that the first GMP monitored the original 12 POPs and this project will include both the original 12 and the 10 new chemicals.	Yes, this will continue the first round of GMP and add the 10 new POPs.
	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?		Yes
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	Yes, this project builds on the existing POPs monitoring programmes and networks.	Yes, this project builds on the original GMP.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>Component 2: How many air sample sites will be upgraded?</p> <p>Component 3: How many laboratories will be trained?</p> <p>ES, September 7, 2012: Response provided. -comment cleared</p>	The project framework table is significantly different from the version in the PIF approved version. Please clarify if the project will accomplish the same results as approved in the PIF.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	This project will ensure quality collection and analysis of POPs containing samples, which would not occur in the absence of GEF financing.	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?	This project specifically monitors POPs exposure of women in childbearing age, by the incorporation of Mother's milk as a core matrices. The results from the milk analysis will help determine to what degree people, especially women, in the region are exposed to different POPs.	Yes, this project targets women delivering significant benefits.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Indigenous women are clearly included in this project. What will CSOs role be? ES, September 7, 2012: Response provided. -comment cleared	Yes.
	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, risks are considered.	Yes.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, the project is consistent with other monitoring programs.	Yes, this builds off and coordinates with other GMP projects.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	The Stockholm Regional Center in Uruguay will be the executing agency.	Yes.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		The structure has changed and no explanation is given. Please explain the changes and if the project will produce similar outcomes as what was approved in the PIF. ES, 12/11/14: Clarification provided. - Comment cleared.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>PMC is too high (7%). It should not exceed 5% for a project over \$2M. PMC co-financing ratio is 1:6.6.</p> <p>ES, September 7, 2012: Reasoning is provided for higher PMC, however the reasons provided would likely apply to the other GMPs which all have a PMC within the acceptable level. Please reduce the PMC.</p> <p>ES, September 18, 2012: PMC has been reduced. -comment cleared</p>	Yes
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Co-financing is at 1:2.03, lower than other POPs projects.	Yes
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	The majority of co-financing will come from National Governments, and it is unknown whether it will be grant or in-kind.	<p>CUVA- In the CUVA co-financing letter it is unclear what amount will be contributed to the GMP project.</p> <p>BRS- In the cash co-financing letter it seems like they are offering \$100,000 which is more than what is listed in the co-financing table (\$25,000).</p> <p>ES, 12/11/14: Clarification provided. - Comment cleared.</p>
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	UNEP will bring \$200,000 in-kind co-financing.	Yes
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Tracking Tools are missing.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes. ES, 12/11/14: Tracking tool provided. - Comment cleared.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	none received	STAP suggested minor revisions, please clarify that STAP comments have been addressed. ES, 12/11/14: STAP Comments addressed. -Comment cleared.
	• Convention Secretariat?	none received	none received.
	• Council comments?		None received.
	• Other GEF Agencies?	none received	None received.
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Not at this time. The following issues need to be addressed: 1. Project framework 2. High PMC ES, September 7, 2012: Not at this time. PMC is too high. ES, September 18, 2012: PMC has been reduced. This project is technically cleared and may be included in a future work program.	
	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?		No PPG was included.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		Not at this time. The following issues need to be addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			1. Country eligibility 2. Differences from PIF in the framework 3. Co-financing letters 4. STAP comments 5. Tracking Tools ES, 12/11/14: All issues have been addressed. CEO endorsement is recommended
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 27, 2012	November 20, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 07, 2012	December 11, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 18, 2012	
	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.