



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

GEF ID:	4894		
Country/Region:	Regional (Indonesia, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Mongolia, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam)		
Project Title:	Implementation of the POPs Monitoring Plan in the Asian 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; Others;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,936,000
Co-financing:	\$13,164,900	Total Project Cost:	\$17,100,900
PIF Approval:	March 12, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	April 12, 2013
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?	Yes. All countries are parties to the Stockholm Convention and have NIPs.	Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	No. Endorsement letters are missing for several countries, including Indonesia, Thailand, and Vietnam. ES, September 7, 2012: Endorsement letter are still missing from Indonesia and Thailand, UNEP expects letter by October 2012. Endorsement letters are required for PIF approval, please provide these letters or remove the countries from the project. ES, Feb. 8, 2013: Thailand endorsement letter will be delivered shortly, all other	

*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)
		letters have been submitted.	
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.
	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 Asia-Pacific, in Bangkok.	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	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes	Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	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.
	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	Yes, the project will use the lessons learned from the first Global Monitoring project and apply them for this round	Yes, this project builds off of the first GMP and other regional GMPs.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	of project outcomes?	and to the 10 new chemicals, this will help ensure sustainability, in addition to training and strengthening capacity of participating laboratories.	
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.
	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, this project will build on the first GMP project.
	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.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Component 2: How many laboratories will be trained? Component 3: How many sampling stations will be established? ES, September 7, 2012: Response provided. -comment cleared	The framework is different from what was approved in the PIF. Please clarify if the outcomes of the project remain the same. ES, 12/11/14: Clarification provided. - Comment cleared
	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	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	Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	what degree people, especially women, in the region are exposed to different POPs.	
	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)	Risks are not clear. Please identify risks. ES, September 7, 2012: Response provided. -comment cleared	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, it coordinates with the other regional GMPs.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes. The Vietnam Environment Administration (VEA) will be the executing agency and regional coordinator for the project.	Yes.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		The project is different from what was approved at PIF. Please explain the differences. ES. 12/11/14: Clarification provided. - Comment cleared
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
		23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes, PMC is acceptable at 4%. PMC co-financing is also acceptable at a 1:4.62 ratio.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Co-financing is at 1:1.98, lower than other POPs projects.	Yes.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	There is concern that nearly half of the co-financing is expected from private laboratories and is unknown at this time.	Cofinancing from BRS is \$100,000 in the letter vs \$25,000 in table C. Please clarify. Cofinancing from CVUA is not clear from the letter. Please clarify. ES, 12/11/14: Clarified. -Comment cleared
	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?		Yes.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Tracking tools are not provided.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	none received	STAP has provided comments. Please confirm if they have been addressed. ES 21/11/14: STAP comments were addressed. -Comment cleared
	• Convention Secretariat?	none received	None.
	• Council comments?		None.
	• Other GEF Agencies?	none received	None.
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/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. Identify risks 2. Project framework ES, September 7, 2012: Not at this time. Endorsement letters are still missing from 2 countries. ES, Feb. 8, 2013: Endorsement letter for Thailand will come shortly and before CEO endorsement. PIF clearance is 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?		There was no PPG.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		Not at this time. The following need to be addressed: 1. Cofinancing 2. Project framework differs from PIF 3. STAP Comments 4. Tracking tools ES, 12/11/14: All issues have been addressed. CEO endorsement is recommended.
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 28, 2012	December 02, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 07, 2012	December 11, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 08, 2013	
	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?	Yes, the proposed activities are appropriate.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes, the budget is justified.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Yes, PPG approval is recommended.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	February 12, 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.