



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

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| GEF ID: | 5701 | | |
| Country/Region: | Regional (Indonesia, Philippines) | | |
| Project Title: | Reducing Environmental and Health Risks to Vulnerable Communities from Lead Contamination from Lead Paint and Recycling of Used Lead Acid Batteries | | |
| GEF Agency: | UNDP | GEF Agency Project ID: | 5364 (UNDP) |
| Type of Trust Fund: | GEF Trust Fund | GEF Focal Area (s): | POPs |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | CHEM-3; | | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | \$0 | Project Grant: | \$838,000 |
| Co-financing: | \$2,471,000 | Total Project Cost: | \$3,309,000 |
| PIF Approval: | | Council Approval/Expected: | |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | Ibrahima Sow | Agency Contact Person: | Mr. Jacques Van Engel |

| 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, the two participating countries are eligible. |
| | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? | | Yes. |
| 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? | | |
| | • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access | | NA |
| | • the SCCF (Adaptation or | | NA |

*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 January 2013

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---------------------|---|--|--|
| | Technology Transfer)? | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund | | NA |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? | | Yes |
| Strategic Alignment | <p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCE/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</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, the project is consistent with the Chemicals FA and will address priorities identified under SAICM. |
| | <p>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?</p> | | Countries participating in this project have prioritized the issue of hazardous waste contamination - lead paint and used acid lead batteries (ULAB) and the associated health impacts in their national policies and plans. |
| Project Design | <p>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 assumptions?</p> | | Yes. |
| | <p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p> | | Yes, outcomes and outputs appropriately described. |
| | <p>8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p> | | Yes. Yes. Global elimination of lead in paint is an achievable goal. This will be done through awareness raising and establishing and enforcing the relevant regulations. |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|--|--|
| | <p>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?</p> | | |
| | <p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p> | | <p>Yes, the project will serve as a platform for multistakeholder platform. In particular, the project will involve paint manufacturers, SMEs, governments, informal and formal lead recyclers and other relevant stakeholders.</p> |
| | <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., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p> | | <p>Yes, major risks identified and strategies of mitigating them are laid out in the proposals</p> |
| | <p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p> | | <p>The project will coordinate with the GEF/UNEP regional project on "lead paint elimination in Africa"</p> |
| | <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. | | <p>The project uses an innovative approach to promoting environmentally safe management of lead in the two industrial sectors - lead paint and ULAB - through its stakeholder methodology, "learning by doing" approach to capacity building and formation of public-private partnerships to solve pollution problems.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-------------------|---|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. | | |
| | 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? | | The project will use Blacksmith Institute's Technical Advisory Board (TAB) members to provide the technical expertise needed. The TAB is comprised of highly experienced professionals. |
| Project Financing | 16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | | Yes. |
| | 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? | | Yes. |
| | 18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate? | | Project mangement is less than 10%. |
| | 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 | | This is one step MSP. |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|--|--|--|
| | 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? | | Yes. |
| Agency Responses | 23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from: | | |
| | • STAP? | | |
| | • Convention Secretariat? | | None received. |
| | • The Council? | | NA |
| | • Other GEF Agencies? | | NA |
| Secretariat Recommendation | | | |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage | 24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended? | | |
| | 25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval. | | |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval | 26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended? | | Yes. |
| | First review* | February 22, 2014 | |
| Review Date (s) | 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.