



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\*

### THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4886		
Country/Region:	Regional (Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Morocco, Mali, Mauritius, Nigeria, Senegal, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Zambia, Congo DR)		
Project Title:	Continuing Regional Support for the POPs Global Monitoring Plan under the Stockholm Convention in the Africa 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:	\$4,208,000
Co-financing:	\$8,462,000	Total Project Cost:	\$12,670,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ibrahima Sow	Agency Contact Person:	Jorge OCAÑA CORREA

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	All countries are party to the Stockholm Convention and all have NIPs.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	No. Endorsement letters are missing for several countries, including Ethiopia, Kenya, Mauritius, Morocco, Nigeria, Senegal, Tunisia, Uganda, and Zambia.  ES, Sept 17, 2012: All countries included in the project have endorsement letters. Nigeria has been removed from the project.	
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.	

\*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	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 Africa in Nairobi, Kenya.	
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	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?	NA	
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	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.	
	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 GMP and apply them in this round and to the 10 new chemicals, this will help ensure sustainability, in addition to training and strengthening capacity of participating laboratories.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
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 include 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 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?		
	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.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Component 2: How many air sample sites and countries will be included?  Component 3: How many laboratories and personnel will be trained?  ES, Sept 17, 2012: Information 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.	
	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 monitors POPs exposure of women of childbearing age, by incorporating mother's milk as a core matrices. The results of the milk analysis will help determine to what degree people, especially women, in the region are exposed to different POPs.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role	Indigenous women are clearly included in this project. What will CSOs role be?	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	identified and addressed properly?	ES, Sept 17, 2012: Information provided. -comment cleared	
	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.	
	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.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	UNEP DTIE Chemicals Branch will be the exciting agency, with close cooperation from regional executing institutions.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	PMC is acceptable at 4.7%. PMC co-financing ratio is 1:9.24.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Co-financing is at 1:2.01, lower than other POPs projects.	
	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.	
	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.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	None received	
	• Convention Secretariat?	None received	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	None received	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	Not at this time. The following issues need to be addressed:  1. Project framework 2. Missing endorsement letters  ES, Sept 17, 2012: All issues have been addressed. 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?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 19, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 17, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	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.