



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

GEF ID:	5067		
Country/Region:	Vietnam		
Project Title:	Vietnam POPs and Sound Harmful Chemicals Management Project		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5154 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	POPs
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CHEM-1; CHEM-1; CHEM-3; CHEM-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$2,550,000
Co-financing:	\$10,900,000	Total Project Cost:	\$13,450,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	April 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Anil Sookdeo	Agency Contact Person:	Suely Carvalho,

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	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	No	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes	
	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources		

*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Resource Availability	available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Project Consistency	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	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	In the context of the inadequacy in the design of the project components described in section 14 below please address the sustainability dimension of the project. 09/11/2012 - AS - comment cleared based on revised PIF and response to review.	
	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?	No. The proposal has an in depth discussion of the barriers and current situation of Chemical Management in Vietnam how it falls short on describing the activities that would be taken in the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>absence of GEF and GEF catalyzed funding. Please clearly describe the activities (baseline project) that would be taken without the GEF and GEF catalyzed funding.</p> <p>09/11/2012 - AS - comment cleared based on revised PIF and response to review.</p>	
	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?	<p>Unable to access due to inadequacy in the description of the baseline project.</p> <p>09/11/2012 - AS - comment cleared based on revised PIF and response to review.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>No. Please clarify and/or remove the following parts in the projects.</p> <p>1. Output 1.1.2 - How is the work being proposed here different to activities that are already covered in the recently approved National Implementation Plan Update? If it is not different please remove this part of the project.</p> <p>2. Output 1.1.3 - What is the relationship of this to the existing law on Chemicals in Vietnam? Why is this not considered under the existing law? What would the cost implications for this be for implementing these proposed</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>provisions under the Environment Law as compared to the Chemical Law? Overall the inclusion of chemical related issues should be done in the context of the existing chemical law.</p> <p>3. Output 2.2.1 to 2.2.3 - UNEP is proposing to strengthen the laboratory capacity in Vietnam in the context of the Global Monitoring Program. Please clarify the need for this component. If there are overlaps with the GMP this component must be removed.</p> <p>4. Outputs 4.2.1 to 4.3.1 - These are not eligible activities, please remove them from the project.</p> <p>09/11/2012 - AS - comment cleared based on revised PIF and response to review.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>		
	<p>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?</p>	<p>This section will need to be rewritten in order to address the comments in section 14 which question the eligibility of some of the activities particularly the monitoring capacity which is already being captured in another project.</p> <p>09/11/2012 - AS - comment cleared based on revised PIF and response to review.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes, however at CEO endorsement detailed descriptions of the participation of the affected public and CSOs and indigenous peoples need to be provided.	
	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 related to a changing environment have not been considered particularly the impact of climate change on long term storage of waste and contaminated material. 09/11/2012 - AS - comment cleared based on revised PIF and response to review.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes	
	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?	Yes	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes, however please note requested changes in section 14 which will change the funding levels of the project. 09/11/2012 - AS - comment cleared based on revised PIF and response to review.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated	Co-financing is consistent with expected	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	amounts and demonstrates the commitment of the Government and bilateral donors. The funding sourced from the private sector should be improved at CEO endorsement.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes	
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	
	• Other GEF Agencies?	None Received	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Pending major revisions and clarifications. 09/11/2012 - AS - comment cleared based on revised PIF and response to review. The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program. 09/11/12 AS	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Involvement of the CSO and other stakeholders in the project Sustainability of outcomes of the project	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Co-financing from the private sector should be improved.	
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?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 16, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Yes
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	February 01, 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.