

HCFC Phase-out in Kazakhstan through Promotion of Zero ODS Low GWP Energy Efficient Technologies

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

9788

Countries

Kazakhstan

Project Name

HCFC Phase-out in Kazakhstan through Promotion of Zero ODS Low GWP Energy Efficient Technologies

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

5/29/2019

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Evelyn Swain

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Project Design and Financing

1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

The project objective and nearly all of table B have been changed without any justification. Please provide detailed justification for all changes. The change in the project objective results in a Major Amendment and the project will need to be recirculated to Council prior to CEO Endorsement.

2/5/20: Please provide the background for the change and strong justification for the change in project results and major amendment of this project.

Response to Secretariat comments 8-Oct-19: A detailed table explaining the re-numbering of Outcomes and addition of Gender related action plan in line with GEF requirements has been provided in Annex H. The change in the project's objective has been mentioned in the project documentation based on a related Decision taken by the Implementation Committee and Meeting of Parties to the Montreal Protocol to adjust the HCFC consumption schedule for Kazakhstan.

2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Justification for the changes is needed prior to determining this.

ES, 2/5/20: The project structure in table B has changed however the expected results are in line with what was approved in the PIF, with a new phaseout date of 2025 from 2020 in accordance with Decision XXIX/14 of the Montreal Protocol.

Response to Secretariat comments 8-Oct-19: This is noted. Attached is the revised project documentation.

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Justification for the changes is needed prior to determining this.

2/5/2020: Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments 8-Oct-19: This is noted. Attached is the revised project documentation.

4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

No this is not accounted for.

2/5/2020: Yes, the project considers risks, including climate risks.

Response to Secretariat comments 8-Oct-19: The project has identified current environmental, social, financial, political and other risks in the CEO endorsement request, Section A.5. “Risks”.

Environmental and social risks are listed in the SESP tool on pages 25-32, and financial and political risks have been identified in Section “UNDP Risk Log” found on the pages 33-35, inclusive of elaborated management responses.

The main objective of the project to phase-out HCFC consumption in Kazakhstan with introduction of low GWP/ODS-free technologies to mitigate climate change consequences.

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments 8-Oct-19: This is noted.

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement NA

Response to Secretariat comments 8-Oct-19: GEF Core Indicators table has been presented as an Annex E.

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement NA

Response to Secretariat comments

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement This project will build off of previous efforts to meet Montreal Protocol obligations.

Response to Secretariat comments 8-Oct-19: There has been a loss of national capacity on the implementation of the Montreal Protocol in Kazakhstan since 2012. Only with the submission of a request for funding of the HCFC phase-out in 2017, the government relies on the technical assistance associated with the current programme to restore the previous capacity and support implementation of an extended HCFC compliance regime adopted by the Meeting of Parties for the country at its XXIX meeting.

Coordination with other similar initiatives in the region has been designed in the project's approach. This is related to the current MLF and GEF funded programmes. Such approach has been tested in a previous GEF-HCFC initial regional programme for Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Belarus and it was recommended for replication in future projects.

9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Responses

11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:

GEFSEC

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement NA

Response to Secretariat comments 8-Oct-19: UNDP, together with the Government of Kazakhstan, presented responses to comments from the MLF Secretariat at the PIF review stage, including on the accumulated sovereign debt in front of the Montreal Protocol.

STAP

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Please provide a detailed response to STAP comments.

2/5/2020: This has been provided in annex B.

Response to Secretariat comments 8-Oct-19: Detailed responses to STAP comments were provided in Annex B.

GEF Council

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Please provide a detailed response to Council comments.

2/5/2020: This has been provided in annex B.

Response to Secretariat comments 8-Oct-19: Detailed response to Council comments has been provided in Annex B.

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement NA

Response to Secretariat comments 8-Oct-19: There were comments received from the MLF Secretariat, which were addressed at the PIF stage.

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Not at this time several issues need to be resolved.

2/5/2020: Not at this time some clarifications are still needed.

Response to Secretariat comments 8-Oct-19: Revised and updated CEO Endorsement Document has been attached for further review.

Review Dates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations