

Supporting the ratification and phase-down of hydrofluorocarbons in production: A regional initiative for enhanced action in Central Asia and Eastern Europe

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11881

Countries

Regional (Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan)

Project Name

Supporting the ratification and phase-down of hydrofluorocarbons in production:
A regional initiative for enhanced action in Central Asia and Eastern Europe

Agencies

UNIDO

Date received by PM

3/6/2025

Review completed by PM

4/8/2025

Program Manager

Evelyn Swain

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments Yes, the project meets the criteria and it populated correctly.

Agency's Comments

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

The summary exceeds the 250 word limit. Please make the summary concise, for example SGD information can be removed.

ES, 4/8/25: Please consider a title that focuses on HFC benefits.

ES, 4/14/25: Comment addressed.

Agency's Comments

UNIDO 4/4/25

The Summary was aligned with the limit

The project title has been changed to: **Supporting the ratification and phase-down of hydrofluorocarbons in production: A regional initiative for enhanced action in Central Asia and Eastern Europe**?. The title has been circulated with Relevant Country OFPs for non-objection. The communication has been uploaded under roadmap and document section.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

The project objective is clear.

Component 2 on technology transfer includes an upgrade of pilot cement kilns and destruction facilities for HFC. Will technologies other than cement kilns be considered?

ES, 4/8/25: Comment addressed.

We have shared the project with the Ozone Secretariat and may have additional comments if they respond.

ES, 4/8/25: The MLF Sec has provided comments that have been attached in the documents section of the portal. Please consider these comments.

ES, 4/14/25: Comments addressed.

Agency's Comments

UNIDO 4/4/25

Gaseous/Fume Oxidation, Liquid Injection Incineration, Porous Thermal Reactor, Rotary Kiln Incineration, Argon Plasma Arc and other destruction technologies approved for HFC destruction by the Meeting of the Parties of the Montreal Protocol will be considered.

The MLF Sec comments have been reviewed and considered. The file with comments has been uploaded to the portal in the Documents section. The corresponding adjustments have been done to the PIF.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

The justification on PMC is not clear.

ES, 4/8/25: PMC justification is clear. Comment addressed.

Agency's Comments

UNIDO 4/4/25

Since the project is regional and includes a significant number of activities carried out at the national level, separately in each country, its management is more complicated comparing with national projects because there will be two levels of its management: 1) national and 2) regional. The 1st level represented at the national level, it will be provided by the Project national coordinators or executing entities (will be identified and confirmed during the PPG phase). They will perform part of the management and administration of the day-to-day activities of projects at the national level. Under supervision of the Project Manager they will prepare and coordinate with the national focal points and stakeholders separate national project work plans and coordinate its implementation at the national level. The 2nd (regional) level will perform by the PMU hosted in the UNIDO HQ. At this level, mutual coherence of national project plans, their synergy with each other, timeliness, consistency and regional coordination will be ensured. There will be provided management of the project output deliverables; maintenance of records of all project-related documentation; management and administration of the Knowledge Management Plan; preparation of progress reports and financial reports for the project; financial auditing for the project and other activities as defined in the GEF Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy for the PMC.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

The project is well justified and has included relevant stakeholders.

Stakeholder Engagement: The PIF alludes to CSOs and academia as project stakeholders but does not elaborate on the potential interest and contribution of these stakeholders to project objective or outcomes. Please elaborate these stakeholder's potential role in project implementation as well as any plans to identify, engage and consult these stakeholders in project development.

ES, 4/8/25: comment addressed.

Agency's Comments

UNIDO 4/4/25

At the PIF stage roles of the national associations of RACHP industry were identified and defined. These non-government and non-profit entities act as the CSOs sector stakeholders in the project. At the country level they play a key role in promoting environmental agenda on the RACHP industry. As an example, the main goal of the Public Union "Refrigeration Association of Ukraine" is to promote energy-efficient and environmentally-friendly technologies in the production and operation of equipment as well as in the construction of the latest refrigeration systems. The role of academia was defined via education entities (university, training centers or similar) which will act as capacity building and trainings operators in the project.

The project will not be limited to involving only the above-mentioned stakeholders of the CSOs sector and academia. National project development experts will be hired during the PPG stage to conduct broader consultations among other stakeholders, with academia and CSOs and engage new ones. A Stakeholder Engagement Plan will be developed in cooperation with these

stakeholders to properly define and ensure their interest and contribution in the project development and implementation.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments Yes, the TOC is well defined.

Agency's Comments

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments Institutional arrangements and coordination with other projects is clear.

Agency's Comments

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

Please include any climate benefits under core indicator 6.

ES, 4/8/25: Comment addressed.

Agency's Comments

UNIDO 4/4/25

The GEB 6 sub-indicators was defined for the project on the PIF phase: Indicator 6.2 Emissions avoided outside AFOLU sector -12,790,483 metric tons of CO₂e (indirect).

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's CommentsYes, risks are articulated.

Agency's Comments

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments This project support obligations under the Montreal Protocol to phaseout HFCs.

Agency's Comments

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments Yes, this is aligned with the CW focal area.

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments Yes, this project is in line with the Montreal Protocol.

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's CommentsYes.

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's CommentsYes.

Agency's Comments

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's CommentsYes, co-financing is appropriate, including from the private sector.

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country's(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's CommentsYes.

Agency's Comments

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's CommentsYes.

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

1. Project title in LoEs (Supporting the ratification and phase-down of hydrofluorocarbons in production: A regional initiative for enhanced climate action in Central Asia and Eastern

Europe) is slightly different than in Portal (Supporting the ratification and phase-down of hydrofluorocarbons in production: A regional initiative for enhanced climate action in Central Asia and Eastern Europe with global cooperation). Please ask the Agency to change the title in Portal to match that in LoEs, or to get a new LoE to make the title matching in Portal ? whichever is easier.

2. The LoE from Uzbekistan is signed by the Political Focal Point (Minister Aziz Abdukhakimov), but it must be signed by the Operational Focal Point (Mr. Jakhongir Talipov). Please request a new LoE.

ES, 4/8/25: Comments addressed.

Agency's Comments

UNIDO 4/4/25

The project title in Portal was aligned with the title in LoEs.

The LoE from Uzbekistan includes both signatures - OFP and PFP GEF. As per explanation from Mr. Jakhongir Talipov, the GEF OFP Uzbekistan, they use such letter modality for all LoE to the GEF projects.

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's CommentsYes.

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

Environmental and Social Safeguards: We note that the UNIDO attached the Environmental and Social Screening template (ESST) and classified the project as moderate risk. The ESST said that an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) will be developed. However, it is not clear the action will be taken during PPG in the Key risks table.

Please include specific action that UNIDO will take during the PPG including development of an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP).

ES, 4/8/25: Comments addressed.

Agency's Comments

UNIDO 4/4/25

The risk "Environmental and Social" was updated for the Measure "Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) will be developed at the PPG stage".

The expert for development an Environmental and Social Management Plan will be hired at the PPG stage.

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

Not at this time. Some questions remain.

Not at this time. Please see comments from MLF uploaded to the portal.

ES, 4/14/25: Comments addressed. PIF and PPG are recommended for technical clearance.

Agency's Comments

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval

Secretariat's Comments1) Please ensure to include relevant gender-specific indicators in the RF. 2) When developing the Gender Action Plan, please ensure the finding are integrated into the relevant outputs; 3) In the development of the Gender Action Plan, please include specific budget lines, as appropriate and plans for monitoring and reporting on the GAP. Under M&E, please reflect that reports submitted (MTR and TE) include gender-specific results and progress in the implementation of the gender action.

Agency's Comments

UNIDO 4/4/25

Thank you for sharing these suggestions. They are well noted and will be taken into consideration during the CEO endorsement stage.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	3/19/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/8/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/14/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		