



Sound management of polychlorobiphenyls in Cote d'Ivoire, phase II - objective 2028 of the Stockholm Convention

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11420

Countries

Cote d'Ivoire

Project Name

Sound management of polychlorobiphenyls in Cote d'Ivoire, phase II - objective 2028 of the Stockholm Convention

Agencies

UNIDO

Date received by PM

10/18/2023

Review completed by PM

10/25/2023

Program Manager

Toshiyuki Yamasaki

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

Toshi 10/30/2023:

Yes, the project meets the criteria for eligibility of GEF funding. The table is also 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

Toshi 10/30/2023:

Yes - the project summary concisely describes the problems to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to achieve the environmentally sound management and final disposal of PCB-containing equipment in the electricity sector of Cote d'Ivoire.

Agency's Comments

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

Toshi 11/22/2023:

Cleared.

Toshi 10/30/2023:

1) In this proposal, there is a content of Capacity Building in outcome 2.1.1 (Capacity building and training of national experts in transformer oil sampling are developed). At the same time, components of Outcome 4 are also Capacity Building and Awareness Raising, so, I suggest that it should be integrated into Outcome 4.

2) In addition, please elaborate on technologies which will be used for treatment and disposal of PCB-contaminated transformers in Component 3.

Agency's Comments

1) Output 2.1.1 has been integrated into component 4 as suggested. The theory of change was edited accordingly.

2) Description of the decontamination and treatment options envisaged at this stage, to be confirmed during PPG, has been added under the description of Component 3.

11/20/23

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

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 11/22/2023:

Cleared.

Toshi 10/30/2023:

On Gender, it is mentioned in 'Gender Mainstreaming?', and it is said gender analysis will be conducted in PPG phase, however, please integrate gender equality considerations in other relevant outcomes and outputs, including in relation to capacity-building, awareness-raising and knowledge management. Please also include women in the stakeholders to be engaged.

Agency's Comments

Description of activities planned to integrated gender considerations has been added under all components. CSOs were consulted for activities focusing on women and youth. Their foreseen role in the project has been described in the Stakeholder Engagement Section.

11/20/23

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

Toshi 11/22/2023:

Cleared.

Toshi 10/30/2023:

1) Please ensure that the co-financing for the PMC is proportional to that of the overall project. Currently, it is 1:6.25 whereas the project is 1:6.01.

2) In addition, the PMC request is slightly above the threshold of the 5% (5.06% on the budget). However, the justification is not based on solid arguments: instead, the reasoning is based on the nature of the project, which does not make justice to the increase.

Agency's Comments

1) Co-financing adjusted across components to ensure proportionality to that of the overall project.

2) Justification has been added into the section "please provide justification" under the Component and budget table. PMC is 5.06 to adequately plan the costs of local travel needed to ensure timely inventory and adequate environmental monitoring of PCB decontamination

11/20/23

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

Toshi 10/30/2023:

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

Toshi 11/22/2023:

Cleared.

Toshi 10/30/2023:

Stakeholder Engagement: The PIF notes that consultations with stakeholders were held, however no names of institutions, CSOs or private sector have been provided. Further ? the agency should provide the expected role of CSOs and other stakeholders in the Project description.

Agency's Comments

A detailed table has been added to provide information on all the stakeholders including CSOs consulted during the development of the PIF. The table includes a description of stakeholders? foreseen role in the project.

Information was also added in:

- the description of the key stakeholders currently involved in the system under section A,
- under Stakeholders? roles and responsibilities in section B,
- In the description of activities of each component.

11/20/23

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

Toshi 10/30/2023:

Yes.

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

Toshi 10/30/2023:

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

Toshi 10/30/2023:

Yes. The project will be implemented by the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, government of Cote d'Ivoire.

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

Toshi 11/22/2023:

Cleared.

Toshi 10/30/2023:

Core Indicators : Please explain the methodological approach and underlying logic to justify target levels for Core and Sub-Indicators below core indicator table.

Agency's Comments

Information explaining the rationale of GEBs has been added in the justification section

11/20/23

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

Secretariat's Comments

N/A.

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?

b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?

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 Comments

Toshi 10/30/2023:

Yes.

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

Toshi 10/30/2023:
Yes.

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

Toshi 10/30/2023:
Yes.

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

Toshi 10/30/2023:
Yes.

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

N/A.

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 10/30/2023:
Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments
Toshi 10/30/2023:
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 Comments
Toshi 10/30/2023:
Yes.

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments
Toshi 10/30/2023:
Yes.

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments
N/A.

Agency's Comments
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments
N/A.

Agency's Comments
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments
N/A.

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments
N/A.

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 Comments
Toshi 10/30/2023:
Yes.

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 Comments
Toshi 11/22/2023:
Cleared.

Toshi 10/30/2023:

- 1) Grant is normally classified as investment mobilized. Please revise the ?recurrent expenditures? to ?investment mobilized? where ?grant? is classified as recurrent expenditures in the indicative co-financing table.
- 2) In-kind is normally classified as recurrent expenditures. Please revise the ?investment mobilized? to ?recurrent expenditures? where ?in-kind is classified as investment mobilized in the indicative co-financing table.

Agency's Comments

1) and 2) : Indicative co-financing table was modified accordingly

11/20/23

Annex B: Endorsements

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

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 10/30/2023:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 10/30/2023:

Yes.

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

Toshi 11/22/2023:

Cleared.

Toshi 10/30/2023:

On the Letter of Endorsement, the financing table is wrong. Reissue of a new letter of endorsement is required with correct amounts in right place (GEF Project Financing Agency Fee and PPG amounts). We will review the financial information whenever the new letter is received.

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area Source	Amount (in US\$)				Total
			GEF Project Financing	GEF Project Financing Agency Fee	Project Preparation Grant (PPG)	Project Preparation Grant (PPG) Agency Fee	
GTF	UNIDO	Chemicals and Waste	4,150,000	14,250	4,708,500	14,250	4,708,500
Total GEF Resources			4,150,000	394,250	150,000	14,250	4,708,500

Agency's Comments

The letter of endorsement was revised with correct amounts. Please note that the letter now mentions the new official name of the Ministry in charge of Environment, which is now **Ministry of Environment, Sustainable Development and Ecological Transition**. The name was also changed in the general project information.

11/20/23

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 Comments

N/A.

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 Comments

Toshi 10/30/2023:
Yes.

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

Toshi 11/22/2023:

Cleared.

Toshi 10/30/2023:

The project overall ESS risk is classified as moderate (Section D. Policy Requirement, P.39), and UNIDO attached the Project Risk Certification. Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) will be developed during the project preparatory (PPG) phase to identify specific risks and impacts of the project and propose related mitigation and monitoring measures. However, the "Risks to Project Preparation and Implementation" section (P.33) said Environment and social risk as "low".

Please make them consistent and correct.

Agency's Comments

The "Environment and social risk" rating, in the table in the Risks to Project Preparation and Implementation section, was changed from Low to Moderate.

11/20/23

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 10/30/2023:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 10/30/2023:

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 Comments

N/A.

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments

Toshi 11/22/2023:
Cleared.

Toshi 11/21/2023:

You said "Comments addressed as highlighted in the relevant sub-sections" in this section (9.1), but the uploaded file is not highlighted. I have confirmed that almost all of comments have been addressed, but I would like to make sure that nothing is left out when I check, so could you please re-upload the latest file?

Toshi 10/30/2023:

Please address the comments above.

Toshi 10/25/2023:

Yes. Technical review is completed with comments above for response from the agency. Project is being sent for PPO screen.

Agency's Comments

Comments addressed as highlighted in the relevant sub-sections.

11/20/23

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/25/2023	11/20/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/30/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/21/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/22/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		