



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9788		
Country/Region:	Kazakhstan		
Project Title:	HCFC Phase-out in Kazakhstan through Promotion of Zero ODS Low GWP Energy Efficient Technologies		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	6090 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Chemicals and Waste
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CW-2 Program 5;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$120,000	Project Grant:	\$4,586,200
Co-financing:	\$8,632,400	Total Project Cost:	\$13,218,600
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Evelyn Swain	Agency Contact Person:	Xiaofang Zhou

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	Yes.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes, this project will help bring Kazakhstan into compliance with the Montreal Protocol. Currently they are out of compliance with their HCFC phaseout obligations.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental	This project will complete the phaseout of HCFCs in the country.	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response	
	degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	No additional funds should be requested for this purpose.		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	This is the first HCFC project supported by the GEF. Funds have not yet been requested and thus the country is out of compliance. This project will fill the gap.		
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	The MLF has provided comments which will be uploaded into PMIS in a separate document. These comments should be addressed. ES, 10/4/17: Responses to MLF comments have been provided.		
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes.		
	Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
		• The STAR allocation?		
• The focal area allocation?		Yes.		
• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access				
• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?				
	• Focal area set-aside?			
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	Not at this time. Comments are pending. ES, 10/4/17: Comments have been		

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		addressed. Technical clearance is recommended.	
Review Date	Review	July 21, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	October 04, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Recommendation			
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		