



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

GEF ID:	8017		
Country/Region:	Belarus		
Project Title:	GEF-6 POPs Legacy and Sustainable Chemicals Management		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5532 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Chemicals and Waste
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$8,400,000
Co-financing:	\$38,163,000	Total Project Cost:	\$46,963,000
PIF Approval:	March 11, 2016	Council Approval/Expected:	April 01, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Anil Sookdeo	Agency Contact Person:	Jacques Van Engel

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	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	The use of CW 2 funds at the level being requested is above what is expected for the NIP update. Feb 20, 2015 (AS) - Please justify the use of CW 1 funds for this project including a	

*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 January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>full justification of the which components contribute to the objectives of this program.</p> <p>March 18, 2015 (AS) - The funds request has been shifted to program 3 of the chemicals and waste focal area - comment cleared.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>The use of funds in CW 2 are for enabling activities. The NIP updates are capped at 250,000. Please provide an explanation of the request of 700,000. The project financing may need to be re-designed.</p> <p>Feb 20, 2015 (AS)- CW program 1 is specifically to build new tools, models etc that have not been previously used in chemical projects. It is expected that the interventions under this program lead to sustainable and replicable models that can be adopted by other countries. Please elaborate on the aspects of this project that meet these requirements.</p> <p>March 18, 2015 (AS) - The fund request has been shifted to the appropriate program. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports</p>	<p>Yes</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?		
Project Design	6. 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?	Yes	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	Yes	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes, the project proposes to address over 6000T of POPs	
	9. 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Yes	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	This is a model that has been used before in dealing with PCB management and Obsolete POPs disposal. The sustainability will be built through the management system that will be set for dealing with PCBs that is still in equipment that is in use.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes, however the requests for 700,000 from CW 2 is not consistent with that program. Feb 20, 2014 - The use of CW Program 1 funds needs to be justified. This project as designed follows the UNDP model for	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>these types of projects and so there is no innovative aspects in this project.</p> <p>March 18, 2015 (AS) - Comments addressed. - cleared</p>	
	<p>17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	Yes	
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	Yes	
	<p>19. <u>At PIF</u>, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u>, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?</p>	The PPG request is within the norm.	
	<p>20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>	No	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		
	<p>22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		
Agency Responses	<p>23. Has the Agency adequately</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>Pending clarifications on the request from CW 2</p> <p>Feb 20, 2015 - The project proponents have identified CW program 1 as one of the source of funds. The described project components do not meet the objectives of program 1. Please clarify or adjust the project financing.</p> <p>March 18, 2015 - Yes the project can be recommended.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Choice of disposal, i.e in country or external and the final amounts that will be targeted by the project.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	January 16, 2015	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	February 23, 2015	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 18, 2015	

* **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.**