



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

GEF ID:	9227		
Country/Region:	Georgia		
Project Title:	PCB-Free Electricity Distribution in Georgia		
GEF Agency:	UNIDO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
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 3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$140,000	Project Grant:	\$3,910,000
Co-financing:	\$56,095,000	Total Project Cost:	\$60,145,000
PIF Approval:	May 04, 2016	Council Approval/Expected:	June 09, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Evelyn Swain	Agency Contact Person:	Mr. Klaus Tyrkko

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	Yes. The project is aligned with CW-2 Program 3 "Reduction and elimination of POPs". However, it is not clear how the project CW-1 objective "i.e. develop the enabling conditions, tools and environment for sound management of chemicals and wastes" would be realized. Please clarify and elaborate at appropriate sections of the project document on specific related outputs in this regard. It would be more appropriate to	

<sup>1</sup> 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)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		utilize resources solely from program 3. LA, 06 August 2015  Funding program changed to CW-2 program 3. Comment cleared. LA, 09 Oct 2015	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes. The project is in line with Georgia's SC NIP which ranks PCB management as a second priority for action. It is also consistent with the country's National Environment Action Plan (NEAP-2) long-term goal to improve hazardous waste management.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Yes. Issues of sustainability, scaling and innovation along with the drivers of global environmental degradation are briefly described in the PIF. However, more detailed information need to be provided in the full document to be submitted for CEO endorsement to enable better reflection/ assessment in this respect.  LA, 06 August 2015	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Yes.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	No. Please address the following comments:  - Describe the project expected	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>outputs with sufficient details that would allow their adequate assessment/ review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Updated PCBs inventory based on the ongoing NIP review and update should be considered, as available during the PPG stage, in the estimation of the PCB quantities to be dealt within the scope of this project. Also please provide information on the start and completion dates of the NIP update.</li> <li>- Further to the previous point, justify the need for detailed inventory of PCB in this proposed project (Output 3.1), considering that there is an ongoing review and update of NIP (as indicated in the proposal) that targets the same?</li> <li>- The results of collected data from transformers and capacitors given on pages 5 and 6 of the PIF indicate much higher quantities of PCB oil and contaminated equipment in the country than those the proposed project attempt to dispose of. Please clarify.</li> <li>- Output 2.1 aims at verifying pure PCB equipment items and managing them safely until</li> </ul>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>replacement. Are these equipment items different from those targeted in output 2.2 (transportation and disposal of 300 tons of PCB oils and associated equipment)? Please clarify.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What is the estimated cost of PCB disposal per ton? What is the basis for the estimate?</li> <li>- Component 3 intend to address technology transfer for long lasting PCB management capacity in the electricity distribution sector, while Output 3.1 stated that inventory of PCB transformers will be undertaken in the industrial sectors. Are these two sectors the same in Georgia? Please clarify. What about the utility sector? Is it to be considered also?</li> <li>- Elaborate on how the project overall expected results will contribute the country's effort towards the elimination of equipment and oils containing PCBs from use by 2025 and bring these under environmentally sound waste management by 2028 in the context of SC.</li> <li>- At relevant sections of the PIF document, please explain how</li> </ul>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>UNIDO's lesson's learned based on similar projects would support and complement the approach undertaken in this project. Also highlight relevant cost effectiveness, efficiency, scaling up benefits and/ or opportunities, if any.</p> <p>LA, 06 August 2015</p> <p>The secretariat comments have been addressed by the agency as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Further details on the expected outputs of the various project components were satisfactory provided.</li> <li>- Clarifications provided on the relationship between the ongoing NIP update and the proposed activity for updating PCBs inventory indicated that the latter will provide more detailed information on PCB inventory (including lab analysis to verify PCB quantities) compared with those covered under the NIP update. Moreover, during the PPG, NIP PCB inventory outcomes will be reviewed to ensure no overlap with the PCB related activity of the proposed project.</li> <li>- Data on PCB oil and contaminated equipment to be disposed of in this project (300 tons)</li> </ul>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>is confined to the electricity distribution sector, while the PCB data reported in the PIF include equipment from other sectors not targeted in this project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The disposal cost has been estimated at US\$ 3,000 / ton for PCB equipment including transportation.</li> <li>- Utility sector PCB inventory beyond the project targeted electricity distribution, may also include hydro-electrical power and water treatment facilities which are highly likely to contain PCB holding equipment.</li> <li>- The experiences resulting from the successful implementation of this project will likely help industrial/transport/ utility/defense) that are in possession of PCB holding equipment. Moreover, availing a new technology for the treatment of PCB containing equipment as proposed in this project would be beneficial in this regard.</li> </ul> <p>Comments cleared. LA, 09 Oct 2015</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes. However, please elaborate further on the socio-economic aspects including relevant gender and CSO's elements in the full project document when submitting for CEO endorsement.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		LA, 06 August 2015	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	NA	
	• The focal area allocation?	Yes	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• Focal area set-aside?	NA	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>No, pending receipt of satisfactory responses to the above review comments.</p> <p>LA, 06 August 2015</p> <p>Yes. GEF Secretariat comments have been adequately addressed. PM recommend PIF clearance.</p> <p>LA, 09 October 2015</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	August 06, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	There have been no changes made.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	Yes	
	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)	Yes	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	Yes	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	Yes	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	N/A	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	Yes	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	Yes	



CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	Yes	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP	Yes. Comments have been addressed	
	• GEF Council	The comment made by the Council member from Germany has been addressed.	
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	Yes.	
Review Date	Review	October 23, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<sup>3</sup> 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.