



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

GEF ID:	9079		
Country/Region:	Honduras		
Project Title:	Environmentally Sound Management of Products and Wastes Containing POPs and Risks Associated with their Final Disposal		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5615 (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 3;	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$110,000	Project Grant:	\$3,460,000
Co-financing:	\$10,420,000	Total Project Cost:	\$13,990,000
PIF Approval:	April 28, 2015	Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ogawa Masako	Agency Contact Person:	Mr. Jacques Van Engel

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	MO, March 23, 2015. Yes.
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MO, March 23, 2015. Yes.
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	MO, March 23, 2015. Yes. Co-processing is an innovative approach in Honduras. The project will strengthen the National Management Committee (NMC) on Sustainable Management of Chemicals, the central coordination mechanism of important stakeholders including private sectors. Together with the implementation of Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR), this project will address

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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		sustainability, market transformation and scaling.
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	MO, March 23, 2015. Yes.
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	MO, March 23, 2015. Component 3 The paragraph 24 for the Component 2 discussed the possibility of PCB disposal in cement kiln, but the component 3 is not clear enough whether the guideline and manual will be produced for PCB disposal. Please propose appropriate activities to implement environmentally sustainable disposal of PCB in cement kiln. Component 4 The Outcome 4.4 and output 4.3 -4.4 are not discussed in paragraph 40-47. Please revise the section B and/or related paragraphs. Regarding awareness raising, the Component 4 relatively focuses activities in academic sectors, however the barrier 2 discusses lack of awareness in the policy-makers and private sectors, and the paragraph 55 discusses that awareness raising in the Government institution will support increase of budget allocation. Please explain how the identified barriers and sustainability of resource allocation will be addressed through the proposed activities, and revise the activities accordingly. M&E Please include one component for monitoring and evaluation to implement mid-term and terminal evaluation, and documentation. PMC There was no amount for PMC from co-financing. Please provide.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		<p>Co-financing Please explain why the all co-financings are in-kind. The project should expect investment. Also please include co-financing from UNDP.</p> <p>2. Stakeholders Please include Ministry of Education and educational sectors (schools, universities), and describe their roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>4.1.4 Risks According to the Project Implementation Review of the GEF/UNDP project #3806, risks were identified related to National Commission of Sound Environmental Management of Chemicals and the change within the government. Please describe the relevant risks and mitigation activities based on the experiences of previous and current projects.</p> <p>MO March 26, 2015 On the paragraph 38, the number of activities are different from those in the Table B. (3.1.4 and 3.1.5 do not exist in the Table B). Please revise.</p> <p>In the Table B, there are still outcome 4.3 and output 4.3.1. If they are already incorporated in Component 3, please delete from the Table B.</p> <p>In the Table B, the outcome 4.4 and output 4.4.1 duplicate outcome 4.2 and output 4.2.1. Please revise to avoid duplication.</p> <p>The awareness raising activities of output 4.1.3, described in the paragraph 47, are rather fragmented. Please develop these activities with more concrete</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		purpose, coordination with important stakeholders, and integrated manner within the government's policy and strategy before endorsement. MO March 27, 2015 Please describe Project Objective in the Table B. MO March 27, 2015 Comments cleared.
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MO, March 23, 2015. Yes. Women will play important role in community-based activities for appropriate solid waste management.
Availability of Resources	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
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	MO, March 23, 2015. Not at this time. Please address the comments on the Component 2, 4, M&E, PMC, co-financing, stakeholders, and risks. MO March 26, 2015 Not at this time. Some errors should be corrected. MO March 27, 2015 Yes, PIF can be recommended.
Review Date	Review	March 23, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
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 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?	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:	
	• GEFSEC	
	• STAP	
	• GEF Council	
	• Convention Secretariat	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	
Review Date	Review	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	

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.