



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

GEF ID:	<b>9214</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Mexico</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Environmentally Sound Management and Destruction of PCBs in Mexico: Second Phase</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5479 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Chemicals and Waste</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CW-2 Program 3;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$4,800,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$20,000,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$24,800,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>October 01, 2015</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Evelyn Swain</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Mr. Jacques Van Engel</b>

<b>PIF Review</b>			
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 this project is consistent with CW-2 Program 3.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes, this project is consistent with the Stockholm Convention NIP.	
<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	Yes, this project will eliminate 5,000 tons of PCBs in Mexico. It will build national capacity to manage PCBs which will also for scale up across the	

<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)?

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

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	innovation?	<p>country to ensure environmentally sound management of PCBs. The project will look as innovative approaches to update existing incineration facilities in the country.</p> <p>At the time of CEO endorsement it should be clear what will happen with regards to the use of cement kilns in the project. If cement kilns will be used in the project UNDP should provide details of how they will achieve international standards for PCB destruction.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Yes, this project build off of the initial GEF PCB project.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Yes, the project objectives are clear and GEBs are appropriate. There is also appropriate participation of the private sector in the project.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes.	
<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?		
	• The focal area allocation?	Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	The Program Manager recommends CEO PIF clearance.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	August 12, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	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?		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		

<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.

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEF Council</li> <li>• Convention Secretariat</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		