



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

GEF ID:	9045		
Country/Region:	Montenegro		
Project Title:	Comprehensive Environmentally Sound Management of PCBs		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5562 (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:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$3,500,000
Co-financing:	\$19,803,691	Total Project Cost:	\$23,403,691
PIF Approval:	April 28, 2015	Council Approval/Expected:	June 04, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Evelyn Swain	Agency Contact Person:	Jacques Van Engel

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, it is consistent with CW-2 Program 3.	Yes.
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes, it is consistent with the NIP.	Yes.
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and	The project builds sustainable infrastructure to manage PCBs in the country. It has strong support from the private sector and will create a	Strong support from the private sector has been confirmed through co-financing grants which will support sustainability and scale. An innovative public private

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
	innovation?	public private partnership.	partnership for the management of PCBs will be established.
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Yes, incremental reasoning is sound.	Yes.
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Yes, an estimated 900 metric tons of PCBs will be disposed of.	Yes.
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes.	Yes. CSO in particular will play a role and are included in the list of partners.
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	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. Table C is not clear. the second row lists the GEF agency then KAP. Please clarify what the GEF agency will contribute to the project. ES, 3/17/15: All issues have been addressed. PIF clearance is recommended.	
Review Date	Review	March 06, 2015	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 17, 2015	
	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?	No changes from the PIF.	
	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, the cost effectiveness is with in the range that we would expect for this type of project.	
	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.	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	Yes co-financing letters are provided.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	Yes.	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	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.	
	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 ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	Yes.	
	• STAP	Yes the issues of disposal technology and other raised by STAP and Council Members have been addressed.	
	• GEF Council	Yes.	
	• Convention Secretariat	1. To be eligible to receive funding from the financial mechanism defined under Article 13 of the Stockholm	

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
		<p>Convention in accordance with a country must be a developing country or a country with an economy in transition; and a Party to the Convention. Montenegro became a Party to the Stockholm Convention on the 31 March 2011, and is eligible to receive financial assistance in accordance with paragraph 1(a) of the Annex to decision SC-1/9. It transmitted its initial national implementation plan addressing the first twelve POPs, the nine new POPs and Endosulfan on the 20 January 2014.</p> <p>2. The project addresses in a comprehensive way all issues relevant to PCBs management aiming at the final disposal of PCBs and PCB contaminated waste. It takes into consideration the wealth of relevant guidance/experience developed under similar projects and also under the Stockholm and Basel Conventions, including the PCBs Elimination Network activities.</p> <p>3. The project adequately takes into account the major risks, in particular the fact that Montenegro is a relatively small country and a feasibility study will need to evaluate whether procuring a PCB destruction facility is justified or whether exporting the PCB/PCB waste would</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>be more feasible.</p> <p>4. With regard to the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, the project does not address any issue related to both of them. Beneficiaries of the capacity building activities are exclusively operators of the PCB sector and there is no evidence of any socio-economic or livelihood analysis to identify vulnerable groups of the sector.</p>	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	CEO endorsement is recommended.	
Review Date	Review	September 22, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		