



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

GEF ID:	9357		
Country/Region:	Paraguay		
Project Title:	Strengthening the Environmentally-sound Management and Disposal of PCBs in the Electricity Sector in Paraguay		
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:	\$250,000	Project Grant:	\$3,953,250
Co-financing:	\$14,485,000	Total Project Cost:	\$18,438,250
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Evelyn Swain	Agency Contact Person:	Alfredo Cueva Jácome

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>	<p>This project is in line with the GEF-6 strategy CW2 Program 3, however it is not clear why funds are being requested from CW1 Program 1.</p> <p>ES, 4/7/16: This project should not request funds from Program 1. The funds should come from program 3.</p> <p>ES, 4/14/16: Funding is coming from Program 3 in line with the GEF-6</p>	

<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
		strategy. -Comment cleared	
	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 in line with the country's 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 innovation?	<p>For ewaste one of the components will develop a sustainable business model for the treatment of ewaste, including attracting investment from the private sector. The project will also contribute to establishing a circular economy through enhancement of recovering and recycling valuable components like metals, resulting in sustainable financing after the GEF project. Public awareness raising on the issue should also push market transformation.</p> <p>For PCBs national policy and regulatory development through the project will lead to sustainability and scale up at the national level. The significant involvement of the electrical utility will also support sustainability.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Yes, the project will build off of baseline activities for both PCBs and ewaste. This project will also build off of the regional components of the GEF funded ewaste project in Latin	

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

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>America.</p> <p>ES, 4/14/16: The project will be developed in line with the regional project in Latin America.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>The GEBs that will be generated through the PCB components are significantly more costly than the typical PCB disposal project. Please reduce or justify the cost.</p> <p>ES, 4/11/16: Under the new PIF the cost effectiveness of the PCB component has improved but is still higher than expected and should be reduced further.</p> <p>ES, 4/14/16: The cost of the PCB components have been reduced. - Comment cleared</p> <p>It is not clear what kind of PCB disposal technology will be used to treat PCBs and PCB containing equipment. It is also not clear if the PCBs will be treated within the country or exported for treatment. Please provide additional information on how PCBs will be treated.</p> <p>ES, 4/11/16: The options for PCB treatment have been discussed further in the PIF and will be finalized during the PPG stage. The project should</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>only addressed closed applications of PCBs, not open applications because the technology is unknown. - Comment cleared</p> <p>The project will dispose of 400 tons of PCB contaminated equipment, 300 of which is at the facility where a recent fire occurred. Please provide information on the site of the fire. How much of the equipment from the facility was effected by the fire? How do you know that there are PCBs left in the burnt equipment or has it all been released during the fire? It is clear from the PIF that while the GEF project will help dispose of PCB contaminated equipment the project will not support the cleanup from the fire, the country will seek other financing for cleanup activities.</p> <p>ES, 4/11/16: The project has increased the amount of PCBs it will deal with to 700 tons based on additional information gained after the fire. - Comment cleared</p> <p>Since the PCB fire there was significant rainfall and potential flooding in the country. Has flooding effected the PCB equipment? What are the associated risks if any?</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		ES, 4/11/16: It is clear that these are concerns and the project will take this into consideration. -Comment cleared	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>Gender is taken into consideration. However, why in Output 1.1.2 will training target only 15 or 50 participants?</p> <p>ES, 4/11/16: Gender will be further considered during PPG. -Comment cleared</p>	
<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)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>PPG of \$125,000 is requested which is above the norm, please provide additional information on the need for this in relation to the fire, including information about the site, how much of the site effected, why is sit containment necessary, is there an immediate risk to people and the environment?</p> <p>PIF clearance is not recommended due to pending questions.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>ES, 4/11/16: There are still two issues pending the cost effectiveness of PCB disposal and which Program GEF funding is coming from. PIF clearance is not recommended due to these pending issues. The increased PPG requested has been justified.</p> <p>AS, 4/25/16 - Please drop the components on e-waste as they do not fit within the framework of this project and additional information is needed to consider this component in the future. Please drop the references to open applications as guidance is being developed on identification, measuring and handling of POPs in open applications including PCN and PCBs.</p> <p>AS 4/29/16 - Comments cleared. The project is consistent with assisting Paraguay in dealing with it's PCB accident and sustainably managing and phasing out PCB's to meet it's 2025/28 goals. The PM recommends this project for technical clearance to be included in a future work program.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	January 12, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 11, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 14, 2016	

## 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?		
	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		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	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.