



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

GEF ID:	9078		
Country/Region:	Philippines		
Project Title:	Implementation of PCB Management Programs for Electric Cooperatives and Safe e-wastes Management		
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-1 Program 1; CW-2 Program 3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$160,000	Project Grant:	\$6,200,000
Co-financing:	\$35,920,000	Total Project Cost:	\$42,280,000
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:	Carmela R. Centeno

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. Philippines updated NIP and identified WEEE and PCB disposal as priority.
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. Financial arrangement by the national bank for PCB disposal is innovative policy and will achieve sustainability.
	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 1 Please explain how to implement inventory of PBDE of

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
		<p>output 1.1.2. Please explain the roles of Local Governments and private sectors identified in EPR, to be played in WEEE disposal, in order to understand why the municipal facility, not private facility, will be developed as demonstration.</p> <p>Please explain candidate technologies and/or processes of BAT/BET demonstration in the paragraph 31-34. People in informal recycling sectors are usually knowledgeable in waste types and its value. Please consider to employ them in the formal facility.</p> <p>Component 2 It is not clear whether the activities described in the paragraph 28 and 29 are parts of baseline or will be implemented in this project. Please clarify.</p> <p>Component 3 Knowledge Management is important activity not only for this project but also for whole POPs management policy implementation. There is a concern that if a website is developed as the "project website", instead of the government's website, it will not be maintained after project closure. Please consider to develop knowledge management including website as a part of policy implementation frameworks of the government so that the sustainability is achieved.</p> <p>2. Stakeholder Please include local governments as stakeholders.</p> <p>4. Risks According to the annual reports of the on-going POPs projects, the ratings of 2 projects were both moderately unsatisfactory, and several risks were identified. Please describe the relevant risks and mitigation activities based on the experiences of previous and current</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		<p>projects.</p> <p>MO March 30, 2015 Comment cleared. In the project document for CEO endorsement, please include detail private sectors' role, especially producers' role identified in EPR (Extended Producers Responsibility).</p>
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>MO March 23, 2015. Please explain current idea of incentive package to alternative livelihood for informal sector. Please explain the role of Bangaray leaders, and the activities of the Material Recovery Facility and SWM program in the paragraph 58 within this proposed project. In addition, please explain how gender consideration will be mainstreamed into the project.</p> <p>MO March 30, 2015 Comments cleared.</p>
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?	<p>MO, March 23, 2015. Not at this time. Please address the comments on the Component 1, 2, 3, stakeholders, risks and socio-economic aspects.</p> <p>MO, March 30, 2015 Yes, PIF can be recommended.</p>
Review Date	Review	March 23, 2015

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	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	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
	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?	
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.