



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

GEF ID:	9712		
Country/Region:	Tajikistan		
Project Title:	Complete HCFC Phase-out in Tajikistan through Promotion of Zero ODS Low GWP Energy Efficient Technologies		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	6030 (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 5;	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$1,585,430
Co-financing:	\$5,763,800	Total Project Cost:	\$7,349,230
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
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.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	It is not clear as consumption data is missing. ES, 6/22/17: Consumption data has been provided. -Comment cleared	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental	It is not clear if this project will complete the phase-out or if this	

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
	degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	request is only to achieve the 2020 compliance target. ES, 6/22/17: It has been clarified that this project will achieve the 2020 99.5% reduction target. No additional GEF funds will be requested. - Comment cleared	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	This is not clear as current consumption data is missing. ES, 6/6/17: Consumption data has been provided. -Comment cleared	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	The MLF provided the following comments that should be addressed: MLF contributions in arrears 1. As of November 2016, Tajikistan's outstanding contributions to the Multilateral Fund (MLF) amount to US \$79,750 (see UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/77/3, Annex I, Table 3). The Executive Committee has requested the Chief Officer and the Treasurer of the MLF to continue to follow up with Tajikistan and other countries that had contributions outstanding for several years and to report back to the 79th meeting (decision 77/1). The PIF proposal on HCFC phase out does not address the important issue of the arrears in contributions to the MLF in line with	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the GEF operational strategy (GEF/C.6/3, para 5.13). The GEF may wish to give due consideration to this issue and may wish to consider that disbursement of funding for HCFC project be contingent on a firm commitment by the country to pay its arrears to the MLF. Kindly be informed that the Chief Officer and the Treasurer have been approaching countries with outstanding contributions for several years to discuss how this might best be accomplished, including possible schedules of payment and other arrangements.</p> <p>Licensing and quota system</p> <p>2. Please note that since the 68th meeting of the Executive Committee (December 2012) the submission of an HCFC funding request requires confirmation from the relevant Government that an enforceable national system of licensing and quotas for HCFC imports and, where applicable, production and exports is in place and that the system is capable of ensuring the country's compliance with the Montreal Protocol HCFC phase-out schedule (decision 63/17). It is unclear whether the Government of Tajikistan has such a system in</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response																														
		<p>place. On this basis, funding cannot be provided until such a confirmation has been received.</p> <p>HCFC consumption and Montreal Protocol compliance</p> <p>3. The proposal does not include any data on HCFC consumption in the country. Such data should be made available and carefully analysed before funding is provided. For example, Tajikistan's HCFC baseline for compliance is 18.7 ODP tonnes; however, the consumption between 2006 and 2015 as reported to the Ozone Secretariat under Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol, has been below 4 ODP tonnes as shown in the Table below. Furthermore, consumption data for 2016 is required to establish whether Tajikistan is in compliance with the Montreal Protocol (as of 2015, it was).</p> <p>2006-2015 A7 Reported HCFC Consumption in Tajikistan (ODP tonnes)</p> <table><tr><td>2006</td><td>2007</td><td>2008</td><td>2009</td><td>2010</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>2011</td><td>2012</td><td>2013</td><td>2014</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>2015</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>3.6</td><td>3.8</td><td>3.9</td><td>2.6</td><td>2.8</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>2.9</td><td>3.03</td><td>2.28</td><td>2.01</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>1.66</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010		2011	2012	2013	2014		2015				3.6	3.8	3.9	2.6	2.8		2.9	3.03	2.28	2.01		1.66				
2006	2007	2008	2009	2010																													
	2011	2012	2013	2014																													
	2015																																
3.6	3.8	3.9	2.6	2.8																													
	2.9	3.03	2.28	2.01																													
	1.66																																

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>4. The proposal seems to indicate that the entire HCFC consumption is in the refrigeration servicing sector; however, this is not entirely clear. The final proposal should include a clear indication of the sector (or sectors) consuming HCFCs.</p> <p>Relation to previous projects</p> <p>5. Tajikistan is part of the GEF regional project 4102 (Initial implementation of accelerate HCFC phase-out in the CEIT region), which in accordance to the GEF project database was approved on 30 August 2012 and completed on 30 July 2015. Under such project US \$1 million were directly allocated to Tajikistan (plus an additional estimated US \$450,000 from common activities for the four countries included in the proposal). Since the approval of the project in 2012, HCFC consumption has decreased up to a level of 1.66 ODP tonnes in 2015.</p> <p>HCFC baseline and eligible level of funding</p> <p>6. Given that the HCFC baseline of Tajikistan is below 360 mt (18.7 ODP tonnes or 340 mt), and that</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>consumption appears to be only in the refrigeration servicing sector, the level of funding for HCFC phase out is determined by paragraph (c)(xii) of decision 74/50. According to this decision, the total level of funding for complete HCFC phase out in Tajikistan should be up to US \$1,800,000. Taking into consideration that Tajikistan has already received US \$1,450,000 from the previous HCFC phase out project, the level of funding to phase out the remaining HCFC consumption should not surpass US \$350,000. This level of funding is consistent with MLF guidelines. In addition, Tajikistan is eligible to receive US \$70,000 for the preparation of an ODS alternatives survey.</p> <p>7. Based on the above, the level of US \$1,941,720 requested from the GEF to phase out the remaining HCFC consumption is neither justified nor consistent with MLF policies. In addition, the level of funding requested for Tajikistan is similar to that requested for Uzbekistan, which is a country around four times larger in population and HCFC consumption.</p> <p>8. In line with MLF policies the</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>proposal should clearly indicate whether this is a final plan to completely phase out HCFC consumption, or if this request is only to achieve the 2020 compliance target and a further request for funding will be submitted in the future to help address the remaining 0.5 per cent of the HCFC baseline.</p> <p>Ratification of the Kigali Amendment</p> <p>9. It is also noted that the proposal includes technical assistance activities that would help Uzbekistan ratify the Kigali Amendment. Is there a firm commitment from the Government to ratify the amendment, and when?</p> <p>Retrofit</p> <p>10. The proposal includes demonstration projects on HCFC replacement with zero ODS/low-GWP alternatives. It is not clear where these replacements will take place, but based on the experience in other countries this seems to refer to replacement of HCFC-22 (or retrofit) by another refrigerant in operating refrigeration and air-conditioning systems. The proposal will require clarifying what technologies are being proposed and in the case of</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>flammable technologies, if there are standards, protocols or regulations established. Kindly note that as a result of extensive discussions about retrofits during the last ExCom meetings, the ExCom decided to include in the approval projects or activities that proposed the retrofit of HCFC-based refrigeration and air-conditioning equipment to flammable or toxic refrigerants, that the ExCom notes that, if the country were to decide to proceed with retrofits and associated servicing to flammable and toxic refrigerants in refrigeration and air-conditioning equipment originally designed for non-flammable substances, it would do so assuming all associated responsibilities and risks and only in accordance with the relevant standards and protocols (decisions 72/17 and 73/34).</p> <p>PPG</p> <p>11. It is noted that a total of US \$50,000 are being requested to prepare the final proposal. Taking into consideration that GEF operational policies for financing ozone protection activities should be consistent with those of the MLF, a guideline for the preparation of proposals including relevant MLF</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>policies and decisions could be sent to the GEG for reference. Please note that this guideline includes elements that need to be included in HCFC phase out proposals, such as HCFC consumption baseline, recent consumption, and distribution of consumption by sectors, among others.</p> <p>ES, 6/22/17: The agency took into account and provided response to all MLF comments. - Comment cleared</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes	
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.	
	• 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?	<p>Not at this time. Several issues need to be addressed.</p> <p>ES, 6/22/17: PIF clearance is recommended.</p>	
Review Date	Review	March 01, 2017	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)	June 22, 2017	
	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?		
	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)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat	<p>The MLF provided the following comments:</p> <p>MLF contributions in arrears</p> <p>1. As of November 2016,</p>	

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>Tajikistan's outstanding contributions to the Multilateral Fund (MLF) amount to US \$79,750 (see UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/77/3, Annex I, Table 3). The Executive Committee has requested the Chief Officer and the Treasurer of the MLF to continue to follow up with Tajikistan and other countries that had contributions outstanding for several years and to report back to the 79th meeting (decision 77/1). The PIF proposal on HCFC phase out does not address the important issue of the arrears in contributions to the MLF in line with the GEF operational strategy (GEF/C.6/3, para 5.13). The GEF may wish to give due consideration to this issue and may wish to consider that disbursement of funding for HCFC project be contingent on a firm commitment by the country to pay its arrears to the MLF. Kindly be informed that the Chief Officer and the Treasurer have been approaching countries with outstanding contributions for several years to discuss how this might best be accomplished, including possible schedules of payment and other arrangements.</p> <p>Licensing and quota system</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>2. Please note that since the 68th meeting of the Executive Committee (December 2012) the submission of an HCFC funding request requires confirmation from the relevant Government that an enforceable national system of licensing and quotas for HCFC imports and, where applicable, production and exports is in place and that the system is capable of ensuring the country's compliance with the Montreal Protocol HCFC phase-out schedule (decision 63/17). It is unclear whether the Government of Tajikistan has such a system in place. On this basis, funding cannot be provided until such a confirmation has been received.</p> <p>HCFC consumption and Montreal Protocol compliance</p> <p>3. The proposal does not include any data on HCFC consumption in the country. Such data should be made available and carefully analysed before funding is provided. For example, Tajikistan's HCFC baseline for compliance is 18.7 ODP tonnes; however, the consumption between 2006 and 2015 as reported to the Ozone Secretariat</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments																														
		<p>under Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol, has been below 4 ODP tonnes as shown in the Table below. Furthermore, consumption data for 2016 is required to establish whether Tajikistan is in compliance with the Montreal Protocol (as of 2015, it was).</p> <p>2006-2015 A7 Reported HCFC Consumption in Tajikistan (ODP tonnes)</p> <table><tr><td>2006</td><td>2007</td><td>2008</td><td>2009</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td>2010</td><td>2011</td><td>2012</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td>2013</td><td>2014</td><td>2015</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>3.6</td><td>3.8</td><td>3.9</td><td>2.6</td><td>2.8</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>2.9</td><td>3.03</td><td>2.28</td><td>2.01</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>1.66</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table> <p>4. The proposal seems to indicate that the entire HCFC consumption is in the refrigeration servicing sector; however, this is not entirely clear. The final proposal should include a clear indication of the sector (or sectors) consuming HCFCs.</p> <p>Relation to previous projects</p> <p>5. Tajikistan is part of the GEF regional project 4102 (Initial implementation of accelerate HCFC phase-out in the CEIT region), which in accordance to the GEF project</p>	2006	2007	2008	2009			2010	2011	2012			2013	2014	2015		3.6	3.8	3.9	2.6	2.8		2.9	3.03	2.28	2.01		1.66				
2006	2007	2008	2009																														
	2010	2011	2012																														
	2013	2014	2015																														
3.6	3.8	3.9	2.6	2.8																													
	2.9	3.03	2.28	2.01																													
	1.66																																

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>database was approved on 30 August 2012 and completed on 30 July 2015. Under such project US \$1 million were directly allocated to Tajikistan (plus an additional estimated US \$450,000 from common activities for the four countries included in the proposal). Since the approval of the project in 2012, HCFC consumption has decreased up to a level of 1.66 ODP tonnes in 2015.</p> <p>HCFC baseline and eligible level of funding</p> <p>6. Given that the HCFC baseline of Tajikistan is below 360 mt (18.7 ODP tonnes or 340 mt), and that consumption appears to be only in the refrigeration servicing sector, the level of funding for HCFC phase out is determined by paragraph (c)(xii) of decision 74/50. According to this decision, the total level of funding for complete HCFC phase out in Tajikistan should be up to US \$1,800,000. Taking into consideration that Tajikistan has already received US \$1,450,000 from the previous HCFC phase out project, the level of funding to phase out the remaining HCFC consumption should not surpass US</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>\$350,000. This level of funding is consistent with MLF guidelines. In addition, Tajikistan is eligible to receive US \$70,000 for the preparation of an ODS alternatives survey.</p> <p>7. Based on the above, the level of US \$1,941,720 requested from the GEF to phase out the remaining HCFC consumption is neither justified nor consistent with MLF policies. In addition, the level of funding requested for Tajikistan is similar to that requested for Uzbekistan, which is a country around four times larger in population and HCFC consumption.</p> <p>8. In line with MLF policies the proposal should clearly indicate whether this is a final plan to completely phase out HCFC consumption, or if this request is only to achieve the 2020 compliance target and a further request for funding will be submitted in the future to help address the remaining 0.5 per cent of the HCFC baseline.</p> <p>Ratification of the Kigali Amendment</p> <p>9. It is also noted that the</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>proposal includes technical assistance activities that would help Uzbekistan ratify the Kigali Amendment. Is there a firm commitment from the Government to ratify the amendment, and when? Retrofit</p> <p>10. The proposal includes demonstration projects on HCFC replacement with zero ODS/low-GWP alternatives. It is not clear where these replacements will take place, but based on the experience in other countries this seems to refer to replacement of HCFC-22 (or retrofit) by another refrigerant in operating refrigeration and air-conditioning systems. The proposal will require clarifying what technologies are being proposed and in the case of flammable technologies, if there are standards, protocols or regulations established. Kindly note that as a result of extensive discussions about retrofits during the last ExCom meetings, the ExCom decided to include in the approval projects or activities that proposed the retrofit of HCFC-based refrigeration and air-conditioning equipment to flammable or toxic refrigerants, that the ExCom notes that, if the country were to decide to proceed with</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>retrofits and associated servicing to flammable and toxic refrigerants in refrigeration and air-conditioning equipment originally designed for non-flammable substances, it would do so assuming all associated responsibilities and risks and only in accordance with the relevant standards and protocols (decisions 72/17 and 73/34).</p> <p>PPG</p> <p>11. It is noted that a total of US \$50,000 are being requested to prepare the final proposal. Taking into consideration that GEF operational policies for financing ozone protection activities should be consistent with those of the MLF, a guideline for the preparation of proposals including relevant MLF policies and decisions could be sent to the GEG for reference. Please note that this guideline includes elements that need to be included in HCFC phase out proposals, such as HCFC consumption baseline, recent consumption, and distribution of consumption by sectors, among others.</p>	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	This project will accelerate the HCFC phase-out in Tajikistan to achieve the 2020 compliance	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>objectives under the Montreal protocol. This project will help to complete the phase-out of HCFCs in the country. The global environmental benefits achieved will include reductions of 1.7 ODP tons, as well as climate benefits by switching to low-GWP and energy efficient alternatives.</p> <p>The project will facilitate the implementation of national legislation on HCFC phase-out and import/export controls. It will strengthen the capacity of customs control, put in place standards for natural refrigerants, and strengthen capacity for maintenance and repair of HCFC equipment. The project will also focus on strengthening the HCFC re-use system and demonstrate the use of zero-ODP and low-GWP energy efficient refrigerant technologies. The project will also have a component on increasing public awareness.</p> <p>This project will help the country meet the obligations of the Montreal Protocol and will consider the recent Kigali Amendment.</p>	
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

