



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

GEF ID:	9683		
Country/Region:	Congo DR		
Project Title:	Promotion of Waste to Energy Options for Sustainable Urban Management in the Democratic Republic of the Congo		
GEF Agency:	UNIDO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-1 Program 1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$3,959,589
Co-financing:	\$15,992,400	Total Project Cost:	\$19,951,989
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ming Yang	Agency Contact Person:	Josy Thomas,

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	11/29/2016 MY Yes, this project is aligned with GEF6 CCM-1: To promote innovation, technology transfer and supportive policies and strategies.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	11/29/2016 MY Not completed at this time. Please estimate how much this project will contribute to the Nationally Determined Contributions of the country to the UNFCCC in the Paris	

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)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Agreement. For example, in its INDCs to the UNFCCC, the country pledged to reduce approximately 17% of its emission level against the baseline year of 2000. How many percentage will the project contribute to the pledged target?</p> <p>1/10/2017 MY Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p>	
Project Design	<p>3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>11/29/2016 MY Not at this time. In Section 1.1 on pages 4 and 5, the PIF presents rich information on local environment issues and drivers, but not enough on global environment issues and drivers. Please</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus on global environment issues. Specifically, present the total GHG emissions and municipal solid waste related methane (CH₄) emissions of the country over the most recent years (2015 or 2014 or 2013). Tell readers how much CH₄ (in cubic meters) will be captured and used through this project. 2. Identify any existing or planned technologies in the country that use landfill gas (LFG) to generate power. 3. Undertake a brief economic/financial analysis to justify 	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>financial viability, sustainability, market transformation, and scaling up of LFG to power technologies in the cities, taking into account the tariffs between \$0.04/kWh and \$0.11/kWh.</p> <p>1/10/2017 MY Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>11/29/2016 MY Yes. The GEF incremental investment will be for LFG technologies to generate power by using the existing and on-going landfills (baseline technologies and facilities). If costs of generating electricity from LFG in the selected four cities are cheaper than the existing cost of electricity production from hydro power plants in the country, the incremental reasoning is sound (see the comments in Box 3).</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>11/29/2016 MY Not completed yet. Please articulate project outputs 2.1.2 on page 1. What kind of and how many waste collection infrastructure facilities will be deployed? Under project outputs 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 on page 2, please use a specific word such as "installed" or "operationalized" to replace "implemented". Please revise the</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>whole PIF accordingly to make it consistent.</p> <p>1/10/2017 MY Not completed at this time. In the output 2.1.2 Table B on page 1, please indicate clearly that this project will only contribute 15 (24-9) communes in Kinshasa city in efficient waste collection infrastructure (not 24).</p> <p>3/3/2017 MY Yes. Comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>11/29/2016 MY Not completed yet. Please identify if and how this project is relevant to indigenous people.</p> <p>1/10/2017 MY Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p>	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	<p>11/29/2016 MY Yes, as of 11/30/2016, this country has more than \$20 million in STAR.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	<p>11/29/2016 MY Yes, as of 11/30/2016, this country has more than \$5 million in CCM of</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		STAR.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	11/29/2016 MY Not applicable	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	11/29/2016 MY Not applicable	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 	11/29/2016 MY Not applicable	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>11/29/2016 MY Not at this time. Please address comments in Boxes: 2, 3 5, and 6.</p> <p>1/10/2017 MY Not at this time. Please address comments in Box 5.</p> <p>3/3/2017 MY Yes. All comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p>	
Review Date	Review	November 29, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	January 10, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 03, 2017	

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)		
	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		
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.