



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	<b>5300</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Regional (Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Russian Federation, Ukraine)</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Initial Technical Assistance for the Regional Demonstration Project for Coordinated Management of ODS and POPs Disposal in the Russian Federation, Ukraine, Belarus, Kazakhstan and Armenia</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNIDO</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CHEM-1; CHEM-2;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$275,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$18,000,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$81,560,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$99,835,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>March 03, 2014</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Evelyn Swain</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Mr. Yuri Sorokin</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Yes, the countries are all eligible for POPs and all except for Armenia is eligible for ODS. Armenia is only receiving POPs funding.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	<p>Endorsement letters are missing from Armenia and Kazakhstan.</p> <p>ES, 1/15/13, Missing endorsement letters should be submitted by the time of project approval.</p> <p>ES, 4/29/13- All endorsement letters have been submitted.</p>	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> 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)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b> ? <i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>	Yes, this project is in line with the chemicals focal area for ODS and POPs. This is not a multi focal area project, it is a multi chemical project within the chemicals focal area. Please correct the project type.  ES, 4,15,13: Project type has been corrected. Comment cleared.	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	Yes, it is consistent with NIP priorities. Is this consistent with the country programs or these countries?	
	6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b> , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>Component 3: Please clarify what the incentives for collection of ODS and POPs will include in 3.5.</p> <p>ES, 4/15/13: Incentives provided. During PPG stage the appropriate incentives should be investigated and elaborated at the time of CEO endorsement. Fees at the time of disposal may result in improper disposal to avoid fees.</p> <p>Activities in 3.1.3 are related to the Basel Convention and therefore should be done through co-financing only.</p> <p>ES, 4/15/13: Addressed, comment cleared.</p> <p>Component 4: Please explain the public private partnership in 4.2.</p> <p>ES, 4/15/13: Addressed, comment cleared</p> <p>Component 5: There is a discrepancy between 5.4 and 5.1.4 one says that the project will achieve destruction of 2,500 MT POPs and 280 MT of ODS per year and the other says that the projects will achieve these amounts over the life of the project. If these amounts are over the life of the project how is building new facilities be justified and sustained?</p> <p>ES, 4/15/13 Addressed, Comment</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>cleared.</p> <p>Please explain 5.1.2. Why are laboratories needed for transportation and vehicle monitoring?</p> <p>ES, 4/15/13: Addressed, Comment cleared.</p> <p>Component 6: Please clarify how much PCBs will be destroyed in Armenia and how this fits in with the project.</p> <p>ES, 4/15/13: Addressed, Comment cleared.</p> <p>Is there a need for training local NGOs in 6.1.4</p> <p>ES, 4/15/13: Addressed, Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>There is a discrepancy between what the GEBs will be for the project as mentioned above in question 7. The amount of benefits achieved by the project needs to be clarified.</p> <p>What are the benefits that will come from recycling of collected ODS appliances. Will the PCBs and mercury contained in collected appliances be addressed.</p> <p>Will ODS containing foams be collected and properly managed from appliances?</p> <p>ES, 4/15/13: All comments addressed, GEB's clarified.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Yes.	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	FAO is considering an obsolete pesticide project in this region. How will this project coordinate with the FAO project?  ES, 4/15/13: Addressed, comment cleared.	
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency</li> </ul>	The sustainability and potential for scale up of this project need to be addressed. Please clarify how this project will be sustained, and if there is a need in the countries for the facilities which the projects proposes to develop.  ES, 4/15/13: Addressed, comment cleared. Carbon trading should be elaborated at the time of endorsement.  This project is innovative because it will	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	experience. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	demonstrate co-destruction of ODS and POPs waste.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>It is unclear if the GEF funding is appropriate because it is unclear what the benefits of the project will be. However, in general the funding is too high. The cost effectiveness for the POPs disposal is above what is usually funded. Please clarify the high cost of ODS destruction.</p> <p>ES, 4/15/13: The cost effectiveness has been clarified and elaborated. Comment cleared.</p>	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	<p>UNIDO brings \$300,000 cash and \$150,000 in-kind.</p> <p>The majority of co-financing is from the private sector, please elaborate on what companies are to be targeted and how the funds from these enterprises will be integrated in the project.</p> <p>ES, 4/15/13: Addressed, comment cleared.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Co-financing will also come from national governments, however financing letters are not included.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	PMC is appropriate at 4%.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		FAO has provided comments which should be addressed.
Secretariat Recommendation			
	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval</b>	Not at this time several issues need to be	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>being recommended?</b>	<p>addressed.</p> <p>ES, 4/15/13: PIF approval is recommended pending receipt of endorsement letters.</p> <p>ES, 4/29/13: All endorsement letters have been received. PIF approval is recommended.</p> <p>ES, 1/28/14: The budget has been reduced. A scale up project is expected in GEF6. PIF approval has been recommended.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>During PPG stage the appropriate incentives should be investigated and elaborated at the time of CEO endorsement. Fees at the time of disposal may result in improper disposal to avoid fees.</p> <p>Carbon trading should be elaborated at the time of endorsement.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	April 02, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 15, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 29, 2013	

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**