



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4387		
Country/Region:	Russian Federation		
Project Title:	Phase-out of CFC consumption in the manufacture of aerosol metered-dose inhalers (MDIs) in the Russian Federation		
GEF Agency:	UNIDO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Ozone Depleting Substances
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CHEM-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$2,550,000
Co-financing:	\$5,550,000	Total Project Cost:	\$8,100,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2010
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Laurent Granier	Agency Contact Person:	Mr. Viktor Shatrauka

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes	
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	We do not have the endorsement on file - kindly forward it.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	4. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes - UNIDO has implemented a number of similar projects for the MLF.	
	5. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	UNIDO is co-financing the PPG.	
	6. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	UNIDO has a number of activities in support of the RF, including related activities financed by the GEF in energy efficiency and with HCFC phase out.	

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

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

FSP/MSP review template: updated 9-8-2010

Resource Availability	7. Is the proposed GEF/LDCF/SCCF 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	
Project Consistency	8. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multi-focal area/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	The project addressing one of the largest remaining CFC use in GEF eligible recipient countries is broadly in line with the GEF-5 programming document - even if the programming document does not explicitly refer to CFCs and MDI. The outcome envisaged in terms of ODP phase out is aligned with the GEF results framework.	
	9. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal area/ LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	Yes - see also comment under point 8.	
	10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, and NCSA?	Yes - well described in section A.2 of the PIF.	
	11. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of project outcomes?	The project is assisting two companies in the RF to transition to non-CFC MDIs. These companies are in the business of producing and selling MDIs and are funding most of the cost of the conversion - thereby ensuring sustainability.	
	12. Is (are) the baseline project(s) sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	Yes - the project design relies in part on the data gathered by the recent expert mission of the TEAP mandated by the MOP.	
	13. Is (are) the problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	Yes - the project benefitted from a TEAP mission mandated by the Parties to analyse the situation in the RF.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	The project framework is essentially to implement CFC-free conversions in two	

Project Design		enterprises and is straightforward. The PIF and even more so the request for CEO endorsement should expand on the justification for choice of CFC-free alternative.	
	15. Are the incremental (in the case of GEF TF) or additional (in the case of LDCF/SCCF) activities complementary and appropriate to further address the identified problem?	Yes - the beneficiary enterprises are co-financing close to 70 percent of the project costs.	
	16. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes - GEB is based on ODP abated and corresponding CO2eq.	
	17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?	Yes, the cost effectiveness of this project compares favourably with similar projects recently approved under the MLF.	
	18. Is there a clear description of the socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and of how they will support the achievement of environmental/ adaptation benefits (for SCCF/LDCF)?	Yes, the socio-economic benefits are linked to the unit cost of MDIs for purchase by the end consumer, and are adequately described.	
	19. Is the role of civil society, including indigenous people and gender issues being taken into consideration and addressed appropriately?	The project targets two enterprises so that the role of civil society including indigenous people, and gender issues, is justifiably a minor consideration in project design - with the proviso offered under point (18).	
	20. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	Risks to project implementation appear minor.	
	21. Is the provided documentation consistent?	Yes	

	22. Are key stakeholders (government, local authorities, private sector, CSOs, communities) and their respective roles and involvement in the project identified?	Yes	
	23. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	We expect UNIDO to use its expertise gained with implementing similar projects in different countries in different regions.	
	24. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Unable to assess at PIF stage.	
	25. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	26. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Level is appropriate. The GEF expects project management to be co-financed at the level of the overall co-financing ratio.	
	28. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding per objective appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs according to the incremental/additional cost reasoning principle?	Yes	
	29. Is co-financing confirmed?	Yes - to be further confirmed during appraisal.	
	30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	31. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	There is no TT as such in the ODS focal area - the relevant indicator is ODP tons for which a target is included in the PIF.	
	32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency	33. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		

Responses	• STAP?	none received	
	• Convention Secretariat?	none received	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	none received	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	34. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Yes	
	35. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	36. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* 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.

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* 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.