



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

GEF ID:	4737		
Country/Region:	Armenia		
Project Title:	Elimination of Obsolete Pesticide Stockpiles and Addressing POPs Contaminated Sites within a Sound Chemicals Management Framework		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4905 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	POPs
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CHEM-1; CHEM-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,700,000
Co-financing:	\$19,417,240	Total Project Cost:	\$24,117,240
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ibrahima Sow	Agency Contact Person:	Dr. Suely Carvalho

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. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	UNDP has significant experience working in Armenia.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes, UNDP has staff capacity in Armenia.	
	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the		

*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Resource Availability	Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	None	
	• the focal area allocation?	None	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	None	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	None	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	None	
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?	None	
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	Yes, the project is consistent with Armenia's NIP.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Sustainability will be achieved to some degree through training experts, building capacity for storing waste, and public awareness. ES, January 12, 2012: Project sustainability elaborated. -Comment cleared	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	The baseline project is well defined. However, further clarification is required on the rotating fund, specifically how it will work and who will manage it.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		ES, January 12, 2012: Brief description on the potential need for the rotating fund provided, however specific details not provided, will be addressed at PPG stage.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	Yes, GEF funded portion is incremental to the baseline project. However it should be improved by clearly describing how GEF intervention compliments baseline projects to maximize impacts and create global environmental benefits. ES, January 12, 2012: Incremental reasoning provided. -Comment cleared	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Page 9 of the PIF mentions an FAO assessment project on the Nubarashen site. Please clarify if 1.1.1 is duplicating the FAO project on site assessment. ES, January 12, 2012: Comment cleared Please indicate where the people to train will be coming from. If it is from private sector companies doing waste management then why do we need to pay for their training? Is the management of these wastes going to be a one of activity?	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>ES, January 12, 2012: Trainees will mostly come from government and NGOs, not industry. -Comment cleared</p> <p>Is there a foreseeable future need for storage of non-POPS chemicals? Will this project be dealing with the entire amount of chemicals at this site in which case the disposal activity can be done in one step with only a temporary storage area? Please elaborate on the need for permanent storage.</p> <p>ES, January 12, 2012: Need for storage justified. -Comment cleared</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the project will achieve benefits of environmentally sound destruction of up to 1,500 t of obsolete pesticides and remediation of up to 2,000 t of moderately contaminated material. Please indicate what type of contaminated material will be remediated.</p> <p>ES, January 12, 2012: Soil/surface material and clean up debris will be remediated. -Comment cleared</p>	
	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, 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?</p>	<p>Yes, gender dimensions are addressed and gender focused NGO is involved in the project.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role</p>	<p>Public participation is addressed. PIF indicated a well developed civil society whose involvement is encouraged for</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	identified and addressed properly?	the project to raise awareness and advocate project achievements.	
	18. 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)	Climate risks including the risk of increased insistence of severe weather should be addressed. Project delay is also a risk identified in the PIF in B.4 and counter measures should be proposed to mitigate the risk. ES, January 12, 2012: Discussion on climate risks provided. -Comment cleared	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, the project is consistent with other initiatives including two GEF 4 MSPs.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Implementation arrangements need clarification. ES, January 12, 2012: Implementation arrangements clarified. -Comment cleared	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Project management cost is appropriate at 4.8%. However PMC co-financing ratio is low, it should be at least equivalent to overall co-financing ratio. ES, January 12, 2012: PMC co-	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		financing is at an appropriate level. - Comment cleared	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The co-financing per objective is below what is expected. Co-financing is 1:1.32, guidance has been provided to all agencies stating a requirement of 1:4 co-financing ratio. ES, January 12, 2012: Co-financing is now 1:4.1. -Comment cleared	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	49% of indicated co-financing is cash.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	UNDP is providing 200,000 cash.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	NA	
	• Convention Secretariat?	NA	
	• Council comments? • Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Not at this time, several issues need clarification, including: 1) Low co-financing 2) Baseline project	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		3) Project design 3) Identifying risks ES, January 12, 2012: Issues have been addressed. PIF clearance is recommended.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 08, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 12, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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. Greyed areas in each section do not need 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.