



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:	\$140,000	Project Grant:	\$4,700,000
Co-financing:	\$19,284,384	Total Project Cost:	\$24,124,384
PIF Approval:	February 15, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	June 07, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Lulwa Ali	Agency Contact Person:	Mr. Jacques

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	Yes LA, November 10, 2014
	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.	Yes LA, November 10, 2014
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	NA
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes, UNDP has staff capacity in Armenia.	Yes LA, November 10, 2014
	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	No
	• the focal area allocation?	None	No
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	None	No
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	None	No
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	No	No
	• focal area set-aside?	None	No
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes	Yes LA, November 10, 2014
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes	Yes LA, November 10, 2014
	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.	Yes LA, November 10, 2014
	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	Yes The additional clarifications on the sustainability of project outcomes provided in the response to the GEFSEC comments are very helpful. It is recommended that these clarifications be incorporated in the relevant sections of the project document LA, November 10, 2014
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address,	The baseline project is well defined. However, further clarification is required on the rotating fund,	Yes A clarification regarding the rotating fund co-financing mechanism was

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	specifically how it will work and who will manage it. 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.	provided in Annex B of the request for CEO endorsement. It indicates that arrangements for the rotating fund co-financing have not been realized, and the project co-financing structure is only based on committed national co-financing. However the Government will continue to solicit such co-funding to reduce its State budget commitment. LA, November 10, 2014
	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?		Yes. The cost effectiveness is demonstrated, as an example, by the unit price quotation for the destruction of POPs pesticide wastes (\$2,000/t) which is much less compared for the same in earlier projects (\$5000/t). LA, November 10, 2014
	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	Yes LA, November 10, 2014
	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	Activity 1.3.1 indicates that some work to be arranged independently by FAO. Please clarify what measures/ countermeasures are to be taken in the project in the event of delay/ un-materialization of FAO's intervention and how this will affect the project outcome.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>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?</p> <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>On page 19 of the project document, please check and correct HCH quantity (is it 43.4 t as is in Table 3 or 48 t?)</p> <p>LA, November 10, 2014</p> <p>LA, December 11, 2014: Clarification on FAO commitment in activity 1.3.1 as well as backstopping measures in case of unanticipated failure of the FAO project were provided and are reflected at relevant sections of the project document - comment cleared.</p> <p>LA, December 11, 2014: Quantity of HCH in the table was a typo error and was corrected- comment cleared</p>
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<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>Yes</p> <p>LA, November 10, 2014</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	Yes, gender dimensions are addressed and gender focused NGO is involved in the project.	Yes LA, November 10, 2014
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Public participation is addressed. PIF indicated a well developed civil society whose involvement is encouraged for the project to raise awareness and advocate project achievements.	Yes LA, November 10, 2014
	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	Yes LA, November 10, 2014
	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.	Yes LA, November 10, 2014
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Implementation arrangements need clarification. ES, January 12, 2012: Implementation arrangements clarified. -Comment cleared	Yes Coordination with the executing agency and other entities involved in the project implementation is adequately addressed. LA, November 10, 2014
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		No. Project design including the expected FA outcomes and outputs for the project components are different from those outlined in the PIF. Although these differences are anticipated based on the PPG

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>outcomes, however, this has not been clarified/ justified in the CEO document.</p> <p>The co-financing of components 2 in substantially lower than those indicated in PIF for the same component. Please provide clarification for the change in the estimate between PIF and CEO endorsement documents.</p> <p>LA, November 10, 2014</p> <p>LA, December 11, 2014: Justification/ clarification to the change of the outcomes and outputs compared with those of the original PIF was provided. Same applies to the co-financing of component 2 which is now adequately addressed in the revised CEO endorsement request. Comment cleared.</p>
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		<p>Yes</p> <p>LA, November 10, 2014</p>
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>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.</p> <p>ES, January 12, 2012: PMC co-financing is at an appropriate level. - Comment cleared</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>PMC co-financing was increased to satisfy GEF criteria</p> <p>LA, November 10, 2014</p>
	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	<p>Yes</p> <p>LA, November 10, 2014</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		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.	<p>Yes confirmed co-financing is provided. However, two points need clarification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The letter of OSCE co-financing confirmation indicate a total of 266,000 Euro (350,000 USD) inclusive of 10,500 Euro (14, 384 USD) in-kind contribution. While Section C of the CEO endorsement request, indicates a total of 364,384 USD (267,500 Euro). Please check. - The amount of total resources required on page 1 of the project document is different from the total allocated resources on the same page. Please check . <p>LA, November 10, 2014</p> <p>LA, 11 December, 2014: The difference noted in the OSCE co-financing was attributed to the variation of exchange rate of Euro versus US\$. For similar situations in the future, it is advised to use current exchange rate to ensure more accurate estimates of co-financing. â€“ Comment cleared.</p> <p>LA, 11, December, 2014: Total resources difference is due to the fact that the Czech Trust Fund (US\$</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			60,000) has been already utilized in the scope of the full sized project preparation stage- comment cleared.
	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.	Yes LA, November 10, 2014
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes LA, November 10, 2014
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes LA, November 10, 2014
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	NA	The panel has commended the project and its comprehensive approach and did not have comments for the agency to respond to.
	• Convention Secretariat?	NA	Comments from the BRS secretariate indicated that the project is in line with the SC requirements
	• Council comments?		No comments were provided by the council for this project
	• Other GEF Agencies?		No comments were provided by the other GEF Agencies for this project
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 3) Project design 3) Identifying risks ES, January 12, 2012: Issues have been addressed. PIF clearance is recommended.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		Yes LA, November 10, 2014
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		Not at this time. Please address the above comments LA, November 10, 2014. LA, 11 December, 2014: Comments have been addressed. CEO endorsement is recommended.
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 08, 2011	November 10, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 12, 2012	December 11, 2014
	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?	The proposed activities for project preparation and coordination are appropriate. However, the budget for the proposed activities are too high. The total PPG budget should be no more than \$100,000. Suggested revised budget is as follows: Activity 1. No more than \$10,000 Activity 2. No more than \$50,000 Activity 3. No more than \$20,000 Activity 4. No more than \$10,000 Activity 5. No more than \$10,000

		<p>ES, June 19, 2012: The budget was reduced from \$200,000 to \$145,000, which is still higher than expected. No justification was provided. Either further reduce the budget or provide a justification through a response to this project review.</p> <p>ES, July 11, 2012: The budget was reduced to \$140,000. Budget justification has been provided. -Comment cleared</p>
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>Budget requires reduction.</p> <p>ES, June 19, 2012: Budget requires reduction or justification.</p> <p>ES, July 11, 2012: Budget has been slightly reduced and justification provided. - Comment cleared</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	<p>Not at this time. Budget reduction is required.</p> <p>ES, June 19, 2012: Not at this time. Budget requires reduction or justification.</p> <p>ES, July 11, 2012: PPG approval is recommended.</p>
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	May 03, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 19, 2012

* 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.