



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

GEF ID:	5038		
Country/Region:	Armenia		
Project Title:	Implementation of BAT and BEP for Reduction of UP-POPs Releases from Open Burning Sources in Armenia		
GEF Agency:	UNIDO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	POPs
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CHEM-1; CHEM-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$853,000
Co-financing:	\$3,388,420	Total Project Cost:	\$4,291,420
PIF Approval:	July 17, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Anil Sookdeo	Agency Contact Person:	Cmela Centeno

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
	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?	Yes	Yes
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	No	No
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes	Yes
	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?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?		
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes	Yes
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes	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	Yes
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes	Yes
	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?	Yes	Thank you for the full description of the baseline projects that are occurring in Armenia in relation to waste management. Please tabulate all of the existing interventions that are being undertaken and describe in detail how these interventions address the overall management of waste in Armenia and the rationale for intervention by the

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design			<p>GEF. It is unclear from the description of the baseline projects if there is an overarching strategy to address waste. Without this overall plan and funding to support it the project will likely achieve very little.</p> <p>Nov 3, 2014 - Comment cleared</p>
	<p>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?</p>		<p>Pending clarifications of specific components.</p> <p>Nov 3, 2014 (AS) - Based on the table provided on component 2 in the revised Endorsement request please clarify how the use of GEF resources in putting in cell liners to prevent leachate reduce the emissions of UPOPs and by how much?</p> <p>Dec 11, 2014 - The activity being proposed is not consistent with the concept of incremental reasoning. The placement of cell liners would be required even in the absence of POPs since it could be reasonably expected that there would be a need to prevent leachate run off from the landfill for newly constructed or re-purposed cells. In this regard the inclusion of resources from the GEF to support this activity is not an incremental cost.</p> <p>The proponents are requested to revise the proposal to reflect the activities that are strictly necessary to reduce emissions of POPS into the global environment.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Feb 10, 2015 (AS) The revisions and explanations provided have confirmed that the proposed interventions are not eligible activities. The component on landfill construction is an activity that should be done in the course of improvement of waste management and requires work at the municipal level to develop standard operating procedures for covering of waste, having properly lined waste cells etc.</p> <p>As already raised in previous reviews this component needs to be dropped or completely financed from other resources.</p> <p>3/17/15 (AS) - Comments addressed - cleared</p>
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	Yes	<p>Please Clarify question 12.</p> <p>3/17/15 (AS) - The activities and associated funding are consistent with incremental reasoning.</p>
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	No. There is a recently approved GEF 5 project for Armenia (PMIS 4737) for obsolete POPs which will be assisting with the development of legislation. It would be more appropriate to ensure that the legislation being developed through that project incorporates the legislation being proposed in component 1 of this project. Since the previously approved project is in development of the CEO endorsement, this can be included.	The GEF's intervention in municipal/hazardous waste management in relation to the reduction of un-intentional POPs is limited to investments and technical assistance related to the reduction. All other investments including for example evaluation of geology, etc for the siting of new landfills, monitoring of groundwater, overall legislative reform of waste laws, etc are not eligible costs and would have to be

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>The public awareness being proposed is also similar to the previously approved PIF and working with that project can reduce cost through coordination.</p> <p>Jan 18, 2013 - Comment cleared</p>	<p>funded from other sources as part of a waste management plan. In this regard please re-design the project components for only eligible activities.</p> <p>Nov 3, 2014 (AS) - the inclusion of liners for waste cells needs to be clarified</p> <p>3/17/15 (AS) - Comments addressed - cleared</p>
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>At the CEO endorsement stage the proposals for GEF resources requires a revision (see point 14 above)</p> <p>Nov 3, 2014 (AS) - No cleared pending comments raised above</p> <p>3/17/15 (AS) - Yes - 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</p>	<p>This requires additional articulation in the CEO endorsement.</p> <p>Nov 3, 2014 - Comment cleared</p>
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>This requires additional articulation in the CEO endorsement.</p> <p>Nov 3, 2014 (AS) - Comment cleared</p>
	<p>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)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	No. See comment 14. Jan 18, 2013 - Comment cleared	It is unclear the interlinkages of all the waste related projects that have been described are contributing to an overall plan to improve waste management in Armenia. Nov 3, 2014 - Comment cleared
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes	Yes
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		The elaboration at the CEO endorsement is not completely consistent with the proposal presented in the PIF. For example there is no description of the incentive mechanisms to encourage BAT/BEP. There is also very little clarity in how this project will be scaled up to achieve reductions of emissions of UPOPs. Nov 3, 2014 (AS) - Comment cleared
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		N/A
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes	Yes
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Please adjust budgets based on comments in 14 above. Jan 18, 2013 - Comment cleared	Pending clarifications Nov 3, 2014 - Pending clarifications 3/17/15 (AS) - comment cleared - the project is appropriately costed.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Yes	Co-financing is confirmed
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the	Yes	Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?		
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		the tracking tool has been provided.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	None Received	
	• Convention Secretariat?	None Received	
	• Council comments?		None Recieved/none recorded in PMIS
	• Other GEF Agencies?	None Received	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>Pending clarifications and budget revisions.</p> <p>Jan 18, 2013 - PIF is technically cleared for CEO clearance pending resolution of issues with the PPG.</p> <p>July 8, 2013 - The PPG has been resolved. The PIF is recommended for CEO clearance.</p>	
	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
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		There are a number of design issues that needs to be resolved before going forward on consideration of this project

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>for endorsement.</p> <p>Nov 3, 2014 (AS) - The proponents have made some effort in addressing the comments raised during the first review, however there are questions still pending an new ones arising from the revision. In this regard additional clarification is required before a final decision can be made.</p> <p>Dec 11, 2014 - The proponents have not addressed the comments and are requested again to revise the proposal in line with the comments.</p> <p>Feb 10, 2015 - This project cannot be endorsed as is. Please clarify if the component can be dropped or financed from other sources.</p> <p>3/17/15 (AS) - The project can be recommended for endorsement now that the issues associated with eligible incremental costs have been addressed. In recommending this project for CEO endorsement the agency and country are requested to report on the use of GEF funds for all activities to ensure that funds are not used for non-eligible activities.</p>
Review Date (s)	First review*	July 10, 2012	September 15, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 18, 2013	November 03, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)		December 11, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)		February 10, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)		March 17, 2015

* 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?	Yes
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Please reduce the overall cost to no more than a total of 50,000. Jan 18, 2013. The PPG justification provided does not justify the budget to be above the ceiling set for projects of this value. Please reduce the budget to no more than 50,000. July 8, 2013 - PPG resolved
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Pending PIF approval July 8, 2013 - the PPG is technically clear.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	January 18, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	July 08, 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.