



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

GEF ID:	4858		
Country/Region:	Bangladesh		
Project Title:	Environmentally-sound Management and Disposal of PCBs and Medical Wastes		
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; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,000,000
Co-financing:	\$12,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$15,000,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	April 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Evelyn Swain	Agency Contact Person:	Mr. Fukuya Iino

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. Bangladesh is Party to the Stockholm Convention and has prepared and submitted an initial NIP.	
	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. UNIDO has the necessary relevant expertise in the domain of environmentally sound management of PCBs and has been active in implementing GEF POPs projects in the Asia region. In addition, UNIDO has relevant expertise in the management of medical waste.	

*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)
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	N/A	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	N/A	
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?		
	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 NIP of Bangladesh identifies PCBs as one of its priorities and medical waste is also identified as a high priority by the government.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Sustainability may be achieved to some degree through strengthening of institutional capacity for managing PCB waste and medical waste, introducing technologies for managing waste, and engagement of private sector in	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>public/private partnerships. Clear articulation of sustainability of project outcomes, however, is not specifically elaborated.</p> <p>ES, August 23, 2012: Additional information provided. -Comment cleared</p>	
Project Design	<p>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?</p>	<p>While sound data is used (initial NIP), the baseline projects are not sufficiently described. Some baseline projects are planned and not yet carried out therefore not serving as established projects on which to build GEF incremental activities. Clarification of baseline project is needed.</p> <p>ES, August 23, 2012: Baseline project data has been provided. -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>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>This proposal does not clearly distinguish between baseline and incremental activities.</p> <p>ES, August 23, 2012: Incremental activities have been clarified. -Comment cleared</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>Please clarify which aspects of the project are building on existing capacities and institutional and regulatory framework. Please clarify</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>possible integration of PPP into project framework. Also, address in Section B whether PCB waste from the ship breaking industry (which accounts for nearly 20% of estimated PCDD/PCDF total), will be considered.</p> <p>ES, August 23, 2012: Project framework is clear. Ship breaking will not be included in the project. - Comment cleared</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>In part. Please provide estimation of dioxin and furan emissions.</p> <p>ES, August 23, 2012: An estimate of 2.1g is provided, and will be refined during PPG. -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, socio-economic and gender dimensions are addressed.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>Stakeholder involvement is well described. Please also include discussion on public participation, CSO, and/or local/indigenous community involvement.</p> <p>ES, August 23, 2012: Description provided. -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>Climate risks should be addressed.</p> <p>ES, August 23, 2012: Climate risks have been addressed. -Comment cleared</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?	Yes. The project recognizes ongoing and planned projects of potential relevance.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Implementation arrangements need clarification - in particular, the involvement of PPP arrangements upon which the medical waste component appears to rely. ES, August 23, 2012: Involvement of IFC in PPP has been elaborated. - 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 4.75% and co-financing ratio is also appropriate at 1:4.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Co-financing per objective is appropriate at roughly 1:4 ratio, however a majority (\$9Million) of the type of co-financing is unknown, and only \$1million is known to be in the form of cash grant/loan. Please clarify the potential source(s) of co-financing. ES, August 23, 2012: Funding sources have been elaborated. -Comment cleared	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing;	8% of co-financing is known to be cash (loan/grant) while 75% of the co-	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	financing is not clear on type (in-kind vs cash). Please specify type of co-financing being provided by government sources. ES, August 23, 2012: Details provided. - Comment cleared	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes. UNIDO is providing 110,000 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?	N/A	
	• Convention Secretariat?	N/A	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	N/A	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Not at this time, several issues need resolution/clarification, including: 1) missing OFP endorsement letter 2) baseline project 3) project framework/design 4) integration of PPP 5) incremental reasoning 6) climate risk 7) public participation 8) type of co-financing ES, August 23, 2012: All issues have	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>been addressed.</p> <p>The PIF has been technically cleared for potential inclusion in an upcoming Work Program, subject to availability of resources in the GEF Trust Fund, as well as being considered a priority in light of considerations such as geographical and focal area balance.</p> <p>The inclusion of a PIF in a Work Program will be decided by the CEO.</p> <p>Technically cleared projects that have not been selected for an upcoming Work Program may still be considered for subsequent ones.</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?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 30, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 23, 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?	Once the baseline project is established in the PIF, please also define PPG activities with reference to building on this baseline. By doing so, the proposed activities in the PPG will be consistent with existing and/or planned efforts already underway to maximize efficiencies in work addressing PCBs and medical waste in Bangladesh. Please also clarify to the extent feasible the integration of the PPP element. ES, 2/8/13: Yes activities are appropriate
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Not at this time, see requested information in item 1 above which must follow from revisions to be made to the PIF. ES, 2/8/13: PPG approval is recommended.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	February 08, 2013
	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.