



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

GEF ID:	<b>5646</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Bolivia</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Environmentally Sound Management of Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCB) - Containing Equipment and Wastes and Upgrade of Technical Expertise in Bolivia</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNIDO</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>POPs</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CHEM-1;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$2,000,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$9,696,435</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$11,696,435</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>December 23, 2013</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Evelyn Swain</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Alfredo Cueva Jacome</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Yes	Yes.
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	Yes there is an endorsement letter from the OFP.	Yes.
<b>Resource Availability</b>	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	NA	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes	Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or	NA	

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

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

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCE/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b> ? <i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>	Yes, this is a CHEM 1 project.	Yes.
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	Yes, this project is consistent with the NIP.	Yes.
Project Design	6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b> , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	Yes, the baseline project is clear and this project will address the PCB issue in Bolivia.	Yes.
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	Will the project also address small owners of PCBs and will there be a mechanism to collect and provide interim storage from these users.  ES, 12/23/13: UNIDO has clarified that small owners will be evaluated for inclusion in the project during PPG.- Comment cleared	Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes, the GEBs are up to 400 tones PCBs disposed (this number will be further refined during PPG).  The incremental reasoning is appropriate.	Yes, at least 400 tones of PCBs will be destroyed.  Incremental reasoning is appropriate.
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , 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 is mainstreaming is included in the project.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes, the project has planned for significant public and CSO engagement.	Yes, public participation is included.
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Yes, risks are considered.	Yes.
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes.	Yes.
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the</li> </ul>	The capacity building components of the project will provide sustainability while the destruction demonstration can lead to scaling up. This project is innovative because the country will manage their PCBs for the first time will strong support from the private sector.	This is a PCB disposal projects with significant support from the Government and private sector. The co-financing and investment from the government and private sector will lead to sustainability of the project.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>		
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Yes.
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		Yes.
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>There is a concern that co-financing from the private sector is in-kind, tangible investment is expected. Please clarify what will be covered by this in-kind investment and if cash investment will be sought during the PPG period.</p> <p>ES, 12/23/13: Cash investment will be sought during PPG phase. Comment cleared</p> <p>The cost effectiveness for disposing 400 tons PCBs is higher that expected compared to other similar project. When this amount is verified during PPG stage if the amount decreases we would expect a relative decrease in the project cost or a strong justification.</p> <p>ES, 12/23/13: Amount will be verified and adjustments made accordingly during</p>	Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		PPG phase. -Comment cleared	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	Yes, co-financing is appropriate. UNIDO brings \$90,000 cash.	Yes, co-financing is confirmed.
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	Yes, PMC is appropriate.	Yes.
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	PPG is requested and at an appropriate level.	Yes, UNIDO reported on PPg activities.
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes.
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		None received.
	• Convention Secretariat?		None received.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• The Council?		None received.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		None received.
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	ES, 12/23/13: All issues have been addressed, PIF clearance is recommended.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		CEO endorsement is recommended.
	First review*	December 12, 2013	October 07, 2014
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	December 23, 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. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**