



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

GEF ID:	4617		
Country/Region:	China		
Project Title:	Municipal Solid Waste Management		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	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; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$12,000,000
Co-financing:	\$48,004,000	Total Project Cost:	\$60,004,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Anil Sookdeo	Agency Contact Person:	Jiang Ru

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?	Yes. This project was originally proposed by UNIDO and was rejected on the basis of UNIDO not having the comparative advantage to implement this project.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	No	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes	

*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	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the 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	
	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	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	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. The baseline project consists of assisting the city of Ningbo to minimise and recycle municipal waste. Similar projects will be undertaken by other cities with their own resources.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	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. The GEF will fund incremental activities to ensure Dioxin and Furan emissions are additionally minimised through a number of activities.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>The project framework is clear, however in order to have a better overview of the investment costs versus the technical assistance costs, please remove the costs related to technical assistance from component 1, including public awareness and consolidate them into a separate "capacity, institutional strengthening, public awareness component".</p> <p>Please clarify if components 2.ii an 2.iii are activities already being undertaken by MEP and if so please provide a rationale for including these activities.</p> <p>Please clarify if there will be economic instruments being developed in component 2.vi will address component 2.ix</p> <p>September 14, 2011 - the country has clarified that the public awareness will be done in the context of the pilot cities so that it will be managed separately. Comment cleared</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>On the reference to the comments raised on the dioxin emission standard, the country has clarified that there is a draft of the upgrade standar which the project will contribute to prior to the standard being promulgated. - Comment Cleared.</p> <p>In regard to the query on the economic instruments being developed it was calrified that the instruments will be city specific and will be linked to compliance with the dioxin standards. The product stewardships would be designed to be voluntary and to encourage reduction of municipal solid waste to ultimately reduce the emissions of D&F - Comment Cleared.</p> <p>I</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes	
	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	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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)	Yes	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes	
	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?	<p>No. The level is above the guidance provided to agencies. Please adjust the figures.</p> <p>September 14, 2011 - The figure has been adjusted to 5.18%. The country has indicated that since three cities are being targeted the need for Project Management in each city makes it difficult to reduce these costs further - Comment Cleared.</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>Yes, however please clarify what is included in the "in kind" contributions. Will this be time of people and other resources or actual investment by the Provinces?</p> <p>September 14, 2011 - The country has</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		clarified that the co-financing from the cities will be cash. - Comment cleared.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Cash co-financing is confirmed, please see comment in question 24 above on in kind co-financing. September 14, 2011 - Comment Cleared.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes	
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?	None Received	
	• Convention Secretariat?	None Received	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	None Received	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Pending response to questions above. Additionally please correct the trust fund for the project management costs in table A. September 14, 2011 - The country has clarified the issues raised during the first review. The project can be	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		recommended for further development.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Cost of the public awareness, level of co-financing from the pilot cities	
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*	September 01, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 14, 2011	
	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.