



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

GEF ID:	4417		
Country/Region:	Colombia		
Project Title:	Development of National Capacity for the Environmentally Sound Management and Disposal of PCBs		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4356 (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:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,400,000
Co-financing:	\$13,598,781	Total Project Cost:	\$16,998,781
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Anil Sookdeo	Agency Contact Person:	Dr. Suely Carvalho

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. Colombia is party to the Stockholm Convention and submitted its NIP 8/11/2010.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, Endorsement letter provided by GEF OP.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	UNDP is coordinating the implementing of a large number of PCB projects in LAC, including Brazil, Argentina and Mexico but also in other regions around the world.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	

*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)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes. The country program outputs pertaining to UNDAF outcome 2, include among others the "improved national capabilities to implement a strategy for the elimination of pollutants" which will benefit directly from the PCB management and disposal project.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	NA	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	Yes. The project fits within the POPs Objective CHEM-1, Outcome 1.4: POPs waste prevented, managed and disposed of -Indicator 1.4.1: Amount of PCB-related wastes disposed of, or decontaminated. Outcome 1.5: Country capacity built to effectively phase out and reduce releases of POPs - Indicator 1.5.2: Progress in developing regulatory framework for ESM of POPs and for the sound management of chemicals in general.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	Yes, as described in section 8.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national	Yes. The NIP identifies the environmentally sound management of	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	PCB as one of the main priorities for the implementation of the Stockholm Convention.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes. It is expected that the specific proposed products to strengthen the legal and institutional framework and the development of PCB holders capacity to handle PCBs, will create the enabling environment that will contribute to the institutional sustainability of the project outcomes.	
Project Design	11. Is the description of the baseline project/ scenario – what is happening in the project area without GEF project – reliable?	Yes, the baseline project is based on the country's NIP and is well described. The PCB inventory will be further elaborated during the PPG phase.	
	12. If GEF does not provide funding, is the rest of the project funded by other partners viable?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	Yes, the incremental activities relate to establishing legal framework, guidelines or standards and developing the necessary capacity to allow Colombia manage and eliminate PCBs in an environmentally safe and organized manner. This would hardly happen without GEF support.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes. The project will build the necessary capacity - legal, administrative, regulatory - at national, regional and local levels to ensure the ESM of PCBs. The development of PCB holders capacity to handle PCBs and of technical capacity for enforcement will create the enabling environment for	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		additional impacts in the long term to comply with the Stockholm Convention targets.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes. The project includes demos that will serve to test all the elements introduced for the ESM and disposal of PCB. The demo projects and additional exports of pure PCBs will help eliminate 600 tons of PCBs.	
	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, the approach seems appropriate. Instead of funding the extraction and disposal of PCBs, GEF funding will be used as seed capital to enable stakeholders to proceed with the conversion and disposal of PCBs making use of financially viable PCB disposal technologies and conditions as put in place as part of the project.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes, there is strong emphasis on stakeholder involvement in the project.	
	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. Major risks and related mitigation measures are adequately described.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, in particular with similar projects in Argentina, Brazil, Mexico and Uruguay.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?		
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	Yes 9%, within guidelines. 25/08/2011 - The Project Management costs have been revised to 5%	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Co-financing is indicative, with an important contribution from private sector (Electricity generators, distribution companies, investors and other PCB holders). To be detailed and confirmed at CEO endorsement. 25/08/2011 - The cofinancing has been formalised and increased to 1:4, of which 96% is cash	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	UNDP is contributing \$US 100,000 in kind. But this needs to be reflected in table C (Indicative co-financing for the project by source and by name if available). 21 December 2010. Comment addressed adequately in the revised PIF.	
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		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	<p>Upon submission of a revised proposal addressing the comments raised in this review, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarify the nature of 600 tons of PCB to be disposed of by the project and of the indicated quantity (between 10,073 and 13,199 tons). - Reflect UNDP co-financing in table C <p>21 December 2010. All comments have been responded adequately in the revised PIF. PM recommends CEO approval of the PIF.</p> <p>27 December 2010 GEFSEC is of the view that the GEF budget is way too high and would also would like to see more co-financing. Please note that UNDP would also need to specify how much is in cash in this co-financing. Finally, UNDP is requested to clarify the value added of UNDP in this project.</p> <p>May 10 - Comment of Dec 27 not adequately addressed.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		August 12, 2011 - The comments have been addressed and the co financing has been raised to 1:4, additionally the project management budget has been reduced to 5% of the GEF amount. The PIF is being recommended for further elaboration. AS, 25/8/2011	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	There must be a full PCB inventory and a long term plan for the disposal of all PCB's in Columbia has to be developed.	
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*	December 06, 2010	
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 27, 2010	
	Additional review (as necessary)	May 10, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 12, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 25, 2011	

* **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 PPG will be used to: - Establish the baseline for PCB management in the country. The existing legal framework and institutional capacity will be review for enforcement. - Prepare a detailed project implementation activities (and costs) according to the outcomes and outputs as presented in the PIF;

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Determine with the interested stakeholders in which ways the GEF project will complement potential initiatives that aim to establish effective and economically viable disposal technologies; - Identify any other on-going or future initiatives supported by PCB holders related to the management of PCBs with the objective to integrate them into planned project activities (including negotiations and confirmation of co-financing); and, - Determine an appropriate project management structure as well as a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Yes.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	May 10, 2011
	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.