



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

GEF ID:	5325		
Country/Region:	Congo		
Project Title:	Environmentally Sound Management and Final Disposal of PCBs		
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;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$975,000
Co-financing:	\$5,009,220	Total Project Cost:	\$5,984,220
PIF Approval:	July 17, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Anil Sookdeo	Agency Contact Person:	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	Yes
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes	Yes
Resource Availability	3. 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	

*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 January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	N/A	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><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></p>	Yes - aligned with the achievement of Chem 1 objectives.	yes
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	Yes	yes
Project Design	<p>6. 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>Please provide the following information for clarification of the intended project components which seeks to address UPOPs emissions from hazardous waste management:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly state what will be the end result of developing a management plan for hazardous waste. Will there be a facility established to treat and dispose of hazardous waste? If yes to 2 above then what is the financing plan for these sites. What will become of the open 	Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>dumpsites that have already been polluted with toxics?</p> <p>5. Are there any plans to close these open dumpsites?</p> <p>6. If the sites are to be closed what will be the alternative for the waste pickers?</p> <p>7. Is mercury containing waste from the health care sector being considered?</p> <p>April 10 - The lack of a plan to deal with the open dumpsites is not satisfactroy. Even if all hazardous material is prevented from entering the site (if that is possible with them remaining open) the burning of these sites will not be prevented. While there will be emission reductions from the diversion of medical waste there will still be significant emissions from these sites.</p> <p>In dealing with projects that seek to address UPOPs emissions from open dumpsites we expect to see an integrated approach that deals with the full problem rather than diverting the waste partially. While there will be a reduction of UPOPs from diversion of the medical waste the bulk of the emissions will probably remain should the open dumps not be dealt with. Further there are no guarantees to prevent future dumping of hazardous waste at these sites.</p> <p>Apr 25, 2013 - The project has removed the BAT/BEP components and the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		remaining PCB components are sufficiently described and based on sound data assumptions. Comment cleared.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	Component 2 is not satisfactorily articulated. Please see comments in 6 above. Apr 25, 2013 - Comment cleared	yes
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	The elimination of 200 tons of PCB contaminated equipment is a clear GEB, however it is unclear what other GEBs will be achieved in spite of the indication of the reduction of dioxins and furans. Apr 25, 2013 - Comment cleared	Yes
	9. 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
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	It is not clear in PIF. The risk section mentions that these organisations will be involved, but does not indicate who or how. Apr 25 - Comment cleared	Yes
	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.	Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes	Yes
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>Pending a satisfactory reply to question 6.</p> <p>Apr 25, 2013 - the project seeks to address the management of PCBs in equipment that is in use and disposal of PCBs that have already been removed. The proper maintenance of equipment containing PCBs is important to prevent contamination of other equipment. Proper maintenance also leads to the improvement in the energy efficiency of these transformers thereby improving the overall efficiency of the electrical grid.</p> <p>UNIDO has managed a number of these types of projects and would be able to replicate the results in this project.</p>	The project represents a standard approach to deal with PCBs
	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
	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	1. Component 2 - Unclear at this time. Additional information asked in question 6 needs to be provided before this can be assessed.	Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing		<p>2. Component 3 - The disposal of PCB contaminated equipment is not usually at 3500\$/ton. Please justify the need for this rate from the GEF.</p> <p>Apr 25, 2013 - Comment cleared - the proponent has clarified that the 3500\$/t includes disposal and all other related activities. In the final prodoc the cost related disposal only needs to be identified.</p>	
	<p>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?</p>	Yes	Co-financing is confirmed
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	Yes	Yes
	<p>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?</p>	The PPG request is within the ceiling established for the size of this project.	Yes
	<p>20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>	No	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant		Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>Pending responses to the review</p> <p>April 10, 2013 - It is recommended that the UPOPs component be re-thought and re-evaluated with a view to deliver a more comprehensive approach to dealing with this issue. The other option is to drop the UPOPS component for now and deal with the PCB component and come back with a better proposal on UPOPS at a later stage.</p> <p>Apr 25, 2013 - the project can be recommended</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	1. Cost for PCB disposal needs to be identified separately from other costs and reported on during the implementation of the project.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		Yes
	First review*	April 03, 2013	February 20, 2015

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 10, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 25, 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. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**