



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

GEF ID:	4485		
Country/Region:	Costa Rica		
Project Title:	Integrated PCB Management in Costa Rica		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4092 (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:	\$1,930,000
Co-financing:	\$7,740,000	Total Project Cost:	\$9,670,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	July 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	
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	No	
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	4. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. UNDP has worked on a number of similar projects.	
	5. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	May 17, 2011 - The Agency should increase the amount of Co-financing, from its own resources, it brings to the project. June 1, 2011 - The amount of cofinancing from the agency has been increased over 200%.	

*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.

	6. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes	
Resource Availability	7. Is the proposed GEF/LDCF/SCCF 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)?		
Project Consistency	8. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multi-focal area/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	Yes, the project seeks to reduce emissions of PCB's through better management practices and by disposal of PCB and PCB contaminated material.	
	9. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal area/ LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	YEs	
	10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, and NCSA?	Yes	
	11. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes. The PCB management system will be implemented into the utility companies and the transfer stations developed by this project can be used for handling of other hazardous waste.	
	12. Is (are) the baseline project(s) sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	Yes. Costa Rica's main utility company which has the majority of PCB stocks and equipment has already made changes to its laboratory to analyse for PCB's and have taken some action in dealing with it. The Utility has already disposed of 56 tons of PCB oil. The Project will build upon this and expand it to the smaller utilities and provide a cost effective means for these smaller companies to dispose of their PCB waste.	

Project Design	13. Is (are) the problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	Yes	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes. The Project will construct a PCB management system to handle PCB still contained in equipment and dispose of already existing PCB and PCB containing equipment. This will be done through strengthening of legislation, building of capacity and safe handling and collection of PCB and PCB containing waste. The PCB and PCB containing waste will be evaluated and high concentration wastes will be exported for disposal while low concentration wastes will be handled locally and low contaminated equipment will be cleaned and re-used, thereby saving cost to the utilities.	
	15. Are the incremental (in the case of GEF TF) or additional (in the case of LDCF/SCCF) activities complementary and appropriate to further address the identified problem?	Yes. The project will build on activities that have already been undertaken by the majority utility company so that smaller companies can have a cost effective means of handling and disposing of their PCB and PCB contaminated Equipment.	
	16. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes	
	17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?	The costs of this project are comparable to projects that have the same objectives. Additionally the capacity strengthening components are below 200,000.	
	18. Is there a clear description of the socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and of how they will support the achievement of environmental/adaptation benefits (for SCCF/LDCF)?	Yes	

	19. Is the role of civil society, including indigenous people and gender issues being taken into consideration and addressed appropriately?	Yes	
	20. 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, the project has overall low risk as the components are to be implemented mainly in the utilities that use PCB and UNDP has a strong track record in working with these companies in these types of projects and as such is expected to be able to manage the risks encountered.	
	21. Is the provided documentation consistent?	Yes	
	22. Are key stakeholders (government, local authorities, private sector, CSOs, communities) and their respective roles and involvement in the project identified?	Yes	
	23. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes. It would be useful if UNDP ensure that knowlegde from these PCB management projects be shared among the countries in the region, especially from countries who are more advanced in this type of project so that overall capacity in the region can be increased.	
	24. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes	
	25. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	26. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
	27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding level for project management cost appropriate?	The Cost is within acceptable guidelines.	

Project Financing	28. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding per objective appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs according to the incremental/additional cost reasoning principle?	Yes	
	29. Comment on indicated cofinancing at PIF. At CEO endorsement, indicate if cofinancing is confirmed.	The co-financing is 1:3.3 with over 50% in cash. There is the opportunity during the PPG phase to increase this co-financing level. For GEF 5, to increase the impact of projects, the involvement of private-public partnerships are being encourage to increase the level of financing for the projects. Costa Rica should seek to increase the level of co-financing for this project.	
	30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	To increase the impact of the project, and to cater for additional disposal and investment into the development and operationalizing of the proposed transfer center, additional funding from the utilities/private sector should be identified especially if the long term sustainability of the transfer center will depend of its being used for multiple types of waste.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	31. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	N/A	
	32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	33. 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	34. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	The Proposed project is well thought out and is technically sound. In spite of this there is still opportunity to engage the	

at PIF Stage		<p>private sector in developing the transfer centre beyond the needs of the project thereby increasing the sustainability of the infrastructure and capacity built by the project. In this regard we request UNDP to work with the Government on increasing the participation of the private sector and increase the resources from them.</p> <p>May 10 - The Proposal's co-financing has been substantially increased to a 1:4 ratio with over 50% of the funding being cash.</p> <p>There is a concern about the level of co-financing being brought by UNDP and it would be necessary to demonstrate a larger amount from UNDP's own resources.</p>	
	35. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>Level of Private Sector Involvement</p> <p>Modality of the transfer center</p> <p>Exact amounts of PCB to be exported and amount of PCB contaminated equipment to be handled.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	36. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 31, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	May 10, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 01, 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.

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	Yes
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Yes, Pending Response to comments on PIF June 15, 2011 - The cofinancing ratio for the PPG needs to be increased.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 31, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 15, 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.