



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

GEF ID:	4741		
Country/Region:	Ecuador		
Project Title:	Integrated and Environmentally Sound PCBs Management in Ecuador		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4827 (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:	\$2,000,000
Co-financing:	\$7,800,000	Total Project Cost:	\$9,800,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ibrahima Sow	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. Ecuador submitted its first version NIP in 2006 and second version in 2009.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. An endorsement letter was signed by OFP in Nov. 2011.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. UNDP is well positioned to implement PCB projects in the region. So far 12 UNDP PCB projects have been approved by the GEF.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	The project is consistent with Agency's program, yet there is no mentioning of staff capacity in the country. Please	

*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)
		address.	
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?	Yes	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	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. CHEM-1 is properly identified.	
	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. POPs issue including PCB management is in line with national strategies. Para 1 of A.2 said that since the adoption of SC, measures have been required to "eliminate the production, use, of 10 additional POPs". Please correct.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Project design includes activities to strengthen institutional capacity through improving legislation, developing PCB inventory, etc. However, it is not clear how the ability developed contributes to sustainability, eg. half of PCB	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		(oil/waste/equipment) will be disposed of through this project by 2015. Yet there is a lack of clear planning on how to deal with the rest to meet the government objective of eliminating PCB by 2020.	
Project Design	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?	There are baseline project/activities existing in the country. Please rewrite this part to clearly show what baseline project are and how GEF project builds on it.	
	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?	Pending assessment upon clarification of Q11.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes. There are activities on development of norms, standards, technical guidelines, plans for sound PCB management. These norms etc have been developed in many other projects. Please make sure that no resources will be used on duplication activities.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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.	
	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)	Major risks are identified with countermeasures.	
	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?	Stakeholders are well identified. GEF expects to see specific implementation/execution arrangement at CEO endorsement stage.	
	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?		
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	9% of GEF grant.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes	To be assessed. There are inconsistencies in the PIF. Please clarify: 1). disposal quantity	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	and outputs?	(750MT/700T/800T?) 2). Type: PCB oil; PCB wastes; PCB contaminated equipments; PCB liquids and solids. Pls specify their amount. PIF also mentions that it's unclear whether it will be disposed of nationally or internationally. This should be stated at CEO endorsement stage. Does Ecuador have certified facilities to conduct ES disposal of PCB?	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Co-financing ratio is 1:3.9.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	UNDP is bringing 40,000 USD in kind co-financing.	
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?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Pending clarification of above mentioned issues.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
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 16, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.