



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

GEF ID:	5816		
Country/Region:	Guatemala		
Project Title:	Environmentally Sound Management and Disposal of Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCB) - Containing Equipment and Disposal of DDT Wastes, and Upgrade of Technical Expertise		
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:	\$85,000	Project Grant:	\$2,000,000
Co-financing:	\$13,771,100	Total Project Cost:	\$15,941,100
PIF Approval:	June 12, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Lulwa Ali	Agency Contact Person:	Alfredo Cueva Jacome

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, a letter from the operational focal point, dated on April 10, 2014, is submitted.	Yes.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	NA	NA
	• the focal area allocation?	Given the fact that the remaining resources in GEF-5 are limited, the proposed PIF will be cleared only if the resources are available.	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 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 LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	NA	NA
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, the project is aligned with the Focal Area objective CHEM-1 "Phase-out POPs and reduce POPs release".	Yes, the project is consistent with GEF 5 chemicals focal area objective CHEM-1 "Phase-out POPs and reduce POPs release". LA, June 1, 2015.
	<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>	<p>Please, provide more details on how the concept and objectives of this project meet the four levels of priorities of Guatemala's NIP. What are the main indicators to consider this project a priority above the others already identified in the NIP?</p> <p>Yes. Comments cleared.</p>	<p>Yes, the project is in line with the Country's SC NIP's priorities.</p> <p>LA, June 1, 2015.</p>
	<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>Not clear.</p> <p>Please see comments on 7.</p> <p>Description on baseline projects (paragraph 12-15) seems to be part of the alternative scenario. Please check it.</p> <p>Yes. Comments cleared.</p>	<p>Yes, the baseline project is adequately described in the request for CEO approval.</p> <p>LA, June 1, 2015.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>The intended outputs and outcomes are not clear Please address the following questions and comments: regarding component 1: Why is an ESM being proposed for DDT? Is the Ministry of Health the only holder of DDT? Is DDT still in use? because this would be the only reason for an ESM for DDT. expected output 1.2: What is the intension here? Please be more precise. regarding component 2: Are there national/local hazardous waste operators? If so, what capacities do they possess for handling hazardous waste? Is there a licensing system in place to ensure these operators can meet international standards for managing and/or disposing of PCBs/DDT? output 2.4: Why is there a need to repeat what has been done in other projects? b) Given the fact that PCB and DDT are completely different, please explain how do you intend to deal with the 2 POPs properly. c) The project identifies financial schemes as one of the outputs. Please be more specific about the financial schemes, which are key to sustain the outcomes of the project schemes as one of the outputs. Please be more specific about the financial schemes, which are key to sustain the outcomes of the project.</p> <p>Yes. Comments cleared.</p>	<p>LA, June 1, 2015: Yes, however the following items require further clarification/ consideration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Table 2 identifies a total of 547.274 Kg of PCB in potential PCB holders in various sectors and locations of Guatemala, while the proposed project aims at disposing up to 400 tons of PCB and PCB waste. Please clarify the difference/ relation between these two amounts. Also some other errors related to data/ numbers in Table 2 were noted and require further revision/ correction. 2. Under item C (ii) on page 20, the development of a strategic environmental assessment was suggested as a way to overcome the complex process to obtain permits for the storage, transport and treatment of POPs. Please clarify/ elaborate more on what is meant by developing strategic environmental assessment in this context, and discuss how would this help in facilitating the internal processes to obtain the required permits. 3. Please justify and clarify the need for tailor-made demonstration projects/ country specific demonstration projects for the disposal of the PCBs as outlined in Component 2. Can't the project utilize/ build on the results of similar activities previously completed in GEF projects to avoid repeating similar work?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>4. A cement kiln is suggested as an option for disposing of the PCB-containing waste and equipment. If this will be the case, field demonstrations are necessary as well as the review of the outcomes of these demonstrations by an independent and qualified expert to verify the technical feasibility and ensure the implementation of this option in a safe and environmentally sound manner.</p> <p>LA, August 20, 2015: The GEFSEC comments were satisfactorily addressed and reflected in the revised project document. The total amount of PCB waste to be disposed was set at 403 tons, the strategic environmental assessment development to be undertaken during the project implementation was further elaborated including internal processes in support of acquiring required permits. It was also explicitly indicated that the options for the disposal of PCBs will be based on lessons learnt from other GEF related projects. Furthermore, it was confirmed that if the co-processing in cement kiln is considered, a field demonstration will be conducted and technical review of the outcomes by an independent qualified expert will be undertaken. Comments cleared.</p>
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning	Yes, the project will bring global environmental benefits due to the environmentally sound management and elimination of up to 400 tons of PCB and	Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	sound and appropriate?	PCB-waste and 15 tons of DDT.	
	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. Gender dimension is clearly described and ensured through the provision of equal access to resources and to services generated and managed by the project. The inclusion of local communities and vulnerable groups (women, children, people living close to the PCBs and DDTs facilities) in the project-related activities will also be considered to raise their awareness and to reduce their exposure to potential health related risks. LA, June 1, 2015.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	The role of public participation, including local communities, has been identified.	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)	The risk of owners of PCB and DDT wastes seems to be Medium or High. Please reconsider the value. Yes. Comments cleared.	Yes. Risks and associated mitigation measures are provided and appropriately described. LA, June 1, 2015.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	No	Yes, the information provided in the request for CEO approval highlight the linkage between this project and other national projects including NIP update and ESM of POPs in WEEE as well as other PCBs projects in the region (Peru, Bolivia). LA, June 1, 2015.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <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>The innovative aspects of this project would be to focus on elimination of stocks and putting in place systems to eliminate the rest as they come offline.</p> <p>Regarding sustainability, please address the comment in box 8-b)</p> <p>Yes. Comments cleared.</p>	<p>Yes, same as PIF regarding innovative aspects. As for the sustainability of the project outcomes, it is envisaged to be realized through (i) capacity building and awareness raising for national stakeholders concerned with the ESM of PCB and DDT; (ii) private sector substantial investment and involvement in the delivery of the project outcomes for the ESM of PCB and the disposal of DDT; and (iii) the development of national business plan and long term strategy for PCB elimination based on project outcomes.</p> <p>LA, June 1, 2015.</p>
	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?		<p>Yes. The project include evaluation of disposal options for PCBs and DDT based on cost effectiveness and technical feasibility including consideration of private sector investment.</p> <p>LA, June 1, 2015</p>
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Co-financing is too low and would need to be increased.	<p>Yes, co-financing has been increased from 4,000,000 in the PIF to 13,776,103 in the CEO request for approval (approx. 1:3.4). This increase is mainly attributed to the contribution of the private sector.</p> <p>LA, June 1, 2015.</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	<p>Please consider to increase the amount of co-financing by the CEO approval stage.</p> <p>No. Comments not cleared.</p>	<p>Yes, co-financing has been confirmed. Co-finance letters are included in the request for CEO approval</p> <p>LA, June 1, 2015.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?		
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes.	Yes.
	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?	Yes and the requested amount is \$85,000.	Yes.
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes.
	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?		NA
	• Convention Secretariat?		None received
	• The Council?		NA
	• Other GEF Agencies?		None received
Secretariat Recommendation			
	24. Is PIF clearance/approval	Not at this stage. Please address the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Recommendation at PIF Stage	being recommended?	above comments. Please note that the PIF will be cleared only if resources are available. 12 June 2014 All comments have been addressed. MSP approval is recommended pending availability of resources.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	This project aims to prevent and reduce threats to the environment and health posed by PCBs and DDT. It focuses on the prevention, management and disposal of PCBs and DDT, and the development of a framework for the environmental management of PCBs and DDT contaminated sites. It will contribute to NIP implementation by reducing PCB and DDT stocks and the stress on human health and the environment caused by them. The project encourages investments into the local PCB and DDT management and disposal sectors to facilitate the disposal of up to 400 tons PCB and PCB-waste and 15 tons DDT, to be verified during the PPG-phase.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		No, pending the receipt of the information requested above (item 7). LA, June 1, 2015 Yes. the Program Manager recommends CEO approval of the project. LA, August 20, 2015
	First review*	June 09, 2014	June 01, 2015
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	June 12, 2014	August 20, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)

*** 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.**