



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

GEF ID:	<b>5068</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Kyrgyz Republic</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Protect Human Health and the Environment from Unintentional Releases of POPs and Mercury from the Unsound Disposal of Healthcare Waste in Kyrgyzstan</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5155 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>POPs</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CHEM-1; CHEM-1; CHEM-3; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$75,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$1,425,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$7,032,109</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$8,532,109</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>February 21, 2013</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Evelyn Swain</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Mr. Jacques Van Engel</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	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, there is a letter from the OFP.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes, UNDP has comparative advantage.	Yes
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	NA
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes, UNDP has a country office in Kyrgyz Republic.	Yes
	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the		

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Resource Availability	Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	NA	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes	Yes
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?	NA	
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes.	Yes
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes.	Yes
	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, it is consistent with the NIP.	Yes, it is consistent with the NIP.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes, sustainability is addressed through training, lessons learned, and cost efficiency.	Yes.
	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?	Yes, the baseline project is well described.	Yes, the baseline project has been elaborated in the project document.
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to		Yes, cost effectiveness has been demonstrated and will contribute to the sustainability of the project.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	Yes, the activities use incremental reasoning and build off the baseline project.	Yes.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Please provide detail on how the allocation formulas will be developed.  For component 3 please select either TA or INV for the grant type.  Please clarify what I-Rat results are.  ES, September 11, 2012: Details provided for all questions. -Comment cleared	Yes, the project framework is clear.
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes, it is estimated that the project will reduce UPOPs emissions by 5 g-TEQ/a and mercury emissions by 3.6 kg Hg/yr.	Yes, the methodology is clear and will result in 95% of health care waste treated by non-incineration.
	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, these benefits are described and supported.	Yes, socio-economic and gender aspects are well developed and supported.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes these are taken into consideration and will be further developed during PPG.	Yes, these have been developed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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)	Please identify any climate risks.  ES, September 11, 2012: Climate risks have been addressed. -Comment cleared	Yes, risks are addressed.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes.	Yes.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Please clarify who the executing agency will be. Also clarify the role of the Ministry of Public Health, we would expect that they play a clear role in the ownership of this project.  ES, September 11, 2012: The project will have two principal cooperating agencies at national level, the State Agency for Environmental Protection and Forestry (SAEPF) and the Ministry of Health, their roles were identified. Comment cleared	Yes, implementation and execution is clear.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Yes, the project is very similar to the PIF proposal.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes, PMC is 9% and co-funding is 1:4	Yes, PMC is appropriate.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes, co-funding is 1:4.	Yes, co-funding is 1:5.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated	Majority of co-funding is cash.	All co-financing letters are provided.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.		
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	UNDP is bringing \$200,000 along with WHO.	There is no no-financing indicated from UNDP. Please clarify if UNDP is offering any co-financing.  ES, March 10, 2014: UNDP has clarified that they will provide \$416,400 cash along with WHO.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes, tracking tools are provided.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes, M&E is included.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	none	none
	• Convention Secretariat?	none	none
	• Council comments?		none
	• Other GEF Agencies?	none	none
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	Pending clarification of the issues listed above, including: 1) Project framework 2) Climate risks 3) Executing agency  ES, September 11, 2012: All issues have been clarified. The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program  ES, Feb 6, 2013: This project has been	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		resubmitted as an MSP under the new guidelines. Approval is recommended.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
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?		Yes.
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		Non at this time. It is not clear if UNDP is providing co-financing.  ES, March, 10, 2014: UNDP has clarified that they will provide co-financing. CEO endorsement is recommended.
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 24, 2012	February 21, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 11, 2012	March 10, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 06, 2013	
	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?	Yes, the proposed activities are appropriate.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes, the budget is justified.
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	Yes, PPG approval is recommended.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	February 21, 2013

	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.