



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

GEF ID:	5179		
Country/Region:	Mexico		
Project Title:	Sound Management of POPs Containing Waste		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4686 (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; CHEM-1; CHEM-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$5,720,000
Co-financing:	\$23,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$28,720,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ibrahima Sow	Agency Contact Person:	Suely Carvalho

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes, Mexico is Party to the SC and has already prepared and submitted its NIP.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. LoE provided by the OFP, Ms Margarita Perez Villasenor.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. UNDP is implementing a number of POPs projects in LAC and in other regions, including obsolete pesticides project and one project with in an e-waste component in China.	
	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?	Yes.	
	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

Availability			
	• the STAR allocation?	NA	
	• the focal area allocation?	In principle yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	
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	
	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?	<p>POPs pesticides have been identified as a priority area in the country's NIP. POPs release from e-waste was not addressed in the first NIP. However the document mentioned that this will likely be done when updating the country's NIP. Mexico has already submitted, through UNIDO, a request for NIP update.</p> <p>It should be noted however that it would be difficult for the GEF to pass a judgment on the importance of POPs and UPOPs related to e-waste management without a preliminary inventory.</p> <p>10 April 2013 Comments addressed</p>	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>Project sustainability is not clearly articulated in the proposal.</p> <p>Please elaborate how the capacities developed will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes</p>	

		10 April 2013 Comment addressed	
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?	Data on UPOPs from e-wastes are not supported by an inventory.	
	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?		No. CE needs to be demonstrated in the proposal.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	Funding of activities related to e-wastes is not based on incremental reasoning. POPs and UPOPs release resulting from e-waste management is not well known. The project should focus on obsolete POPs pesticide management and disposal. For the e-waste component, we recommend UNDP to redesign the project with the view to developing pilot activities, (including assessing UPOPs released from unsound e-waste practices), development of management plan in one selected state. Consequently, the budget for this component should be drastically reduced.	
		Comments addressed	

	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	No, GEF 5 strategy focusses on investments. So it would appear somewhat strange to provide nearly \$ 4.0 million dollars for the categories of activities defined under project component 2 (legal framework, inventories, pilot management plans, etc...).	
		10 April 2013 Comment addressed	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Will be assessed upon revision of the proposal.	
		10 April 2013 Comment addressed	
	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?	Issues not addressed in the project document. Please describe socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and how these will support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits.	
		10 April 2013 Comment addressed	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Issues not addressed. Please respond.	
		10 April 2013 Comment addressed	
	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)	Climate change risks are not addressed here.	
		10 April 2013 Comment addressed	
	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?	Project arrangement needs to be better elaborated. In particular, we expect UNDP to specify the role of government agencies and the modality of private sector involvement. 10 April 2013 Comment addressed	
	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?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	To be assessed based on revisions requested 10 April 2013 Comment addressed	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	See comment under sections 13 and 14.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated 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's contribution is not reflected in the indicative co-financing table (Table C) 10 April 2013 Comment addressed	
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 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?	Not at this time. Please address comments raised in this review. 10 April 2013; All comments have been addressed. PIF clearance 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?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	October 24, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 10, 2013	
	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
	1. Are the proposed activities for project	

	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.