



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

|  |   |                              |                       |
|--|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| GEF ID:                                    | <b>5322</b>   |                              |                       |
| Country/Region:                            | <b>Regional (Botswana, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mozambique, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia)</b>  |                              |                       |
| Project Title:                             | <b>Promotion of BAT and BEP to Reduce uPOPs Releases from Waste Open Burning in the Participating African Countries of COMESA-SADC Subregions</b> |                              |                       |
| GEF Agency:                                | <b>UNIDO</b>  | GEF Agency Project ID:       |                       |
| 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;</b>  |                              |                       |
| Anticipated Financing PPG:                 | <b>\$180,000</b>  | Project Grant:               | <b>\$6,615,000</b>    |
| Co-financing:                              | <b>\$26,460,000</b>   | Total Project Cost:          | <b>\$33,255,000</b>   |
| PIF Approval:                              |   | Council Approval/Expected:   | <b>March 03, 2014</b> |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval                   |   | Expected Project Start Date: |                       |
| Program Manager:                           | <b>Evelyn Swain</b>   | Agency Contact Person:       | <b>Erlinda Galvan</b> |

| Review Criteria              | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup> | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|------------------------------|---|--|--|
| <b>Eligibility</b>           | 1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?   | Yes, all countries are eligible.                                     |  |
|                              | 2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?   | Yes, there are endorsement letters from all countries.               |  |
| <b>Resource Availability</b> | 3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply): |  |  |
|                              | • the STAR allocation?  | NA   |  |
|                              | • the focal area allocation?  | Yes  |  |
|                              | • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access  | NA   |  |
|                              | • the SCCF (Adaptation or   | NA   |  |

\*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 January 2013

| Review Criteria     | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>                         | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---------------------|---|--|--|
|                     | Technology Transfer)?   |  |  |
|                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>   | NA   |  |
|                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>   | NA   |  |
| Strategic Alignment | <p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCE/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</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 in line with Chem1.   |  |
|                     | <p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>  | Yes, it is consistent with country NIPs.   |  |
| Project Design      | <p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>   | Yes, the baseline is clear.  |  |
|                     | <p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>   | Yes, the components are clear.   |  |
|                     | <p>8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>   | Yes, the GEBs are estimated to be 350 g-TEQ/a uPOPs with additional co-benefits for climate. |  |

| Review Criteria | Questions  | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>  | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
|                 | <p>9. Is there a clear description of:</p> <p>a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and</p> <p>b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>  |   |  |
|                 | <p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>   | <p>Yes, public participation, including waste pickers is included.</p>  |  |
|                 | <p>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)</p>   | <p>Yes, risks including climate risks are identified.</p>   |  |
|                 | <p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>   | <p>Yes, this project will be coordinated with other initiatives including the GEF/UNEP/UNIOD project on SC implementation.</p>  |  |
|                 | <p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for</li> </ul> | <p>Yes, the project is innovative and will apply BAT/BEP technology. The project is designed to be sustainable and be a demonstration for the region with the ability of scale up. The Risks section also addresses some of the risks associated with sustainability.</p> |  |

| Review Criteria   | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
|                   | scaling up the project's intervention.  |  |  |
|                   | 14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?   |  |  |
|                   | 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?   |  |  |
| 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?  | Yes. Co-financing is 1:4.  |  |
|                   | 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 bringing to the project in line with its role?<br><u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?  | UNIDO brings \$100,000 in kind. There is a significant amount of cash, as well as in kind contributions from all of the country governments. |  |
|                   | 18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?  | Yes, PMC is 5%.  |  |
|                   | 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?<br><u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund? | Yes, PIF is requested and approval is recommended.   |  |

| Review Criteria                             | Questions  | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|--|--|--|
|   | 20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?            | NA   |  |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation           | 21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?    |  |  |
|   | 22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? |  |  |
| Agency Responses                            | 23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:  |  |  |
|   | • STAP?  |  |  |
|   | • Convention Secretariat?  |  |  |
|   | • The Council?   |  |  |
|   | • Other GEF Agencies?  |  |  |
| Secretariat Recommendation                  |  |  |  |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage                 | 24. <b>Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>  | Yes, PIF approval is recommended.<br><br>ES, 10/9/13: 3 countries have been removed from the project and the budget has been reduced accordingly. PIF approval is recommended. |  |
|   | 25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.   |  |  |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval | 26. <b>Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>  |  |  |
|   | First review*  | April 09, 2013   |  |
| Review Date (s)                             | Additional review (as necessary)   | October 09, 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. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**