



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

GEF ID:	<b>5082</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Regional (Cambodia, Lao PDR, Mongolia, Philippines, Vietnam)</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Demonstration of BAT and BEP in Open Burning Activities in Response to the Stockholm Convention on POPs</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; CHEM-1; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$7,560,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$28,700,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$36,260,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>June 01, 2013</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Evelyn Swain</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Ms. Carmela Centeno</b>

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. All countries are Party to the Stockholm Convention and have submitted 1st NIPs.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	No. The endorsement letter from Mongolia is not signed. This letter should be signed by the GEF Operational Focal Point.  Oct. 10, 2012 Addressed.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. UNIDO has been contributing to efforts made in sound management of waste and chemicals and have expertise in BAT/BEP.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		

	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	N/A	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	N/A	
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?	There is no specific mention about the project consistency with each country's NIP. Please describe the relevance of the project with each country's NIP.  Oct. 10, 2012 Addressed	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Clear articulation of sustainability of project outcomes is not specifically elaborated. Please elaborate how the capacities developed will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes.  Oct. 10, 2012 It is suggested that TA through this	

		project will assist the government's effort in establishing regulatory framework which will contribute to project sustainability.	
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?	<p>The baseline projects are not sufficiently described. For the respective project components, the baseline projects in each country, and when applicable, across the region should be elaborated.</p> <p>It is not clear why a regional information sharing platform should be established in this project despite the fact that an existing platform, the ESES BAT/BEP Forum, has been already established.</p> <p>The capacity of local waste management authorities and how they will be involved are not clear to lead successful BAT/BEP implementation and sustainable outcomes.</p> <p>Please elaborate these points.</p> <p>Oct. 10, 2012 The above three points are not addressed.</p> <p>ES, April 5, 2013: Comments addressed.</p>	
	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?	<p>It is not clear which portions of all activities are incremental.</p> <p>Also for the respective project</p>	

		<p>each country, and when applicable, across the region should be elaborated.</p> <p>Please elaborate these points.</p> <p>Oct. 10, 2012 To be assessed upon clarification of project activities.</p> <p>ES, April 5, 2013: Comments addressed.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>It is not clear what activities will be implemented in each country and what is the reasoning for them. Please elaborate this point.</p> <p>Oct. 10, 2012 Please justify or elaborate the following activities: 1.3 on BAT/BEP guidance formulation and adoption when SC has published guidances. 1.4: how to sustain the proposed financial mechanism for waste management and reuse. 2.1: the necessity of establishing this regional platform when UNIDO has an existing BAT/BEP forum already.</p> <p>ES, April 5, 2010: Addressed</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>The methodology for incremental benefits is not well defined. There is no estimate of global environmental benefits for this project. Please elaborate these points.</p> <p>Oct. 10, 2012 An estimation of GEBs is provided.</p>	

	<p>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?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>Yes. But it is not clear how the personnel of the hospitals will be involved. Please describe how the population are affected by open burning practices.</p> <p>Oct. 10, 2012 Addressed</p>	
	<p>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)</p>	<p>Climate risks should be addressed.</p> <p>It is not clear what the network of laboratories is and how it will function.</p> <p>Even if the network of laboratories is established, it is still not clear if the possible core laboratory which will be a center of POPs analysis will be able to have necessary budget and human resources for monitoring activities sustainably. Also the other laboratories may need additional resources.</p> <p>It is not clear how the project ensures that the waste management including collection, transfer and disposal of the waste will be sustainably implemented, especially how the cost of waste management will be recovered.</p> <p>Please elaborate these points.</p> <p>Oct. 10, 2012 Not addressed.</p>	

		ES, April 5, 2013: Comment addressed.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	While the project mentions other related initiatives in Vietnam and the region, there is no reference on those in the other countries. Please mention about projects in the other four counties as well.  Oct. 10, 2012 Addressed	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Executing agencies are Ministry of Environment (Cambodia), Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (Lao PDR), Ministry of Nature and Environment and Tourism(Mongolia), Department of Environment and Natural Resources (Philippines), Vietnam Environment Administration, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (Vietnam).	
	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?	Yes.	
Project Financing	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate	The ratio between the funding and co-financing is 1:3.8, which is acceptable.	

	and outputs?	<p>Oct. 10, 2012 At its current design, project budget is too high. eg. 1 million is budgeted for awareness raising; 4.7 million is allocated to BAT/BEP pilot without stating what technologies/sites are to be piloted.</p> <p>Co-financing Co-financing table lists 5.6 millions of cash from JICA as project co-financing. While in the documentation, it's clear that the JICA finance is for building a municipal waste landfill for Lao PDR. There is no description of how the JICA finance to Lao PDR contributes to the outcomes of this proposal. Please elaborate.</p> <p>ES, April 5, 2013: addressed.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Co-financing is a mix of cash and inkind.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	UNIDO is providing \$150,000 in-kind and \$50,000 grant.	
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?		

Secretariat Recommendation

Recommendation at PIF Stage

**30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**

Not at this time.

Please address the following:

- 1) Please provide an endorsement letter signed by the Mongolia's GEF Operational Focal Point.
- 2) Please describe the relevance of the project with each country's NIP.
- 3) Please elaborate how the capacities developed will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes.
- 4) Please describe the baseline projects more clearly and comprehensively.
- 5) Please elaborate incremental reasoning for the respective project components.
- 6) Please elaborate what activities will be implemented in each country and what is the reasoning for them.
- 7) Please elaborate the methodology for incremental benefits and show estimate of global environmental benefits for this project.
- 8) Please describe how the personnel of the hospitals are affected by open burning practices.
- 9) Please elaborate risks concerning climate, the network of laboratories and the waste management system.
- 10) Please mention relevant initiatives in the four countries other than Vietnam as well.

Oct. 12, 2012

Please address the remaining comments.

April 5, 2013:



		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?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 29, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	October 12, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 05, 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.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	The budget is too high. The cost should not exceed \$200,000, or significant justification is needed.  ES, 4-17-13: Budget has been reduced. Comment cleared.
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	No, PPG is not recommended. The budget is too high.  ES, 4-17-13: Yes, PPG approval is recommended
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 12, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 17, 2013

\* 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.