



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

GEF ID:	5532		
Country/Region:	Regional (Botswana, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mauritius, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Seychelles, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe)		
Project Title:	Disposal of PCB Oils Contained in Transformers and Disposal of Capacitors Containing PCB in Southern Africa		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	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:	\$90,000	Project Grant:	\$7,710,000
Co-financing:	\$31,440,000	Total Project Cost:	\$39,240,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	March 03, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Anil Sookdeo	Agency Contact Person:	Jorge Ocaña

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	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		

*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 SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		
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	
	<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>	Yes	
Project Design	<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>The project design has a number of issues that requires clarification:</p> <p>1. National legislation is usually developed to capture national circumstances. What would be the rationale for reviewing the legislation of 12 countries in a co-ordinated manner? What would this involve and how would the expected outcome be different if done separately.</p> <p>2. The project seems to suggest that a regional PCB treatment facility will be established by this project but projects</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>that the project will handle 4000 - 5000 tonnes out of possibly 10000 tonnes. Please justify how this would be sustainable and how would transboundary shipment be accomplished. Are there barriers due to the Basel and Bamako convention that would prevent this? Why are extra-regional disposal not an option?</p> <p>3. Are the utilities in the 12 countries privately owned or public entities?</p> <p>4. Who will be paying for the cost of replacing PCB containing equipment. What is the current plans by the utilities for their equipment inventory? How will this plan fit with the phase out of PCB containing equipment by 2025 and how does the project address this?</p> <p>5. What is the value for regional inventories for PCB containing equipment? Will there be instances where one utility in one country ships its used transformers/equipment to another country for use? In this regard what would be the value be of regional decision meetings on inventories and phase out plans? What is the value added from having a regional plan that would still only be implemented on a country by country basis?</p> <p>6. What are the barriers that would prevent the PCB owners to give their contaminated equipment to be disposed</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>and how does the project propose to overcome them?</p> <p>7. What safeguards will be in place to prevent diversion of equipment meant for recycling and treatment particularly since the project is proposing to move contaminated equipment and materials over international borders.</p> <p>Jan 28 - Comments cleared</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>No. Please refer to questions in (6) above.</p> <p>Jan 28 - based on discussions and re-submission on Jan 24 the comments have been addressed.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes. the project seeks to dispose of 4000-5000 tonnes of material contaminated with PCB.</p>	
	<p>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?</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>The proposal identifies the major utilities, it however does not indicate what NGOs would be involved in the project.</p> <p>Jan 28 - The Agency has indicated that during the project preparation specific NGO's will be identified.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<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>Please identify and explain how the trans boundary movement of waste PCB and wastes containing PCB will be managed. Are there restrictions due to the Basel and Bamako Conventions and if so how will these be dealt with?</p> <p>Jan 28 - The agency clarified that there are no restrictions - There will be no restrictions from the Basel and Bamako conventions for environmentally sound disposal of the PCBs in this project. The PCBs and PCBs contaminated equipment will be collected into national hubs and then brought together into a regional hub for storage and pretreatment for shipment to overseas for final disposal and any material recovery that may be involved.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
	<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 	<p>Pending clarifications on the project design. In revising the project design please carefully examine the barriers that prevent the environmentally sound management of PCB and PCB containing waste and describe how the project will address these particularly how scale up and replication will be achieved.</p> <p>Jan 28 - Comments have been addressed satisfactorily</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	experience. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for 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?	The GEF funding is appropriate for the amount of material to be disposed.	
	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? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	No. The distribution of co-financing is unusual. For example in component 3 where the actual treatment and disposal of PCB contaminated and containing equipment the co-financing is significantly comparatively low when compared to the other three less investment intensive components. The level of cash co-financing is also low compared to the amount of ambition of the project. Jan 28 - Addressed satisfactorily	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	PPG amount is within the norm.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	No	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan 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. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Not at this time. Revisions and responses to the review will need to be submitted for a second review. Jan 28 - Yes	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	The proponents must clearly put forward a project framework that will ensure environmentally sound management of	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>not only out of service equipment but also in-service equipment up to the end of life and final treatment/disposal.</p> <p>The proponents must ensure that PCB containing and contaminated oils are properly accounted for from the time of removal to final disposal.</p> <p>The proponents must include a clear rationale for choosing technologies and methods for treating PCB containing oil and PCB contaminated equipment and oil.</p> <p>At CEO endorsement the project must clearly articulate the regional management structure for the project.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	August 27, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	January 28, 2014	
	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.**