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

_____

GEF ID:	**5554**		
Country/Region:	**Regional (Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, El Salvador, Uruguay, Venezuela)**		
Project Title:	**Strengthening of National Initiatives and Enhancement of Regional Cooperation for the Environmentally Sound Management of POPs in Waste of Electronic or Electrical Equipment (WEEE) in Latin-American Countries**		
GEF Agency:	**UNIDO**	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:	**$200,000**	Project Grant:	**$9,500,000**
Co-financing:	**$35,000,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$44,700,000**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Anil Sookdeo**	Agency Contact Person:	**Khac Tiep Nguyen,**

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		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *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).*	Yes	
	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?	Please provide the references to the NIPs Nov 14 - Comment cleared	
Project Design	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?	The recycling and recovery of materials from e-waste usually can be attractive investments for the private sector yet this project does not seek to address this as a major component of the project. Would it be better to design a project that seeks to remove the barriers for the involvement of the private sector? In this way the project can be sustainable over the long term. A major issues in LAC is the transboundary movement of waste among and between countries. How would this project seek to overcome this barrier?	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		It is unclear what is being proposed in Component 2. Is it the intention to scale-up facilities in all countries? If not how would scaling up in a subset of countries be replicated in other countries? The level of ambition in the project is impressive but in light of the comments above there is little justification to pursue essentially 13 national projects in regard to the strengthening of national e-waste managment with a regional super-structure imposed to facilitate regional cooperation on e-waste management. The regional super-structure in itself does not seem to add value since the project works primarily at the national level in 13 countries. Nov 14 - Comment addressed - cleared	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	No - See comments in 6 above Nov 14 - Comment cleared	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	No - please provide estimates of how much emission are targeted by this project. Nov 14- The estimated reduction of POPs has been provided and would need to be confirmed during the PPG phase. Comment cleared.	
	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		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	The role of the private sector, which should be a major one is not considered in sufficient depth. Nov 14 - Comment cleared	
	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)	A major risk of projects in this regiona particularily in the context of the transboundary movement of waste has not been addressed. Nov 14 - Comment cleared	
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes	
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. • 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 experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.	The project misses the role of the private sector which could be a valuable opportunity for sustainably managing e-waste in this region. Nov 14 - Comment addressed - cleared	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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 amounts seem appropriate but an evaluation cannot be done without responses to comments raised above. Nov 14 - The Funding is appropriate for coverage of 13 countries.	
	17. At PIF: 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? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	Co-financing has not been confirmed. Nov 14 - The Agency has clarifeid the co-financing will be confirmedduring the PPG phase.	
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	Yes	
	19. At PIF, 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? At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	Yes within the norm.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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. There is substantial room for improvement of the design of the project. There should be a focus on how the project could remove the barriers preventing the private sector from fully managing this sector. Nov 14 - The project concept has been clarifed and can be a model for addressing the emission of POPS from this region. The project is technically cleared and can be included in a future GEF 5 workprogram.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Calculations of the amount of POPS to be reduced/eliminated.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Clear description of the regional activites and the approach to dealing with transboundary transport of POPS containing materail. Clear plan for how this project will be used to catalyse the reduction of POPS in the entire sector.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		
	First review*	September 06, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	November 14, 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.**