



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5000		
Country/Region:	Regional (Azerbaijan, Kyrgyz Republic, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Turkey)		
Project Title:	Lifecycle Management of Pesticides and Disposal of POPs Pesticides in Central Asian Countries and Turkey		
GEF Agency:	FAO	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; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$8,136,986
Co-financing:	\$32,400,000	Total Project Cost:	\$40,536,986
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	April 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Anil Sookdeo	Agency Contact Person:	Mohamed Ammati

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	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	No	
	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		

*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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Resource Availability	available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?		
	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?	Yes	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes	
	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?	Yes	
	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?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	Yes	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes	
	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?	Yes	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>Please provide a list of CSO's that will be involved and their roles in the project.</p> <p>July 3, 2012 - Two NGO's have been identified, however their roles have not been clearly stated. At the stage of CEO endorsement the roles and involvement of NGOs must be clearly defined.</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>The Majority of risks are high in this project. A major concern is the internal transportation costs which have resulted in a project in Tajikistan being aborted after the PPG stage.</p> <p>The costs of this project are high and the majority of funds seems to be directed towards transport. How will the project be implemented in the instance that co-financing levels do not sufficiently assist in the transportation costs?</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>June 1, 2012 - The use of limited resources for transport costs seems unreasonable. Please address these costs through other means.</p> <p>Oct 2, 2012 - The budget has been revised. Comment cleared</p>	
	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?	Yes	
	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?	Yes	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>The cost effectiveness of this project is on the high side for projects of this type. There is a real risk that if the co-financing cannot be realized then the movement of packaged waste will not be possible. Please breakdown the costs per kg of disposal by components - safeguarding and re-packaging, transport, disposal.</p> <p>The level of co-financing for component is much lower than than for component 2. In component 1, where the majority of reduction will occur it</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>would be a better usage of funds to re-allocate the amounts of co-financing from component to deal with a larger stockpile than 900 tonnes and remove the burden of covering high transportation costs from the GEF contribution.</p> <p>July 3, 12 - While the responses provided indicate that the co-financing is tied to other work there remains a major concern on the cost of the destruction of only 900 tons. The project would benefit from a rethinking of how to leverage additional funding from other donors to allow for a significant reduction of these chemical stockpiles. Comment not cleared</p> <p>Oct 2, 2012 - Comment addressed - cleared</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>The co-financing at the PIF stage is adequate, however a re-distribution of these funds should be done to increase the amount of pesticide being dealt with as well as cover the majority of the costs of internal transport.</p> <p>July 3, 2012 - Same as 24.</p> <p>Oct 2, 2012 - comment cleared</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	None Received	
	• Convention Secretariat?	None Received	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	None Received	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>Pending responses to the review</p> <p>July 3, 2012 - Overall there remains a high degree of uncertainty if this project can be implemented with any significant reductions being made. A better case has to be constructed with additional donors to raise the impact level of the project. FAO is advised to redesign this project.</p> <p>Oct 2, 2012 - The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>Confirmation of the Co-financing</p> <p>Possibility of regional disposal facility</p> <p>Clear estimate of costs involved at each stage of the management and disposal operations.</p> <p>Cost effectiveness of the overall disposal operations must be clearly defined and justified in the final project document.</p>	
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?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	June 04, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	July 03, 2012	
	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
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	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.