



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;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$8,136,986
Co-financing:	\$38,300,000	Total Project Cost:	\$46,636,986
PIF Approval:	February 19, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	April 12, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Evelyn Swain	Agency Contact Person:	Richard Thompson

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	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	Yes
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	No	No
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes	Yes
	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Resource Availability	• the STAR allocation?	NA	NA
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes	Yes
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	NA
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	NA
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	NA
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	NA
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes	Yes
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes	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	Yes
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes	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	Yes
*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)
Project Design	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?		Cost effectiveness will be achieved through the utilization of the capacities acquired during previous and on-going initiatives conducted by FAO and other partners, particularly those related to POPs contaminated sites and disposal options. The proposed pilot/ demonstration projects for pesticide life cycle and container management will also enable the exchange and enhancement of related experiences among the participating countries towards expanding similar future activities in a cost effective way.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	Yes	Yes
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes	It was indicated under component 1 that GEF funds will be used to decontaminate a highly contaminated site in one of the Central Asia countries covered by this project. In this respect, FAO is advised to coordinate the selection of this site with UNEP team who will be undertaking a similar intervention in Kyrgyz Republic and Tajikistan under the project entitled "Demonstration of non-thermal treatment of DDT wastes in Central Asia". This is necessary to avoid duplication and to maximize opportunities for sharing related information and lessons learned. Furthermore, planned exportation of POPs waste to a high temperature

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>incinerator in Turkey (i.e. Izaydas facility, being qualified under GEF/UNDP project # 4601) to be undertaken during this project, should be aligned with the incinerator facility upgrading time schedule to ensure that the waste is treated only after the facility is upgraded.</p> <p>LA, 10 June 2016</p> <p>ES, 9/21/16: The project has been revised to clearly coordinate with other projects in the region. -Comment cleared</p>
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes	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	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>	<p>The involvement and roles of the key CSOs/ NGOs in the project preparation and implementation have been elaborated.</p> <p>LA, 10 June 2016</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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> <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>	<p>Yes. The project document indicates that the proposed mitigation measures for the high risks will be further elaborated in the EMP.</p> <p>LA, 10 June 2016</p>
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes	<p>Yes (please also consider the comment in box 15 above).</p> <p>LA, 10 June 2016</p>
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes	Yes
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		<p>Most changes have been made to the PIF have been adequately clarified and justified. However, the project document has included an assessment study on the use of cement kilns for the destruction of the POPs wastes in some of the participating countries. While Cement Kilns under ideal conditions with robust health and safety regulations can be an option, this is not a preferred option for funding given the high level</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>of health and safety risks that can result from converting a commercial cement plant into a hazardous waste facility which would require a completely different set of standard operating practices, new licensing etc. In this regard please reconsider the technology options and Please revise the project document accordingly.</p> <p>LA, 10 June 2016</p> <p>ES, 9/21/16: The project document has been amended. - Comment cleared</p>
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes	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 1 is much lower than for component 2. In component 1, where the majority of reduction will occur it would be a better usage of funds to re-allocate the amounts of co-financing from component 1 to deal with a larger</p>	<p>A number of budget items listed in Appendix 3 warrant further justification/ revision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The total amount of \$189,000 estimated for communications and gender mainstreaming under components 1, 2 and 3. 2. The unit cost of \$4,425 for regional workshops, under components 1 (travel and DSA for 12 person amounting to \$53,100) 3. The personal protective equipment for inventories (\$53,200): whom are we purchasing these for? If for government personal, these costs should be borne by the government co-financing.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>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>	<p>4. The IT equipment cost for computers, cameras, hard drivers, printers should be from the PM budget not the project budget.</p> <p>5. The lump sum of \$120,000 for cost benefit comparison under component 3.</p> <p>LA, 10 June 2016</p> <p>ES, 9/21/16: Justification has been provided. -Comment 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>	Yes, confirmation of co-financing from all participating countries is provided with the project document submitted for CEO approval.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes	Yes
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors		Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	Yes	Yes
	• Convention Secretariat?	No comments received for this project.	No comments received for this project.
	• Council comments?		No comments received for this project.
	• Other GEF Agencies?	No comments received for this project.	No comments received for this project.
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> <p>All requested support information and documents have been provided.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		LA, 30 May, 2016	
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?		Yes
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		Not at this stage. Please address the GEFSEC comments above. LA, 10 June 2016 ES, 9/21/16: All comments have been addressed. CEO endorsement is recommended.
Review Date (s)	First review*	June 04, 2012	June 10, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)	July 03, 2012	September 21, 2016
	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.

