



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

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| GEF ID: | 4915 | | |
| Country/Region: | Russian Federation | | |
| Project Title: | Environmentally Sound Management and Final Disposal of PCBs at the Russian Railroad Network and Other PCB Owners | | |
| 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; CHEM-1; Project Mana; | | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | \$0 | Project Grant: | \$7,400,000 |
| Co-financing: | \$34,200,000 | Total Project Cost: | \$41,600,000 |
| PIF Approval: | | Council Approval/Expected: | June 01, 2012 |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | Anil Sookdeo | Agency Contact Person: | Mr. Mohamed Eisa |

| 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, Russia has recently ratified the Stockholm Convention. Please submit a NIP or draft NIP to the GEF by the time of CEO endorsement of the project. AS 13/Apr/2012 - The draft NIP has been submitted. The management and disposal of PCB has been identified in the NIP as priorities. | |
| | 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 | |

*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 11-22-2010

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| | 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 | |
| Resource Availability | 6. 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 | | |
| | • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? | | |
| | • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund | | |
| 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? | Please elaborate on the elements from the draft NIP that this project will be responding to. AS 13 Apr 2102 - Yes - Comment cleared | |
| | 10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes? | Yes | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|--|--|
| 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 project needs to be clarified on what are the proposals for disposal and the plans for collection and removal of the in use and obsolete PCB containing equipment.</p> <p>AS Apr/13/2012 - The baseline project has been satisfactorily elaborated in the revised PIF. - Comment Cleared</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>Pending</p> <p>AS Apr/13/2012 - Yes - Comment Cleared</p> | |
| | 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 indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly? | Yes | |

| 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) | Yes | |
| | 19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region? | This is the first project on POPs elimination in Russia,. | |
| | 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>No. On average the cost effectiveness of PCB management projects including disposal is on the order of 1\$/kg. This project proposes to dispose of 5000 tonnes of contaminated waste and equipment which should be in the range of a 5M project. Please reduce the GEF component of this project to no more than 7M from the GEF trust fund.</p> <p>AS 13/Apr/2012</p> <p>The project has been re-aligned and is well withing the Cost Effectiveness a project of this type. The cost effectiveness is now \$1.3/kg.</p> | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | 25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided. | The majority of the co-financing is in kind or not known at this stage. Since the project proposes to establish disposal/treatment facilities in Russia then there should already be funding identified for this purpose in addition to the funding associated with the replacement program for in use transformers. AS 13/Apr/2012 - The Russian Railroad, who are the main co-funders of this project has included in their own budgets the land and development and construction of decontamination, interim storage and disposal facilities for PCB. This is part of the baseline project. Comment Cleared. | |
| | 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? | | |
| | 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 | |
| | • Other GEF Agencies? | None Received | |
| Secretariat Recommendation | | | |
| | 30. Is PIF clearance/approval being | The cost of the project is higher than | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|--|
| Recommendation at PIF Stage | recommended? | expected for PCB management projects. This needs to be addressed along with comments related to the baseline project, the NIP priorities and others detailed in the review sheet. AS 13/Apr/2012 - All issues have been addressed. The project can now be 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? | | |
| | 33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended? | | |
| Review Date (s) | First review* | April 04, 2012 | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | April 13, 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? | Yes |
| | 2. Is itemized budget justified? | Yes |
| Secretariat Recommendation | 3. Is PPG approval being recommended? | Yes |

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| | 4. Other comments | |
| Review Date (s) | First review* | April 13, 2012 |
| | 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.