



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

GEF ID:	<b>4877</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Serbia</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Environmentally-Sound Management and Final Disposal of PCBs</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNIDO</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>POPs</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CHEM-1; Project Mana; Others;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$2,100,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$8,510,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$10,610,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>April 01, 2013</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ibrahima Sow</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Mr. Fukuya Iino</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes. Serbia is a party to the Stockholm Convention and has submitted an initial NIP.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. Endorsement letter submitted by Mr. Aleksandar Vesic, GEF OFP for Serbia.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. UNIDO has been very active in implementing POPs related projects in particular it has extensive experience in ESM of PCBs in Eastern Europe and Balkan Region.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes. UNIDO has staff capacity present in Serbia.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	N/A	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	N/A	
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?	Yes. The project is consistent with Serbia's NIP.	
	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, baseline projects and data assumptions are clear.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	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?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	Yes. Incremental reasoning provided is clear.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Project framework is clear.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes, this project will replace and destroy 200 tons of PCB containing equipment.	
	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?	Not fully. Please provide additional detail to discussion of gender dimension.  ES, July 19, 2012: Additional info has been provided in B.3 para 17. - Comment cleared	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Please provide additional discussion addressing public participation such as the role of local and indiginous communities.  ES, July 19, 2012: Para 18 has been added to address local communities. - Comment cleared	
	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)	Please address climate risks including the risk of increased severe weather.  ES, July 19, 2012: Climate risks have been included. -Comment cleared	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, the project notes ongoing relevant initiatives in the region and coordination and consistency with the goals of this project.	
	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?	PMC costs are appropriate at 5%. PMC co-financing ratio is 1:8.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes. Overall co-financing ratio is adequate at 1:4.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Co-financing is appropriate at a ratio of 1:4. The majority of co-financing comes from the state owned power company which is appropriate.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	UNIDO is contributing \$10,000 cash.	
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?	N/A	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council comments?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>	N/A	
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>Not at this time, some items, as noted above, need further information, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) climate risks</li> <li>2) public participation</li> <li>3) gender dimension</li> </ol> <p>ES, July 19, 2012: All issues have been addressed. PIF clearance is recommended.</p>	
	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?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	May 03, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	July 19, 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	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	Yes.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 27, 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.