



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

GEF ID:	<b>6966</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>China</b>		
Project Title:	<b>UPOPs Reduction through BAT/BEP and PPP-based Industry Chain Management in Secondary Copper Production Sector in China</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5383 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Chemicals and Waste</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$300,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$12,600,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$52,450,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$65,350,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>October 01, 2014</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Anil Sookdeo</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Jacques Van Engel,</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Yes	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	Yes	
<b>Resource Availability</b>	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	N/A	
	• the focal area allocation?	N/A	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	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 January 2013

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>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	N/A	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><i>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).</i></p>	Yes, the project is aligned with CW 2, Program 3 and seeks to reduce UPOPs	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	Yes	
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>Yes, however would it be better to address the secondary metals processing sector as a whole rather than a sub-sectoral approach as being proposed in the project?</p> <p>ES/AS, 8/22/14- Justification was provided for only addressing the secondary copper sub-sector. The primary reason being the differences in the other secondary metals processing including lead from lead acid batteries. Additionally the copper sector poses the most urgent of the sub-sectors in terms of emissions of UPOPs. In this regard it</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>would be more efficient to deal with the sub sectors through individual projects. - Comment cleared</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>Have the proponents considered addressing the entire secondary metals processing sector rather than the sub-sectoral approach being proposed?</p> <p>ES, 8/22/14- Justification was provided for only addressing the secondary copper sub-sector. -Comment cleared</p> <p>Please elaborate on what is envisioned for component 3. How is it different from what is proposed in 2.3?</p> <p>ES/AS, 8/22/14- The difference was clarified and the PIF has been revised. - Comment cleared</p> <p>What would the target audience be for the public awareness raising being proposed in 3.2</p> <p>ES/AS, 8/22/14- Target audience clarified and the PIF has been revised. - Comment cleared</p> <p>Would the results being that would come out of the projects be made available to other countries, and if so how?</p> <p>ES, 8/22/14- Yes, the results will be available for other countries through BCRCs and others. -Comment Cleared</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes	
	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)	Yes	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes	
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the</li> </ul>	<p>The project will address a small fraction of the secondary copper processing industry and the results of the project, if successful, can be scaled to the entire secondary copper processing sector which in China would achieve significant scale.</p> <p>ES, 8/22/14- Scale will be achieved</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>through the National Replication Programme in component 3. -Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>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?</p>		
Project Financing	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>For component 1 please provide a breakdown of the expected activities to which the GEF resources will be assigned and those to which co-financing will be assigned.</p> <p>Same comment for component 2</p> <p>ES, 8/22/14- Acceptable breakdown provided for Component 1 and 2. - Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>17. <u>At PIF</u>: 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? <u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>The financing package seems appropriate at this stage however better details on the type of technology or other that will be implemented as BAT/BEP would be useful at the time of CEO endorsement.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	Yes	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , 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? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	PPG is requested within the norm.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	No	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> 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. <b>Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	Pending clarifications from the agency.  ES/AS, 8/22/14- PIF approval is recommended pending availability of GEF trust fund resources.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	1. Clear details of the financing package 2. Clear estimates of the UPOPs to be reduced 3. Clear description of the technologies that will be implemented through the project 4. Clearly define the role of the Stockholm and Basel Convention Centers in knowledge dissemination from the project.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	August 14, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 22, 2014	
	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.**