

Enhancing environmental performance in the expanded and extruded polystyrene foam industries in Turkey

GEF Secretariat Review for Full Sized Project

Basic Information

GEF ID
10082

Countries
Turkey

Project Title
Enhancing environmental performance in the expanded and extruded polystyrene foam industries in Turkey

GEF Agency(ies)
UNIDO

Agency ID
UNIDO: 170008

GEF Focal Area(s)
Chemicals and Waste

Program Manager
Evelyn Swain

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please add core indicators 6 and 11.

ES, 11/17/18: For indicator 9 can you estimate the tons of foam using HBCD rather than pure chemical?

ES, 11/19/18: Information provided. -Comment cleared

ES, 11/20/18

Comments on Rio Markers:

This project appears to contribute towards CCM as a co-benefit (Core Indicator 6). If so, the Rio Marker for CCM should be "1". The project does not describe any CCA co-benefits and hence the Rio Marker for CCA should be "0".

Comments on Core Indicators:

Indicator 6. The Portal reports 2000 tons for indicator 6 (1000 direct and 1000 indirect), but this is not reflected in the underlying project document.

ES, 11/20/18 Rio marker and core indicator 6 have been corrected. Comment cleared

Agency Response

Added indicators 6 and 11. Further the information on the amount of foam converted to HBCD-free foam products, 110000 metric tons/a, due to project activities were inserted in Indicator 9.

11/20/18: Indicator 6 estimated results are now reflected in the GEB section. Also Rio Marker Climate Change Mitigation 1 has been selected.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please add core indicator 6 and 11.

ES, 11/17/18: Added. -Comment cleared

Agency Response

Added

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please add GEBs for core indicator 6 if possible.

ES, 11/17/18: Comment cleared

Agency Response

The GEB for climate benefits are substantial and complex. These arise from higher utilization of modern insulation material which are on average 16% more efficient than traditional insulation material. Also because of their affordability the rate of using such materials are expected to raise significantly and through this increase the building energy efficiency and GEB. In addition, using lower GWP blowing agents at manufacturing will have a large contribution to the climate GEB. However exact quantities are depending on the actual lines (and their capacity) converted. Due to this a detailed GEB for core indicator 6 can only be calculated in the PPG phase.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please add coordinates.

ES, 11/17/18: Added. -Comment cleared

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes.

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes.

Agency Response

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes.

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
PIF and PPG are recommended for technical clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>