



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

GEF ID:	4601		
Country/Region:	Turkey		
Project Title:	POPs Legacy Elimination and POPs Release Reduction Project		
GEF Agency:	UNDP and UNIDO	GEF Agency Project ID:	4833 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	POPs
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CHEM-1; CHEM-1; CHEM-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$250,000	Project Grant:	\$10,815,000
Co-financing:	\$84,664,583	Total Project Cost:	\$95,729,583
PIF Approval:	February 20, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	April 12, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Anil Sookdeo	Agency Contact Person:	Jacques Van Engel,

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?	UNDP and UNIDO have demonstrated comparative advantage in the activities that are indicated to be implemented by them respectively.	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		

*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)
Resource Availability	available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the STAR allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund • focal area set-aside? 		
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?	<p>The project proposes to train up to 50 professionals on BAT/BEP and 25 professionals on regulations and policy along with 10 training sessions. It would be useful to have an idea where there professionals will be sourced, what level of training is expected and their baseline skills. Additionally for BAT/BEP what sectors will be targeted and which professionals will be trained and on what exactly.</p> <p>November 21, 2011 - Comment cleared based on explanations provided in the response to the 1st review.</p>	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>No. The baseline project design has not been elaborated. There is a good description of the baseline situation (current situation) and the GEF project that seeks to address it. The baseline project is not evident from this description. The GEF project is the alternative to the Baseline Project.</p> <p>See further comments in 30 below.</p> <p>November 21, 2011 - The revised PIF has elaborated the baseline project. Comment cleared.</p>	Yes
	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?		Yes. The project costs are consistent with similar projects that have been funded by the GEF.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>Unable to access without the baseline project being described.</p> <p>November 21, 2011 - The Baseline has been elaborated and the case for incrementally has been clearly made. - Comment Cleared.</p>	Yes
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>1. It is not clear from the project framework if the project will be upgrading the Izaydas incineration facility, and if so will the only reason for the upgrade be for it to treat POPs waste.</p> <p>November 21, 2011 - The response elaborated that the facility can currently handle POPS and the project will assist</p>	Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>with the certification of the facility. - Comment cleared.</p> <p>2. Which chemicals and in what amounts will be part of the test burn. How much will need to be disposed once the test is completed and how will the remaining amounts be dealt with.</p> <p>November 21, 2011 - The remaining stockpiles of POPS in Turkey will be dealt with. Comment cleared.</p> <p>3. This project seeks to dispose of the remaining 200 Tonnes of PCB, however a large component is being dedicated to managing PCB contamination that may or may not exist. Could the revised inventories not be done through the NIP Update and can PCB ESM models not be shared with Turkey so that the utilities manage this system. If transformers and capacitors were replaced then there should already be an inventory of these and this can be compared to the older equipment. There can be reductions in this component and more financing from the private sector.</p> <p>November 21, 2011 - The explanation provided gives some comfort in the validity of this component and we expect that if during the PPG stage this component is not significant that it be dropped. However it is expected that the industry will bear the major part of financing this component and in this regard the level of co-financing for this</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>component needs to be increased substantially.</p> <p>ES, January 4, 2012: Co-financing has been increased. - Comment cleared.</p> <p>4. Please clarify if BAT/BEP being considered in component 3 will be applied to the incineration facility.</p> <p>November 21, 2011 - Comment Cleared.</p> <p>5. Please clarify what sectors are being targeted and why. Please also clarify the low level of industry support for this component. The co-financing for this component is well below what would be expected.</p> <p>November 21, 2011 - the co-financing is still lower than ideal. The industries need to bear the major cost of this component.</p> <p>ES, January 4, 2012: Co-financing has been increased. - Comment cleared.</p> <p>6. Please clarify if the sites in component 4 include the Merkim Site. If so then component 1 would be a subcomponent of component 4 and the design would need to be adjusted. If they are not intended to be related activities please clarify why this is not being done. In any case we would recommend aligning component 1 and 4 so that they complement each other and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>not appear as unrelated activities.</p> <p>November 21, 2011 - Comment cleared</p> <p>7. Are there already planned uses of the land that will be cleaned up? If so what role will the occupiers play in this project?</p> <p>November 21, 2011 - Comment cleared</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>Unable to access without the baseline project being described.</p> <p>November 21, 2011 - Comment Cleared</p>	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?	<p>The description in the PIF does not link the socio-economic benefits to the achievements of the project objectives. The description gives an indication of how the project will deliver socio-economic benefits but stops short of linking this to the achievement of the additional benefits of the GEF funded part of the project.</p> <p>November 21, 2011 - Comment cleared</p>	Yes
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes	Yes
	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	Yes
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, however how are the ongoing work being accounted for? Are these activities parallel or complimentary to the project? Would some of this work,	Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		such as the SAICM related activities and the assessment of contaminated sites a basis on which the project can build? November 21, 2011 - Comment cleared	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	This has not been described. November 21, 2011 - Comment Cleared	Yes
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Yes
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		N/A
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	No. November 21, 2011 - The PMC costs have been revised to levels according to GEF Guidance. Comment Cleared.	Yes
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The Overall co-financing ratio is poor. In particular the ratios in components 2, 3 and 4 are unacceptable. These levels are of concern and it is unclear with the level of co-financing if the components especially 2, 3 and 4 can be achieved. November 21, 2011 - The levels in several components have been increased, however for the levels are sub optimal. Further work by the Government of Turkey, the agencies and private sector is needed in increasing the participation of national sources of funding and other source of funding to	Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>improve the co-financing of the project.</p> <p>ES, January 4, 2012: Co-financing has been increased. The GEF funded portion of this project is too high please reduce GEF funding to no more that \$6.5 million.</p> <p>August 17 - Based on additional information from the country the costs have been reduced to 10M. This is acceptable - Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>Most of the Co-financing is known at this stage.</p>	<p>The co-financing is confirmed.</p>
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		<p>Yes</p>
	<p>28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		<p>Yes</p>
Agency Responses	<p>29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 	<p>None Received</p>	<p>Yes</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 	<p>None Received</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? • Other GEF Agencies? 	<p>None Received</p>	<p>None recieved</p>
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<p>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</p>	<p>This is a promising project, however there are issues that need to be resolved before a decision can be made.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Project Framework:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is not clear from the project framework if the project will be upgrading the Izaydas incineration facility, and if so will the only reason for the upgrade be for it to treat POPs waste. 2. Which chemicals and in what amounts will be part of the test burn. How much will need to be disposed once the test is completed and how will the remaining amounts be dealt with. 3. This project seeks to dispose of the remaining 200 Tonnes of PCB, however a large component is being dedicated to managing PCB contamination that may or may not exist. Could the revised inventories not be done through the NIP Update and can PCB ESM models not be shared with Turkey so that the utilities manage this system. If transformers and capacitors were replaced then there should already be an inventory of these and this can be compared to the older equipment. There can be reductions in this component and more financing from the private sector. If this project is recommended then at the PPG stage the assessment of PCB contamination needs to be done to determine if there is an actual need for this project. 4. Please clarify if BAT/BEP being considered in component 3 will be applied to the incineration facility. 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>5. Please clarify what sectors are being targeted and why. Please also clarify the low level of industry support for this component. The co-financing for this component is well below what would be expected.</p> <p>6. Please clarify if the sites in component 4 include the Merkim Site. If so then component 1 would be a subcomponent of component 4 and the design would need to be adjusted. If they are not intended to be related activities please clarify why this is not being done. In any case we would recommend aligning component 1 and 4 so that they complement each other and not appear as unrelated activities.</p> <p>7. Are there already planned uses of the land that will be cleaned up? If so what role will the occupiers play in this project?</p> <p>Baseline Project:</p> <p>1. The PIF only describes the baseline situation and the project components. While the description of the baseline situation and barriers is necessary in arriving at both the baseline project and incremental activities it is not sufficient. It is not possible to see what the incremental activities are since we cannot compare the alternative scenario with the baseline project. Even though there may be no current activities occurring the Project Manager</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>needs to define what activities would be necessary to safe guard the national population from exposure and poor handling of POPS. Please revise this section.</p> <p>Project Financing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Overall co-financing ratio is poor. In particular the ratios in components 2, 3 and 4 are unacceptable. 2. As per the GEF guidance on Project Management Costs for projects exceeding 2M from the GEF Trust Fund this project is above the acceptable levels. <p>November 21, 2011.</p> <p>The revised PIF address the technical issues raised in the first review of the PIF and the baseline project has been improved, and there is a clear understanding of the objectives of the project.</p> <p>The question of financing of this project has however not been sufficiently addressed and it is expected that with such a large involvement of the private sector that the level of financing from these entities should be higher. In this regard the agency, country and industry should seek to raise the level of co-financing for this project.</p> <p>ES, January 4, 2012: Co-financing has been increased and clearance is</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>recommended pending a reduction in GEF funding to no more than \$6.5 million.</p> <p>August 17 -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>Exact Industry Sectors being targeted for BAT/BEP</p> <p>PCB contamination assessment should be completed in the PPG stage to determine if there is an actual need for an ESM for PCB.</p> <p>The nature of the training to be provided to 50 BAT/BEP professionals and 25 legal/regulatory professionals.</p> <p>The type of upgrading of the destruction facilities.</p> <p>ES, January 4, 2012: These items have been noted by UNDP/UNIDO and will be elaborated during PPG stage.</p>	
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?		Yes
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 06, 2011	November 14, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	November 21, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 04, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 17, 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. 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*	August 17, 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.