



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9371		
Country/Region:	Regional (Burkina Faso, Benin, Mali, Niger, Senegal, Togo)		
Project Title:	Impact Investment and Capacity Building in Support of Sustainable Waste Management to Reduce Emissions of Unintentional POPs (UPOPs) and Mercury in West Africa		
GEF Agency:	BOAD	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Chemicals and Waste
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CW-1 Program 1; CW-2 Program 3; CW-2 Program 4; CW-2 Program 6; CW-2 Program 3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$275,230	Project Grant:	\$15,924,771
Co-financing:	\$77,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$93,200,001
PIF Approval:	October 30, 2017	Council Approval/Expected:	November 30, 2017
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ibrahima Sow	Agency Contact Person:	Youssef TOURE

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	Yes, the project is aligned with CW1, program 1, CW2, programs 2,4 and 6. The project also includes a CCM 2 component totally covered by co-financing.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes, the project is consistent with recipients country's strategies and plans related to chemicals and waste management. It aims at addressing, in particular the issue of open burning	

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>which remains the main source of dioxins and furans in the participating countries. The project will also address mercury in hospitals.</p> <p>However, the project is not taking into consideration ongoing projects in the region. Duplication with other activities in the region should be avoided. Please specify how coordination with relevant ongoing projects will be assured.</p>	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>Drivers of environmental degradation - open burning of municipal and hazardous wastes, uncontrolled landfills, mismanagement of infectious wastes, are well described in the project document.</p> <p>An innovative financial mechanism is designed to allow a sustainable waste management system in the participating countries through supporting small medium enterprises (SMEs) and Economic Interest Groups (EIGs) in charge of collection, sorting, recycling and treatment of wastes.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>Yes. BOAD will develop a financial model to support SMEs and other enterprises in charge of waste collection, recycling, etc... and work with specialized enterprises for the</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>development and management of the sanitary landfills in the participating countries.</p> <p>However, BOAD is requested to provide a very clear justification for requesting 8.5M for CW1 program 1. More importantly we should expect that use of resources from Program 1 has very clearly defined learning and knowledge objectives and the design of the project should be such that it answers a number of questions related to waste management.</p> <p>The GEF would like to see its resources be strategically used to ensure that investments by the Government, municipalities etc. are done such that the end result prevents the entry into landfills materials that will contribute to the emissions of POPs and mercury. In this regard the GEF component could be limited to technical assistance that provides guidance to the investment on the best available technologies and practices and help to guide the decision of the investment on the costs and benefits of the selected technologies and practices. It is not clear from the description in the proposal what exactly the GEF resources are being used for.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>In terms of promoting the development of SMEs etc, ... to enter the recycling sector, the question here is that should this be incorporated into an integrated waste management system, or is it better to ensure the mechanisms and incentives for at source segregation and collection of materials along with centralized recycling a better option. The project design takes the former as the way forward, in the regard, what is the basis for this?</p> <p>Please explain why the GEB is very low (200t) and why there is no estimation of UPOPs emission reductions.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>BOAD will work micro-finance Institutions with the view to supporting SMEs in charge of waste management, including proper collection, sorting, recycling and environmentally sound treatment. The operationalization of 50-100 micro-loans per country adapted to the needs of micro-enterprises for waste treatment and recycling including POPs is an important niche of jobs creation and reflects the innovative aspect of this project.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>However, the project activities planned for Senegal should be implemented in a city other than Dakar as there are already several ongoing activities on waste management in the Capital City, including the planned activities in the context of the Sustainable Cities program funded by the GEF.</p> <p>It is stated that only Ouagadougou (Burkina Faso) and Dakar (Senegal) have installed LTC with an acceptable quality in terms of protection of human health and the environment, though improvements can still be made.</p> <p>I am not aware of an acceptable landfill in Dakar or in any other city of WAEMU. Please clarify. Please provide a comprehensive description of what is meant here by LTCs.</p> <p>I am not convinced by the relevance of 15 exchange trips in the recipient countries. This might be too costly and can prove to be not efficient as countries have different situation in terms of legal/regulatory framework, stakeholder involvement, level of awareness, etc.. In lieu and place, I would suggest to focus on training, building capacity of SMES and</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		developing a powerful communication campaign to raise awareness of the relevant authorities and local population.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes. EIGs, SMEs and CSOs will be largely involved in the development and implementation of the project. The gender element will be very significant in the project as several associations and other micro-enterprises working on waste management often include women.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	NA	
	• The focal area allocation?	Yes	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• Focal area set-aside?	The project will be funded under the C&W set-aside for LDCs	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>Not at this time: Please address the comment above and the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Replace low developed countries by least developed countries, everywhere in the project document - Select another city other than Dakar for Senegal - Provide the letter of endorsement for 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Guinea Bissau</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please provide an explanation of the concept of pedagogical ENVIRO-Mobile in each partner country - Please focus on training, capacitating and certification of SMES and other relevant enterprises in lieu and place of the 15 exchange trips in the participating countries. <p>Considering that the issue of waste management and their related health and environmental impact needs to be strongly advocated in the participating countries, I recommend BOAD to develop a powerful communication and awareness campaign targeting the relevant authorities and local population.</p> <p>4 April 2016 All comments have been addressed. PM recommends CEO clearance of the PIF. Inclusion in upcoming work programs is pending availability of resources.</p>	
Review Date	Review	February 02, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 04, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.