



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

GEF ID:	4756		
Country/Region:	Benin		
Project Title:	ASP2 Disposal of POPs and Obsolete Pesticides and Strengthening Life-cycle Management of Pesticides		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	POPs
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CHEM-1; CHEM-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,830,000
Co-financing:	\$10,031,000	Total Project Cost:	\$11,861,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	February 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jie Pan	Agency Contact Person:	Mohamed Ammati

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.	
	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?	Yes.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	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):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• 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.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes. CHEM1 and CHEM3 are properly identified.	
	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, this project addresses NIP priorities in the country.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	There are project activities which will contribute to the sustainability, such as the establishment of a container management system, national network of PSMS, and promotion of POPs alternatives. GEF would appreciate that Agency provides a summarized para in the proposal on this. Jan.4, 2012-JP Addressed	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address,	Yes, baseline projects and problems are very clearly defined.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?		
	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. This project is incremental, addressing priority pesticide management issues.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>Yes. The overall project framework is sound and clear.</p> <p>There are a few questions to be clarified.</p> <p>1. Disposal of 350 tons of endosulfan is included in this project. Please confirm that co-financing will take care of this part.</p> <p>2. In a PAN-Germany report, Benin is listed as one of the 55 countries where crops can be grown without the use of endosulfan. This shows that practical alternatives to endosulfan exist and are technically and economically feasible. In addition, Benin's successful experience with growing crops without endosulfan has been highlighted by using a range of non-chemicals strategies by an NGO called OBEPAB. Please clarify that how this IPM component is for scaling-up not duplication.</p> <p>3. B2. Mentions that "contaminated sites posing immediate risk to human health and the environment will be</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		remediated." But in project framework, there is no mentioning of contaminated soil treatment or site remediation. Please clarify. If remediation of contaminated sites is included, what is the land size or soil amount? Jan.4, 2012-JP Addressed. Amount of contaminated soil to be treated will be indicated at CEO endorsement.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	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?	Yes.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes, key stakeholders and their roles are identified.	
	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, risks are raised and countermeasures identified.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes. FAO will coordinate with related initiatives in the country or region. It is also important to take into account NGO's achievement (eg. OBEPAB) so far and utilize/incorporate it if applicable.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Stakeholders are identified without much detail on implementation/executing arrangement. This will need to be fleshed out at PD stage. Jan.4, 2012-JP Addressed	
	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 stands at 5% of total GEF resources Jan. 5, 2012 GEF contribution vs. co-financing contribution for PMC should be equivalent to project co-financing ratio of 1:5.48. Please adjust and make sure all future incoming projects follow this principle.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Component 1 and 2 where the disposal of 600 tons of stocks and decontamination of 30,000 contaminated containers takes place is well financed. However, component 3 is costly, including update legislation, training 50 staff, upload data into PSMS, and establishment of national network for PMS. Same with component 4 for IPM promotion(0.55m). GEF would like to	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>see cost-effectiveness in these 2 components and thus requests FAO to sufficiently justify/greatly reduce GEF amount.</p> <p>Jan.4, 2012-JP GEF is not convinced at the PIF stage that component 3 and 4 are cost effective. Given the disposal amount, land size and population of the recipient country, and GEF's mandate to accommodate many more requests, FAO is advised to reduce the total GEF budget allocation for 3 and 4 to no more than 450,000 USD. thus reducing GEF amount by almost 500,000 USD.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>Co-financing ratio stands at 1:2.2, falling short of GEF requirement.</p> <p>Jan.4, 2012-JP Addressed</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes. FAO is bringing 1.5million in cash to the project.	
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?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>Pending issues to be clarified before PIF clearance.</p> <p>Jan.4, 2012-JP This PIF will be recommended once the total amount is adjusted.</p> <p>Jan. 5, 2012 Pending recommendation before PMC adjustment.</p> <p>Jan. 9, 2012 PIF clearance is recommended.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	GEF expects to know the size/amount of contaminated soil to be remediated through the project at CEO endorsement stage.	
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?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*		
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 04, 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?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.