



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

GEF ID:	<b>5109</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Malawi</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Pesticide Risk Reduction in Malawi</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>FAO</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>POPs</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CHEM-1; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$75,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$2,550,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$11,879,374</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$14,504,374</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>October 02, 2012</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>November 15, 2012</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Evelyn Swain</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Francesca Mancini</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	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?	Yes	Yes
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	No	NA
	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.

<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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	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	Yes.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes	Yes, this comes from Chem-1
	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?	Yes	The project will strengthen the legal and institutional framework and address alternatives.
	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?	Yes	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		Yes, cost effectiveness is demonstrated.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	Yes	Yes, the activities are based on incremental reasoning.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes	Yes.
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes	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	Yes, gender and social sustainability are described.
	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, risks are accounted for.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes	Yes.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes	Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Yes. Justifications were provided for the minor changes made.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes	Yes.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The project costs should be reduced. Suggested cuts are 450,000 from Component 1, 300,000 from component 2 and 100,000 from component 3.  19/09/12 (AS) - The project costs have been revised - Comment cleared.	Yes.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Co-financing is appropriate.	Yes, all co-financing letters are provided.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes	Yes.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	None Received	Yes, STAP comments are addressed.
	• Convention Secretariat?	Non Received	Comments received by Canada and France are adequately addressed.
	• Council comments?		None received

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>Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>	None Received	None Received
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	The PIF is technical clear, however please address the issues related to the project costs before final technical clearance.  19/09/12 (AS) -The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Yes, CEO Endorsement is recommended.	
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?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		Yes, CEO endorsement is recommended.
Review Date (s)	First review*		September 24, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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?	Yes
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes

Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	Yes, PPG approval is recommended.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	May 29, 2013
	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.