



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4738		
Country/Region:	Morocco		
Project Title:	ASP2 Disposal of Obsolete Pesticides including POPs and Implementation of Pesticides Management Programme		
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:	\$3,500,000
Co-financing:	\$25,730,000	Total Project Cost:	\$29,230,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	February 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ibrahima Sow	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, FAO has significant experience in disposal of obsolete pesticides including POPs pesticides.	
	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, FAO has representation in Morocco.	
	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the		

*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	Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	None	
	• the focal area allocation?	None	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	None	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	None	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	None	
	• focal area set-aside?	None	
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	
	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, the project priorities are identified in the country's NIP.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	The project includes sustainability efforts through training and curricula development under component 3.	
	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?	The baseline project is clear.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	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, incremental reasoning is applied to add global environmental benefits to the baseline project.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>Component 1: In outcome 1.2 how many sites will be remediated?</p> <p>Component 3: Is integrated pest management being considered?</p> <p>ES, January 3, 2012: Comment cleared, FAO clarified that an estimated 10 sites will be remediated and this number will be adjusted during project preparation. Also, IPM is being promoted.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	The project will cost about USD \$4,000 per ton calculated based on a recent contract for disposal in Mali. 1,000 tons will be eliminated as well as remediation of heavily contaminated sites.	
	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 it will address the gender dimension. Women are frequently exposed to pesticides through reuse of contaminated containers.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>Public participation is lacking.</p> <p>ES, January 3, 2012: Comment cleared, public participation included in component 3.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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)	Climate change risks should be identified and mitigated, including extreme events and pest infestations. ES, January 3, 2012: Comment cleared, climate changes risks addressed.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, the project is consistent with other initiatives including the Africa Stockpile Project Phase I. Please indicate if there will be coordination with the UNIDO and UNDP PCB disposal project in Morocco. ES, January 3, 2012: Comment cleared, FAO is coordinating with UNIDO and UNDP.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes, Ministry of Agriculture will be the lead national executing partner.	
	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 is appropriate at 5%. ES, January 5, 2012: The PMC cofinancing ratio is 1:2.86 while the overall cofinancing ratio is 1:7.35. The PMC cofinancing ratio should match the overall project cofinancing ratio.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Co-financing ratio is 1:3.6. Little effort is needed to bring the co-financing to 1:4. ES, January 3, 2012: Co-financing has	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		been increased. The GEF funded portion of this project is too high please reduce GEF funding to no more that \$3.5 million.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	About half of the co-financing is cash.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	FAO is providing \$560,000 in cash.	
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?	NA	
	• Convention Secretariat?	NA	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	NA	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>Not at this time, several issues need to be clarified as mentioned above, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Efforts to increase the co-financing 2. Climate risks identified 3. Public participation <p>ES, January 3, 2012: All issues have been clarified and PIF clearance is recommended pending a reduction in GEF funding to no more than \$3.5</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		million. ES, January 5, 2012: The GEF funding has been reduced to \$3.5 Million and PIF clearance is recommended pending an increase in the PMC cofinancing to a level equal to the overall project cofinancing. ES, January 6, 2012: PMC cofinancing is at an acceptable level and PIF clearance is recommended.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
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*	December 09, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 03, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 05, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 06, 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?	

	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.