



PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF)

PROJECT TYPE: FSP
THE GEF TRUST FUND

Submission Date: August 18, 2009
Re-submission Date: January 28, 2010

PART I: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

GEF PROJECT ID: P118630 **PROJECT DURATION:** 24 MONTHS

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: AIS

COUNTRIES: Regional (Mali, Tunisia)

PROJECT TITLE: Africa Stockpiles Programme - Project 1 – Supplemental Funds for Disposal and Prevention

GEF AGENCY: World Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Direction Nationale de l'Assainissement et du Contrôle des Pollutions et des Nuisances (Mali), Agence Nationale de Gestion des Déchets (Tunisia)

GEF FOCAL AREA: POPs

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAMS: POPs-SP1-Capacity Building; POPs-SP2-Investment

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT:

PROJECT PROMOTES SOUND CHEMICAL MANAGEMENT: Yes

INDICATIVE CALENDAR*	
Milestones	Expected Dates
Work Program (for FSP)	March 2010
CEO Endorsement/Approval	April 2010
Agency Approval Date	June 2010
Implementation Start	September 2010
Mid-term Evaluation (if planned)	N/A
Project Closing Date	December 2011

A. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: Reduced exposure to POPs and other harmful chemicals in two countries (Mali and Tunisia) participating in the first phase of the Africa Stockpiles Programme¹

Project Components	Indicate whether Investment, TA, or STA*	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Indicative GEF Financing		Indicative Co-financing		Total (\$) c = a + b
				(\$ a)	%	(\$ b)	%	
1. Clean up and disposal of inventoried publicly-held obsolete pesticides and associated waste	Investment TA STA	Eliminated release of POPs and other harmful substances originating from inventoried publicly-held obsolete stocks and associated waste	100% of inventoried publicly-held obsolesces stocks and associated waste in Mali, and Tunisia ² safely repackaged, stored, transported and disposed of	3,465,000	56	2,750,000	44	6,215,000
2. Prevention of accumulation of obsolete pesticides and associated	Investment TA	Sustainable reduction of additional stocks of obsolete	Financial and implementation mechanisms for nation-wide tracking,	330,000	11	2,700,000	89	3,030,000

¹ Noteworthy, this PDO is different from the initial ASP-P1 PDO (i.e. "to eliminate inventoried publicly-held obsolete pesticide stockpiles and associated waste, and implement measures to reduce and prevent future related risks"). The revised objective matches the latest guidelines from the Stockholm Convention as well as recommendations and findings from the assessments of the ASP-P1 design and implementation results.

² See more detail in Table 4.

waste		pesticides and associated waste	collection and treatment of obsolete pesticides and associated waste put in place in Mali, and Tunisia					
3. Project Management		Effective coordination and M&E of project components	Technical, progress and financial reports, audits, procurement and work plans delivered with sufficient data on time to the GEF, World Bank, donors and relevant governmental agencies.	165,000	52	150,000	48	315,000
Total project costs				3,960,000		5,600,000		9,560,000

* TA = Technical Assistance; STA = Scientific & Technical Analysis.

B. INDICATIVE CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE and BY NAME (in parenthesis) if available, (\$)

Sources of Co-financing	Type of Co-financing	Project
Project Government Contribution (Mali and Tunisia)	Cash and in-kind	2,010,000
GEF Agency (IDA) (co-financing of AELP in Mali)	Cash and in-kind	2,500,000
Private Sector (CropLife International)	Cash and in-kind	1,090,000
Total co-financing		5,600,000

C. INDICATIVE FINANCING PLAN SUMMARY FOR THE PROJECT (\$)

	Previous Project Preparation amount (a)	Project (b)	Total C = a + b	Agency Fee
GEF financing	0	3,960,000	3,960,000	396,000
Co-financing	0	5,600,000	5,600,000	
Total	0	9,560,000	9,560,000	396,000

D. GEF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRIES

GEF Agency	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
			Project (a)	Agency Fee (b)	Total C=a+b
WB	POPs	Tunisia	770,000	77,000	847,000

WB	POPs	Mali	3,190,000	319,000	3,509,000
Total GEF Resources			3,960,000	396,000	4,356,000

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. STATE THE ISSUE, HOW THE PROJECT SEEKS TO ADDRESS IT, AND THE EXPECTED GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS TO BE DELIVERED:

Background: ASP and ASP-P1

The Africa Stockpiles Programme was first conceived of in December 2000, with the dual objective of eliminating the existing stockpiles of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and other obsolete pesticides, and putting in place measures to prevent recurrence of similar obsolete pesticide stockpiling. The intention was to complete this task in all African countries over a 12-15 year period on a rolling basis. The estimated costs were US\$250 million, and the Program was to be implemented by a broad partnership of collaborating organizations.

In October 2002 the GEF Council approved a grant of US\$25 million for phase 1 of ASP (ASP-P1) in seven countries: Ethiopia, Mali, Morocco, Nigeria, South Africa, Tanzania and Tunisia, with the understanding that this would be followed by requests to the GEF for additional US\$55 million over the following phases of ASP. ASP-P1 was launched in September 2005.

The first of the seven ASP-P1 country projects - Tunisia and South Africa - were launched in late 2005, while the last was launched in September 2007 (Ethiopia). ASP-P1 projects have been implemented by the countries, supported through a network of participating organizations, which include, in alphabetical order, CropLife International (CLI), the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Pesticide Action Network (PAN-Africa and PAN-UK), the World Bank and World Wildlife Fund for Nature (WWF). For the purposes of ASP-P1, the World Bank has been the lead GEF Implementing Agency, technically supported by FAO's Technical Support Unit (TSU), which received a separate GEF grant for this purpose. WWF has been leading communication and awareness-raising activities, PAN-UK and PAN-Africa have been responsible for civil society inclusion in project implementation, and CLI is the main contact for the private industry, including for financial and technical support for disposal. Each project (except for Nigeria – see below) follows a similar structure: Inventory and emergency safeguarding, followed by a Country Environmental and Social Assessment (CESA) ending with disposal of stocks. In parallel, projects are tasked with implementing prevention (awareness raising, communication and legal reviews), capacity building and project coordination activities.

Important results have been achieved so far under ASP-P1, including the inventory of approximately 4,800 tons of obsolete pesticides and associated waste as well as a large number of contaminated containers across all 7 countries; implementation of prevention and capacity building activities; and the development of toolkits for the Country Environmental and Social Assessment, M&E and procurement of waste disposal services. In **South Africa** a portion of the non-hazardous stocks from the pilot projects has been disposed of locally and in **Mali and Tunisia** procurement of disposal contractors are underway, and work is expected to commence beginning of 2010. The two countries have also implemented emergency safeguarding and remediation operations in a number of high risk sites. The **Ethiopia, Morocco and Tanzania** projects are at the CESA stage following the completion of their inventory. **Nigeria**, which is fully funded by a CIDA grant, has completed the pilot states inventory process, and the nation-wide inventory is expected to be completed by October 2009, although in this particular case, disposal of identified stocks will only be implemented during a follow-on project as stipulated in the funding (CIDA) agreement. See Table 1 below for a summary of ASP-P1 projects' progress.

With the support of international NGOs (WWF, PAN-UK and PAN-Africa) and national NGO networks, awareness campaigns and outreach programs targeted at farming communities and other relevant stakeholders have been undertaken to ensure that farmers, traders, policy makers and other relevant populations are aware of the danger of improper pesticide management. Education of journalists, use of media campaigns and development and dissemination of clear informative products has been used to empower communities in ASP-P1 countries. There has been significant improvement of civil society capacity to actively promote sustainable pest management and engage

in pesticide issues, including monitoring health and environmental impacts, advocacy and promotion of relevant international conventions.

Table 1. ASP-P1 projects' progress

Country/launch date	Key Milestones				
	<i>Pilot inventory</i>	<i>Nation-wide inventory</i>	<i>CESA</i>	<i>Disposal tendering</i>	<i>Disposal</i>
Ethiopia/ September 2007	N/A				
Morocco/ April 2007	N/A				
Mali/ June 2007	N/A				
Nigeria/ September 2006				N/A	N/A
S. Africa/ June 2006		N/A	N/A		
Tanzania/ December 2006	N/A				
Tunisia/ November 2005	N/A				

ASP-P1 has undergone an independent evaluation in 2009 by the consulting firm COWI A/S, which provided recommendations for ASP-P1 and future ASP projects. With regard to ASP-P1, the report recommends:

1. Redefining the program's objectives to more realistic, precise and operational terms, **taking into account identified funding gaps and opportunities**
2. **Strengthening prevention efforts, including increased funding for sustainable and measurable results**
3. **Streamlining overall ASP and projects planning and reporting** to allow better progress and performance monitoring and knowledge management of the various ASP partners
4. **Introducing activity-based costing and budgeting** to allow linkage between activities progress and their associated budget.

The Issue: ASP-P1 funding gap for disposal and prevention

During the preparation of ASP-P1, the amounts of obsolete pesticides were estimated based on the existing level of information on the extent, geographic distribution and characteristics of the obsolete stocks for the purpose of establishing an allocation for safeguarding and disposal in each participating countries; it was recognized that the clean up and disposal costs would be better assessed once detailed inventories take place. The number of sites was established in Mali, Morocco and Tunisia, while in Ethiopia, Nigeria, South Africa and Tanzania insufficient information was available to establish the number. Similarly, a proxy-budget was allocated for prevention activities such as communication, awareness-raising and legislation needs identified in all countries.

Safeguarding and disposal

Following nation-wide inventories the budget for adequate safeguarding and disposal of stocks and associated wasted has been recalculated, demonstrating significant gaps, in particular in Mali and Tunisia. The main reasons for the safeguarding and disposal gap in these countries are:

1. **Larger than estimated stocks of obsolete pesticides:** Preliminary inventories conducted as part of project preparation estimated the stocks of obsolete pesticides in Tunisia and Mali and at 2,000 tons. Comprehensive national inventories³ now indicate additional 400 tons in these countries as well as larger volume of highly contaminated soil (see Table 2 below for more detail). The reasons for the larger stocks are incomplete information during preparation and the accumulation of additional stocks in the meanwhile.
2. **An increase of 50% on average in the unit cost of safeguarding and disposal** in the two countries (see Table 2 below). The unit has increased as a result of the following factors:
 - i. Larger number of sites with small quantities of pesticides, and their wide distribution, leading to higher ground transportation costs;
 - ii. Unbudgeted evaluation of remediation costs of some associated waste, such as contaminated empty containers and equipment;
 - iii. Over half of ASP-P1 funds have been provided in US dollars, and have, therefore, been subject to devaluation relative to the major reserve currencies, in particular the Euro. This is particularly important since the companies most likely to provide disposal services for obsolete pesticides are located in the European Union.

Table 2. Funding gap for safeguarding and disposal in Mali and Tunisia

Country	Amount of Obsolete Pesticides (Tons)		Unit cost for disposal (USD/Ton)		Funding gap for safeguarding and disposal (USD)
	<i>Estimated</i>	<i>Actual</i>	<i>Estimated</i>	<i>Actual</i>	
Mali	800 plus \$880,000 for soil remediation	1100 plus \$1,880,000 for soil remediation ⁴	3,263	5,500	4,440,000 ⁵
Tunisia	1,200	1,300	2,625	3,500	1,735,000 ⁶
Total	2,000	2,400			6,175,000

Since, on average, 22% of the total disposal costs are shipment, including national transportation (28% repackaging, 50% treatment), the unit cost is also significantly affected by the distance between the storage location and the port of export. For example, the unit cost for Tunisia is lower than that of Mali partly because it has direct access to maritime transportation (via Casablanca and Tunis), while in Mali stocks need to be transported to Dakar and then exported. Additionally, packing costs vary depending on the condition of the stocks and the packing vessels (e.g. bags or metallic drums). Finally, the recalculation of unit cost also takes into account cost decreasing factors, such as the commercial competition between the disposal companies.

Associated waste includes: contaminated equipment and empty containers, materials (such as fertilizers and seeds), storage facilities and highly contaminated soil (identified by visual inspection - color, viscous components and vicinity to the source of pollution). Below is a table which summarized the amount of each type of waste in the 2 countries, based on FAO's PSMS data:

³ The inventories were conducted in close collaboration with local communities, producer organizations and decentralized teams of the ministries of agriculture, environment and health.

⁴ Mali has a number of known sites where severe soil and underground contamination has taken place through spillage of pesticides. The additional cost was calculated as part of a soil contamination assessment as planned.

⁵ Inclusive of soil remediation costs.

⁶ Inclusive of 335K for treatment of associated in Tunisia (in-country decontamination of associated wastes: drums, equipment, packing and storage of contaminated soil).

Table 3. Associated waste in Mali and Tunisia

Type of associated waste contaminated by pesticides	Mali	Tunisia
Equipment	33 tons	274 tons
Material (fertilizers, seeds)	9 tons	137 tons
Empty containers	134 tons	28 tons
Storage facilities	70 tons	2 tons
Highly contaminated soil	130 tons	313 tons

Prevention

Under ASP-P1 countries have benefited from strengthened legislative and institutional framework for pesticides management, promotion of alternatives to chemical pesticides, awareness-raising to the adverse effect of mishandled pesticides, and training on safe handling and alternative pest control. During the course of implementation it has become clear that small accumulations of obsolete pesticides and associated wastes (such as used packing material) are unavoidable despite the above activities, **and if sustainable mechanisms for the tracking, funding and implementation of collection and disposal are not put in place by the end of the project, ASP-P1 will need to be repeated in a few years time.**

Consequently, a number of ASP-P1 countries have recently initiated discussions on long-term solutions for tracking, collection and disposal of obsolete pesticides and associated waste, such as levies on pesticides sales and the establishment of private-public partnerships who would manage future obsolete pesticides and associated wastes; however, since ASP-P1 projects were not adequately budgeted to develop and implement such systems, additional funding is of high importance.

Next Steps: Ensuring sufficient funding for safeguarding and disposal and for putting in place sustainable systems for reducing future accumulation

The additional funds will be utilized toward bridging the financing gap for safeguarding and disposal of all the inventoried publicly-held obsolete pesticides and associated waste and toward the establishment of sustainable mechanisms for managing future accumulation of obsolete stocks and associated wastes beyond the life of the projects in Mali and Tunisia.

For safeguarding and disposal, since each country is different in terms of the amount of stocks and associated waste, their composition, condition and location, as well as the local disposal options, each country will utilize the funds differently, however with the same end-result – full disposal and in accordance with the recommendation of the Basel Convention of giving priority to disposal management options at the country level and to export only hazardous wastes which cannot be treated in the country.

The second component will focus on the implementation of a sustainable tracking, financing and implementation mechanism to ensure future collections of new obsolete stocks and container management. The approach will be country-specific, and will bring together Government, private sector and producer organizations.

This project focuses on Mali and Tunisia only and not on the other four ASP-P1 countries for the following reasons:

- I. *Implementation progress*
 - i. ASP-Tanzania has not concluded its nation-wide inventory and early data indicated that disposal funds may be sufficient – to be confirmed once all data is available. Additional funding might be required only as seed funding for a private-public partnership for collection and disposal of new stocks and associated waste – to be proposed potentially under a separate proposal.

- ii. ASP-Morocco has identified a budget gap; however, the project is still in the process of validating the inventory data, which does not allow for accurate calculation of the gap. Additionally, the implementing agency is currently undergoing restructuring, which is causing serious implementation delays and may require the restructuring of the project in the coming months.
- iii. Both Mali and Tunisia have well developed databases which allow accurate calculation of their funding gap and the necessary treatment measures. Additionally, both countries have a CESA in place and are in an advanced stage of procuring a disposal firm. Consequently, both projects are rated satisfactory by the World Bank.

II. Funding gap

- i. ASP-Ethiopia does not have a funding gap.
- ii. ASP-South Africa does not have a funding gap for disposal and additional funding is required only as seed funding for a private-public partnership for collection and disposal of new stocks – to be proposed potentially under a separate proposal.
- iii. ASP-Nigeria is not designed to dispose of inventoried stocks – this will be addressed under a potential follow-up project once the national inventory is finalized and the CESA is in place.

Below is a description of overall items to be funded under each of the 2 countries:

Table 4. Activities to be funded under the project

Country	Safeguarding and Disposal Activities	Prevention
Mali	Re-packing, transportation and temporary storage of pesticides and associated wastes for disposal abroad, including high contaminated soils. Containers falling within the scope of the Desert Locust Program will not be treated.	The project will strengthen the national pesticide management framework, undertake a study and provide seed funding to develop a long-term funding mechanism for future tracking, collection and disposal of empty containers and obsolete stocks, with a particular focus on the cotton sector and locust control activities.
Tunisia	Re-packing, transportation and temporary storage of pesticides and associated wastes for disposal abroad and treatment of associated wastes and/or storage in national facilities.	A proposal is in place for a national pesticides management plan and a feasibility study for the establishment of a sustainable mechanism for managing future build-up of stocks, especially empty containers. The project will support the implementation of the national plan with special focus on local facilities for the treatment of associated wastes, and the launch of the sustainable mechanism.
General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional approach for the treatment of associated wastes National contracts for disposal based on regional biddings Funds for safeguarding and disposal will be utilized according to the following order or priority, based on health and environmental impact: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Testing and implementation of national treatment facilities as a measure to avoid long-term storage of contaminated waste. Development of nationally-owned databases for the tracking of pesticides throughout their life cycle: import, distribution, use and

	1 – Disposal of pesticides 2 – Highly contaminated soils 3 – Contaminated storage buildings and equipment 4 - Confinement of others associated wastes in temporary storage	storage in line with the Rotterdam and Basel Conventions. These databases will complement FAO's Pesticides Stock Management System (PSMS) which has been used by the projects and will continue to be used for the purpose of disposal.
--	---	--

Implementation arrangements

The project will be implemented by the ASP-P1 executing agencies through the already established PMUs in Mali and Tunisia, and will be supervised and advised by the countries' existing Steering Committees. Technical support will be provided by contracted specialists (existing Technical Advisors for Disposal (TADs) and prevention specialists) and the World Bank, while WWF, PAN-UK and PAN-Africa will provide support for communication (component 2) and civil society inclusion (component 1 and 2), respectively, through the ASP Multi-Donor Trust Fund. Please refer to Section H for a description of the project's cost-effectiveness.

Expected global environmental benefits

The project will contribute to the achievement of the objectives of the Stockholm Convention on POPs, the Basel Convention on the Control of Trans-boundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal, the Rotterdam Convention on Prior Informed Consent Procedures for Certain Hazardous Chemicals, and support the overall objectives of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM).

The safeguarding and disposal component of the project will put an end to the pollution of land, water and air by stocks of obsolete pesticides and associated waste, while the prevention component will ensure that this reality remains unchanged. As some of the stocks include POPs, the benefits are likely to be seen at regional and global levels as the adverse impact on the global food chain will be significantly reduced and so will the risk to the health of people and wildlife. Trans-boundary water quality will improve, and the threat to the quality of the global hydrological regime will decrease. Without the additional funds the scale of the problem will be reduced, however large amounts of POPs and other harmful substances will remain and increase over time.

Importantly, this project will have a strong and sustainable impact and high visibility. It will ensure a satisfactory completion of ASP-P1 as a whole through replication of practices from Mali and Tunisia to the other ASP-P1 countries and to future ASP countries, and send a strong message to recipient countries about the donor community's ongoing commitment to mitigating the risks associated with POPs and other harmful chemicals in Africa.

In April 2009 the World Bank and FAO jointly submitted to GEF a Program Framework Document (PFD) for USD 20.7 million in support of ASP's second phase (ASP-P2). In addition to supplemental funding for ASP-P1 countries which had been facing funding gaps for disposal and prevention, the PFD included 5 MSPs and 5 FSPs in new countries. While the overall ASP-P2 funding framework was not accepted by GEF due to uncertainty regarding the availability of resources, the GEF Secretariat provided initial approval to fund individual projects in Eritrea, Mozambique (FAO) and Egypt (World Bank), and both FAO and the World Bank were encouraged to submit additional funding requests for individual countries or sub-regions to be considered once GEF funds become again available. Significantly, the World Bank has decided to submit this supplemental PIF as a matter of priority before any additional funding requests are put forward. It is expected that a PIF for a regional approach in West Africa will be submitted under GEF-5.

B. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH NATIONAL/REGIONAL PRIORITIES/PLANS:

At the national level, the Project is directly contributing to the implementation of the countries' National Implementation Plans (NIP) submitted to the Stockholm Convention on POPs in 2006 and 2007. The project also addresses national development strategies in the areas of public health, poverty alleviation, environmental protection and strengthening of the agricultural sector. The Project is expected to enhance the capacity of the countries' agricultural sector to strengthen their pesticide management systems – a topic of high priority in Mali and Tunisia, especially in a context of intensification of agricultural production and spiraling global food prices. The Project will promote sustainable development of participating countries as stated in their Country Assistance Strategies (CAS) and national environment strategies.

Mali

The project will contribute to sustainable management of the environment and natural resources, which is one of the items of focus of Mali's second poverty strategy, the Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy Framework (GPRSF). The GPRSF provides the foundation for the government's development and poverty reduction strategy for the period 2007-11. It is designed as the first phase of the 10-year action plan to achieve the MDGs, and is embedded in the government's long term vision "Mali 2025". Mali ratified the Stockholm Convention in September 2003 and submitted its NIP to the Convention on August 9, 2006; the project will provide direct assistance in the implementation of the NIP as part of Mali's obligations under the Convention.

Tunisia

The Government of Tunisia (GoT) has shown strong commitment to ASP-Tunisia since its beginning, and wishes to see it meeting the objectives for which it was established. The project would directly contribute to the implementation of Tunisia's NIP, which was submitted to the Stockholm Convention on January 30, 2007. It also supports the GoT's strategy to increase competitiveness of agriculture while enhancing social and environmental sustainability as described in the Tunisia CAS of June 2004, Outcome 1.4.

Regional

The Bamako Convention, which came into force in 1998, dictated, amongst others, environmentally sound management of hazardous wastes, and the taking up of necessary steps to prevent pollution arising from such wastes. The Commission of the African Union on the Occasion of the Fifth Anniversary of Africa Environment Day on March 3, 2007, called for "*the full and speedy implementation of the Africa Stockpiles Programme, which aims at elimination [of] the current stockpiles of hazardous chemicals in Africa and to institute prevention measures against a repeat in the future, and the protocols of the Bamako Convention as well as the Stockholm Convention on the Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)*". The case of the dumping of hazardous chemicals in the lagoons of Abidjan, with "disastrous social, environmental and economic consequences", was given as an example for the urgent need to implement the program.

C. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH [GEF STRATEGIES](#) AND STRATEGIC PROGRAMS:

Overall, the Project will be a continuation of the direct implementation of the Stockholm convention on POPs, and will contribute to the international effort to eliminate Persistent Organic Pollutants and improve management of toxic chemicals. The Project will continue to address GEF-4 strategic objective in the POPs focal area to protect human health and the environment by assisting recipient countries to reduce and eliminate production, use and releases of POPs, and consequently contribute to capacity development for sound management of chemicals.

The project is consistent with Strategic Program 1, "Strengthening Capacities for NIP Implementation", under its second component as it will assist countries in putting in place frameworks for the management of POPs and the sound management of chemicals in general, and strengthen chemical management administration within the central

government as well as the capacity for enforcement. In line with the Program's scope, the project will develop and begin the implementation of instruments to secure resources for NIP implementation through engagement with various non-governmental stakeholders, including the private sector.

The project is consistent with Strategic Program 2, "Partnering in Investments for NIP Implementation", by removing and disposing of POPs and other harmful chemicals in an environmentally sound manner. The Project targets countries that have already established much of the necessary enabling environment to implement their NIPs and that have demonstrated willingness to follow through their commitment to reduce the targeted POPs and other harmful chemicals.

D. JUSTIFY THE TYPE OF FINANCING SUPPORT PROVIDED WITH THE GEF RESOURCES

Under component 1, the project will partner in investments needed for NIP implementation through collection, repackaging, shipment and disposal of POPs and other harmful chemicals which are present in the publicly-held stocks and associated wastes which have been inventoried under ASP-P1. This component will also provide technical assistance by increasing the governments' capacity to procure, manage and implement disposal and treatment operations. Scientific and technical analysis will allow the countries to choose the most appropriate and cost-efficient treatment options for the different types of contaminated stocks.

Under component 2, the project will increase governments' capacity to achieve sound and sustainable management of obsolete pesticides and associated waste as part of their obligations under the Stockholm convention and will provide seed funding for the implementation of the developed management systems.

E. OUTLINE THE COORDINATION WITH OTHER RELATED INITIATIVES:

As indicated above, ASP-P1 is implemented by the recipient countries with support from a network of NGOs, international organizations and the private sector. These organizations are represented in the ASP Implementation Committee (ASPIC), which oversees and coordinates program activities, and ensures collaboration with other related initiatives in Africa and elsewhere. This includes i) initiatives led by FAO on IPM promotion (IPM Global Facility), initiatives on strengthening compliance with the International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides, and regional programs on pesticide registration (e.g., Comité permanent Inter-Etats de Lutte contre la Sécheresse dans le Sahel); ii) WHO's effort on awareness raising through the International Programme on Chemical Safety (IPCS); iii) UNEP/UNIDO, Basel Convention Secretariat efforts to support the implementation of the Stockholm and Basel Conventions; iv) CLI stocks safeguarding and financial support for the destruction of stocks supplied by its member organizations; and v) PAN/WWF initiatives on civil society capacity building and awareness raising. This project will continue to benefit from this partnering.

The Project will build on ongoing initiatives which have taken place in several countries in Africa over the last five years, including those implemented under ASP-P1, to address the key needs which have been identified. This includes for the national inventories in Tunisia and Mali, the disposal of 2,900 tons of obsoletes pesticides by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs in Ethiopia with FAO support, and emergency safeguarding operations of high risk sites conducted under ASP-P1 in Tunisia and in Mali.

F. DISCUSS THE VALUE-ADDED OF GEF INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROJECT DEMONSTRATED THROUGH INCREMENTAL REASONING :

Without additional GEF support, only 40% of the additional publicly-held inventoried obsolete pesticides and associated waste in the two countries would be eliminated (primarily, stocks which originated from CLI member companies), leaving the two countries to face continued health and environmental risks. Additionally, the countries will not have sufficient funds to develop and begin the implementation of sustainable mechanisms for the management of new accumulations of obsolete stocks, which would necessitate the repetition of ASP activities (and significant funds) in a number of years.

The GEF alternative offers a comprehensive solution to the short and long-term risks that obsolete pesticides and their associated wastes pose on human health and the environment. With GEF involvement, 100% of the additional

inventoried stocks of publicly-held obsolete pesticides and associated wastes in Mali and Tunisia would be safeguarded and disposed of in an environmentally sound manner and according to international laws, and collection and disposal of future stocks and associated will be managed and funded in the long-term.

Overall, this proposed project will provide a subsidy to governments to invest in activities in which they would otherwise not be able to invest, and will leverage significant additional funding.

G. INDICATE RISKS, INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE RISKS, THAT MIGHT PREVENT THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE FROM BEING ACHIEVED, AND IF POSSIBLE INCLUDING RISK MITIGATION MEASURES THAT WILL BE TAKEN:

Table 4. Project risks and mitigation measures

RISKS	RISK MITIGATION MEASURES
Lack of government implementation capacity and/or support and commitment	Governments' capacity has been reinforced during the course of ASP-P1. Contracting of disposal is nearing completion in Tunisia and Mali; the experience gained, including approved lists of prequalified firms and bidding documents in Tunisia, will be used by the countries with intensive support from World Bank, CLI and project-hired specialists. Governments have shown continued commitment to addressing the issue of obsolete stocks under their respective agendas and as a result of public pressure.
Inventory data is deemed inaccurate by the disposal contractor, resulting in claims beyond the agreed and budgeted amount.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The quantities provided in the tender will be indicative and would be revised by the contractor when visiting the sites during the tendering process • The contracts would be based on a unit price only and an indicative quantity of pesticides and associated wastes under the available disposal budget under the supervision of the contract manager: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If 100% of pesticides are shipped for disposal, the disposal cost will be limited to the quantities shipped - If less than 100% of pesticides wastes are shipped for disposal, the quantities will be limited to budget available • Disposal will take place in 2 phases, where the pesticides with the highest toxicity (OMS classification) will be selected for disposal first by, while stocks with medium and low toxicity will be treated according to the available budget. • The options for treatment of highly contaminated soil (reducing and managing local impact) and associated wastes will be limited by the budget available and selected under the overall guidance from the technical advisory expert.
Lack of public support or opposition by NGOs	During ASP-P1 NGOs have partnered with the program through networks in each country, supervised and supported by PAN-UK and PAN-Africa. NGOs will continue to be engaged in project implementation,

	especially in the monitoring of clean-up and removal activities.
Countries fail to meet adequate safeguard requirements	This risk has been mitigated so far by substantial technical support from the World Bank and FAO/TSU, and all relevant activities have been executed in compliance with safeguards requirements. This Project will continue to receive support from the Bank, using the agreed set of tools, and supervision missions will monitor closely adherence to safeguard requirements.

Taking into account scientific studies which indicate that climate change may impact pest incidence and, therefore, the demand for pesticides, this project provides the necessary additional support to put in place mechanisms for the future management of obsolete pesticides, thus mitigating the risks these would pose on people's health and the environment.

H. DESCRIBE, IF POSSIBLE, THE EXPECTED COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROJECT:

The Africa Stockpiles Programme, of which this Project is part, is in line with the GEF 2006 decision to move away from single project interventions towards a more programmatic focus in order to increase operations' cost-effectiveness. This project would benefit from a platform for experience exchange, lessons learned and tools developed during ASP-P1. It would utilize a standard approach to using tools such as the Pesticide Stock Management System (PSMS) and associated safeguards and environmental risk assessment tool kits prepared by the WB and FAO; safeguarding and disposal strategy/technology guidance; risk assessment and standardized operating procedures for project implementation; disposal tender development and evaluation guidance; and monitoring and evaluation guidance and reporting system.

Use of common tools and procedures, sharing of experience and replication of successful approaches would lead to a greater overall impact to be achieved with lower costs. Cost-effectiveness would be further enhanced through a regional approach for the treatment of associated waste and national contracts based on regional biddings, potentially leading to lower unit costs.

I. JUSTIFY THE COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE OF GEF AGENCY:

In line with the 2007 GEF document GEF/C.31/5, *Comparative Advantages of the GEF Agencies*, ASP in general and this project in specific emphasize country ownership and stakeholder involvement as fundamental operational principles. The World Bank will continue to focus its involvement within its respective comparative advantages of being able to leverage additional financial resources, which would also help in generating a high level of commitment from government counterparts; its experience in promoting investment opportunities that are consistent with GEF objectives and national sustainable development strategies; a significant global experience in managing trust funds that mobilize the resources of multiple donors for a shared purpose (experience of such kind has been key to the management of ASP-P1's numerous Trust Funds: a Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF), GEF Trust Funds, a Development Grant Facility (DGF), and other trust funds from bilateral donations); and in managing complex, multi-country and regional programs; considerable experience in facilitating the interface between governments, NGOs and the private sector.

Specifically in Mali, the Bank has been actively involved in the agriculture sector and pest control management issues through the regional Africa Emergency Locust Project (AELP) and national agriculture projects, and in Tunisia, the Bank has been supporting the agriculture sector for several decades. It should also be noted that Bank support to ASP-P1 is fully consistent with the implementation of the Bank's Environment Strategy, the key pillars of that strategy being to improve people's quality of life, quality of economic growth and quality of regional and global commons. One of the key objectives in improving people's quality of life is protecting environmental health, which is reflected in ASP-P1's approach.

PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINTS AND GEF AGENCY

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINTS ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENTS:

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MONTH, DAY, YEAR)
<u>Mali</u> Mr. Alamir Sinna TOURE	Ingénieur des Eaux et Fôrets	Secretariat Technique Permanent du Cade Institutionnel de la Gestion des Questions Environnementales	August 21, 2009
<u>Tunisia</u> Mr. Najeh DALI	Direction générale de l'environnement et de la Qualité de la Vie	Ministère de l'Environnement et du Développement Durable	September 8, 2009

B. GEF AGENCY CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for project identification and preparation.					
Agency coordinator, Agency name	Signature	Date (Month, Day, Year)	Project contact person	Telephone	Email address
Steve Gorman Executive Coordinator The World Bank			Paola Agostini Regional GEF Coordinator Africa Region	202-473-9727	pagostini@world bank.org

wb263889

L:\ASP\GEF\Supplemental P1\ASP - P1 Supplemental PIF September 3, 2009 - for resubmission.doc

9/8/2009 3:45:00 PM