



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

GEF ID:	<b>4740</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Regional (Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal, Chad)</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Disposal of Obsolete Pesticides including POPs and Strengthening Pesticide Management in the Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel (CILSS) Member States</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; CHEM-3; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$250,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$7,450,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$25,337,684</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$33,037,684</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>January 06, 2012</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>February 29, 2012</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Evelyn Swain</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Mark Davis</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?	<p>Cape Verde, Niger, and Guinea-Bissau are missing NIPs. NIPs should be submitted or draft NIP available at time of CEO endorsement. Please remove Mali from the project because of potential overlap with World Bank project under implementation in Mali. Coordination between these two projects is encouraged.</p> <p>ES, January 5, 2012: Draft NIP for Niger has been submitted. Cape Verde and Guinea-Bissau are still missing NIPs. NIPs should be submitted or draft NIP available at time of CEO</p>	Yes

\*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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		endorsement.  A justification for including Mali has been provided and overlapping activities with World Bank Project removed. - Comment cleared	
	2.Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Endorsement letters missing from Guinea-Bissau and Chad. Please provide letters.  ES, January 5, 2012: Endorsement letter from Guinea-Bissau received. Chad removed from the project and will be added at a later date if endorsement comes. - Comment cleared	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes, FAO has significant experience implementing POPs and obsolete pesticide projects.	Yes.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	NA
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes, FAO has a Regional Office for Africa in Ghana and representation in CILSS member countries.	Yes.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	None.	NA
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes.	Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	NA
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	NA
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	NA
	• focal area set-aside?	Yes	Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
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
	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, all submitted country NIPs have prioritized obsolete pesticide stocks and pesticide management.	Yes.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes, sustainability will be achieved by training experts and strengthening capacity for sound management of pesticides will contribute to the prevention of future accumulation of POPs and obsolete pesticides.	Yes
Project Design	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?	Baseline project not well defined. Please clarify what project will occur in the absence of GEF funding and how the GEF portion would add incremental global environmental benefits. It seems like the write up on page 9-10 of the PIF should be transferred to the baseline section.  ES, January 5, 2012: Baseline project clear. - Comment cleared	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 similar benefits?		Yes, CE will be achieved through building on existing capacity development under previous and on going initiatives, including GEF funded projects in Benin, Cameroun and Morocco, implemented by FAO. Obsolete pesticides will be disposed of under one disposal contract instead of several contracts. This approach will

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			reduce transaction costs and the cost of disposal.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>Please clarify how the GEF funded portion will build on the baseline project.</p> <p>ES, January 5, 2012: Incremental reasoning is clear. - Comment cleared</p>	Yes.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>Component 1: Outcome 1.1 and 1.1.4 are repetitive. Please revise to avoid repeated outcomes.</p> <p>ES, January 5, 2012: Outcomes revised to avoid repetition. - Comment cleared</p> <p>Component 2: There is an error # sign please correct. 2.1.2 Why container management networks in only 6 project countries, why not all countries? 2.1.3 How many container management schemes will be piloted?</p> <p>ES, January 5, 2012: Questions addressed. - Comment cleared</p> <p>Component 3: Should include enforcement.</p> <p>ES, January 5, 2012: Enforcement addressed. - Comment cleared</p> <p>Component 4: There is an error # sign please correct. 4.1.2 How many field tests will be conducted and in what geographical areas?</p> <p>ES, January 5, 2012: Information of</p>	Yes, the framework is clear.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		tests provided. - Comment cleared	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Project will dispose of 850 tons of POPs and obsolete pesticides. This amount seems low given the number of countries participating in the project. Please describe methodology for calculating this amount.  ES, January 5, 2012: Justification of amount provided. - Comment cleared	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?	Gender dimension addressed through container management. Women and children are exposed to pesticides through empty containers re-used as food containers.	Yes.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Public participation is lacking.  ES, January 5, 2012: Discussion of public participation provided. - Comment cleared	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)	Climate change risks should be included. Specifically how will extreme weather events such as floods, drought, and pest infestation risks be mitigated?  ES, January 5, 2012: Information provided. - Comment cleared	Yes.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	A list of coordinating initiatives is provided, but please briefly describe how coordination will occur in each initiative.  ES, January 5, 2012: ES, January 5, 2012: Descriptions provided in the revised baseline project section and in	Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>FAO's response to comments document although the associated section of the PIF was not elaborated. Project should also coordinate with the GEF African LDC project under implementation specifically on component 3 for institutional capacity building and legislation.</p> <p>ES, January 6, 2012: Linkages with the GEF African LDC project under implementation will be established during project preparation. - Comment cleared</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes, coordination among key stakeholders is well explained.	Yes, relevant regional institutions - CILSS, ECOWAS, UEMOA - in particular will execute the project.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Yes
	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?	<p>Yes, PMC is at the acceptable level of 5% and has a 1:4.8 co-financing ratio.</p> <p>ES, January 5, 2012: PMC co-financing ratio is at the acceptable level of 1:5.23.</p>	Yes.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>Co-financing is low at 1:2.75. Guidance has been provided to all agencies on acceptable co-financing ratios of 1:4.</p> <p>ES, January 5, 2012: Co-financing is at the acceptable level of 1:4. However the overall funding level is too high for this project. Please reduce the cost to no</p>	Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		more than \$6 Million with a focus on the disposal component of the project. The legislation component should be coordinated with the GEF African LDC project under implementation.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.		<p>Co-financing letters are missing from two regional organizations (UEMOA and ECOWAS).</p> <p>In table C. in the project document that lists the co-financing sources the column titled "Type of co-financing" should be broken down by grant and in kind contributions. It should be clear exactly how much grant vs. in kind contributions each co-financing source will contribute.</p> <p>ES, 12/18/14: Table C has been broken out by co-financing source. - Comment cleared</p> <p>Co-financing letter was provided from ECOWAS. The other missing co-financing source has been removed from the list of sources since a letter was not provided.</p>
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	FAO is providing a grant for 1,500,000.	Yes.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes, tracking tools are included.
	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		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	NA	STAP Comments have been addressed.
	• Convention Secretariat?	NA	NA
	• Council comments?		Council comments have been addressed.
	• Other GEF Agencies?	NA	NA
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
<b>Recommendation at PIF Stage</b>	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>Not at this time. Several issues need to be clarified as indicated above, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Missing endorsement letters</li> <li>2. Low co-financing</li> <li>3. Baseline project</li> <li>4. Incremental cost reasoning</li> </ol> <p>ES, January 5, 2012: Project cost should be reduced to no more that \$6 Million with a focus on the disposal component.</p> <p>ES, January 6, 2012: Project cost has been reduced to the acceptable level of \$7.45 Million PIF clearance is recommended.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
<b>Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval</b>	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		Yes, progress of PPG described.
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		<p>Not at this time. Two co-financing letters are missing and Table C. needs to be adjusted.</p> <p>ES, 12/18/14: All issues have been addressed. CEO endorsement is recommended.</p>



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 09, 2011	March 04, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 05, 2012	December 18, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 06, 2012	
	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, the proposed activities are appropriate.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes, the budget is justified. PPG is 3% of the associated GEF project grant.
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	Yes, PPG approval is 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.