



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4668		
Country/Region:	Regional (Botswana, Ethiopia, Gambia, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Mozambique, Namibia, Senegal, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, South Africa, Zambia, Zimbabwe)		
Project Title:	DSSA Demonstration of Effectiveness of Diversified, Environmentally Sound and Sustainable Interventions, and Strengthening National Capacity for Innovative Implementation of Integrated Vector Management (IVM) for Disease Prevention and Control in the WHO AFRO Region		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	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; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$15,491,700
Co-financing:	\$118,720,000	Total Project Cost:	\$134,211,700
PIF Approval:	March 27, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Evelyn Swain	Agency Contact Person:	Jan Betlem

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?	<p>Zimbabwe is a signatory of the Stockholm Convention but has not ratified. They may participate in the project at their own cost.</p> <p>Update table 1. Botswana NIP transmitted 7/6/2011.</p> <p>Namibia NIP transmission pending.</p> <p>South Africa NIP transmission pending, advanced draft available.</p>	

*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)
		<p>Update Table 1. Swaziland NIP transmitted 6/1/2011.</p> <p>ES, November 14, 2011: Namibia NIP still pending, should be available at time of CEO endorsement. South Africa NIP should be final at time of CEO endorsement.</p>	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	<p>Endorsement letter for Kenya and Swaziland missing. Please submit.</p> <p>ES, November 14, 2011: Endorsement letter from Swaziland still missing.</p> <p>ES, March 6, 2012: Endorsement letter from Swaziland still missing. Please provide the missing endorsement letter, or remove Swaziland from the project. PIF cannot be approved without all endorsement letters from participating countries. If endorsement comes during PPG Swaziland can be added at the time of CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>ES, March 20, 2012: Swaziland has been removed from the project. It is expected that Swaziland will join the initiative during PPG. - Comment cleared</p>	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. UNEP is well positioned to implement Integrated Vector Management for disease prevention and control projects. Partnering with WHO on this project gives then a competitive	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		advantage. UNEP has implemented several other similar projects including the UNEP/GEF project to phase-out DDT in Mexico and Central America and a project demonstrating alternatives to DDT in Europe, Africa, and Eastern Mediterranean.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes. The project fits UNEP's thematic program and UNEP has staff capacity in the countries and headquarters in Nairobi, Kenya.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?		
	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?	Language for table A. should come directly from the GEF Focal Area Results Framework document. ES, November 14, 2011: Table corrected, comment cleared.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	<p>Yes. DDT management is a priority set out in countries which have prepared NIPs. However the situation for countries pending NIPs submission are unknown at this time and should be monitored for DDT priorities.</p> <p>ES, November 14, 2011: Info on countries with missing NIPs added and will be monitored as NIPs are finalized.</p>	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes. The project will build regional and country capacities through national policies and strengthened capacities for IVM.	
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?	<p>No. The baseline project is not well defined. Please define the baseline project as the project that would occur in the absence of GEF financing.</p> <p>ES, November 14, 2011: The baseline project has been elaborated to describe actions being taken in each country; however country baseline projects should be elaborated. Specifically, what achievements have existing projects made, what is the collaboration between relevant ministries, and how will baseline project inform the GEF funded project.</p> <p>ES, March 6, 2012: Country baseline projects have been provided and show what achievements existing projects made, what is the collaboration between relevant stakeholders, and how will baseline</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		project inform the GEF funded project. - Comment cleared	
	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?	<p>It is not clear how GEF funding will contribute to incremental global environmental benefits.</p> <p>ES, November 14, 2011: Table 5 was added to show that GEF funding will contribute to global environmental benefits of about 2,500 tons a.i. of DDT per year. For several countries in the table no data is available and for Kenya the DDT use is most likely 0. Why is no data available in some countries? For countries without DDT use how will the project contribute to additional global environmental benefits? What is the rationale for doing a DDT project for a country with no available data on DDT use?</p> <p>ES, March 6, 2012: Reason for lacking data in some countries provided. Rationale for doing DDT projects in countries with little or no use of DDT is that countries may revert back to DDT use if alternatives are not well institutionalized. -Comment cleared</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	The project framework is clear, however please clarify or correct the following:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Grant type is listed as STA for all components, but should either be TA or INV. A combination of technical assistance and investment should be applied in this project. ES, November 14, 2011: Revised, comment cleared.</p> <p>Component 1- Why is a different decision analysis support tool needed for each country? Can the tool be designed to be applicable to all countries? Also, in output 6) Annual Output to Outcome review should be for Component 1 NOT Component 2. ES, November 14, 2011: Justification for different tools provided and error fixed, comment cleared.</p> <p>Component 2- Output 3) does not make sense, please clarify. Also, in output 6) Annual Output to Outcome review should be for Component 2 NOT Component 3. ES, November 14, 2011: Revised, comment cleared.</p> <p>Component 3- Why not target a demo site in each project country in output 3)? Are all demo sites expected to be households? If not a different type of survey should be used for output 5). Also, in output 6) Annual Output to Outcome review should be for Component 3 NOT Component 1.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>ES, November 14, 2011: Clarified and revised, comment cleared.</p> <p>Co-financing is not sufficient for all components. ES, November 14, 2011: Co-financing still not sufficient.</p> <p>ES, March 6, 2012: Co-financing for components has been increased. -Comment cleared</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>The methodology for incremental benefits is not well defined. There is no estimate of global environmental benefits for this project.</p> <p>ES, November 14, 2011: See comment 13: Table 5 was added to show that GEF funding will contribute to global environmental benefits of about 2,500 tons a.i. of DDT per year. For several countries in the table no data is available and for Kenya the DDT use is most likely 0. For countries without DDT use how will the project contribute to additional global environmental benefits?</p> <p>ES, March 6, 2012: See comment 13. -Comment cleared</p>	
	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?	<p>Yes. Benefits to women and children are discussed and PPG phase will further assess gender dimensions.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes. NGO and CSO participation is taken into consideration as well as households through household surveys.	
	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 including climate change risks and risks associated with DDT replacement are taken into consideration. Risks and risk mitigation measures should be presented in table form laid out in the PIF template, not paragraph form. ES, November 14, 2011: Revised, comment cleared.	
	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 related initiatives, including those supported by the Global Fund and Roll Back Malaria partnership. It is also consistent with other GEF funded DDT projects.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes. The role of WHO in implementation is clear.	
	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?	No. Agencies were guided on a number of occasions that the level of project management costs applies to projects exceeding 2M in GEF funding should not exceed 5%. The project management costs are well above this level and we request that it be reduced to the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>threshold or lower or a detailed justification on the costs be provided.</p> <p>ES, November 14, 2011: Project management cost has been lowered to the acceptable level of 5%.</p> <p>ES, March 6, 2012: PMC co-financing should equal the co-financing level of the overall project. Please increase PMC co-financing.</p> <p>ES, Match 20, 2012: There is a discrepancy in the PMC co-financing. Page 2 lists it at 500,000 and page 9 says 1,500,000. Please correct this error. Also, PMC co-financing should equal the co-financing level of the overall project. Please increase PMC co-financing.</p> <p>ES, Match 26, 2012: PMC co-financing has been increased to match the co-financing level of the overall project. - Comment cleared</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>No. The co-financing is below what is expected. There is concern that the majority of the co-financing is in-kind, and where cash is mentioned it is not clear what portion will be cash and what will be in-kind.</p> <p>ES, November 14, 2011: Co-financing is still below what is expected.</p> <p>ES, March 6, 2012:</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Co-financing has been increased significantly and mostly comes from the Global Fund to Fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria. This co-financing is in-kind to the GEF project but cash to recipient countries. -Comment cleared	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Low co-financing: 1:1.02. Agencies were guided on a number of occasions that the level of co-financing for GEF 5 projects is expected to be 1:4. ES, November 14, 2011: Co-financing is still low at 1:1.45. ES, March 6, 2012: Co-financing is at the acceptable level of 1:7.66 and it is expected that this amount will be increased significantly during PPG. -Comment cleared	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	No. UNEP is bringing 10,000 as in-kind co-financing to the project, this level is too low. ES, November 14, 2011: Co-financing has been increased to \$50,000. ES, March 6, 2012: Co-financing has been increased to \$500,000	
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?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	None Received	
	• Convention Secretariat?	None Received	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	None Received	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>Not at this time. Several issues (listed above) need to be clarified, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Missing endorsement letter from Kenya and Swaziland 2. Unclear baseline project 3. Unclear description of incremental benefits and incremental cost reasoning 4. High project management costs 5. Inappropriate co-financing <p>ES, November 14, 2011: Not at this time. Several issues (listed above) still need to be clarified, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Missing endorsement letter from Swaziland 2. Elaborate baseline project 3. Unclear description of incremental benefits and incremental cost reasoning 4. Inappropriate co-financing 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>ES, March 6, 2012: The following issues need to be addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide missing endorsement letter or remove the country from the project 2. Increase PMC co-financing <p>ES, March 22, 2012: The following issues need to be addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PMC co-financing error 2. Increase PMC co-financing <p>ES, March 26, 2012: All issues have been addressed. PIF clearance is recommended</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Swaziland has been removed from the project. It is expected that Swaziland will join the initiative during PPG.	
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*	September 28, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	November 15, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 06, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 20, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 26, 2012	

* **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?	Components 5 and 6 are not appropriate to include during PPG phase, these activities can be carried out during project implementation and should not require needs assessment. International consultants mirror local consultants. Are international consultants necessary for each of these tasks?
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	The budget is too high at \$415,000. Removing Component 5 and 6 will decrease budget by \$80,000.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Not at this time due to high budget.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 28, 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.