



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

GEF ID:	4888		
Country/Region:	Senegal		
Project Title:	Environmentally Sound Management of Municipal and Hazardous Solid Waste to Reduce Emission of Unintentional POPs		
GEF Agency:	UNIDO	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; Others; Project Mana;	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$130,000	Project Grant:	\$2,000,000
Co-financing:	\$17,030,186	Total Project Cost:	\$19,160,186
PIF Approval:	February 19, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	April 12, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ibrahima Sow	Agency Contact Person:	Fukuya IINO

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?	The endorsement letter is addressed to UNIDO, but in the text World Bank is requested to be the GEF Agency for this project. Please address the contradiction.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Generally the project fits into UNIDO's comparative advantage in terms of demonstrating UOPs reduction and POPs waste disposal. However this project has activities on piloting collection of Used Lead Acid Battery, UNIDO's experience in this aspect is not stated.	It is not clear how the issue of used lead acid battery will be addressed in the project. Has UNIDO identified a private partner with a clear business model and sound management of ULAB? Please clarify. 9 October 2014 comment addressed,

*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)
		Aug. 23, 2012 Addressed	
	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?	No. It is confusing that in C2, a Serbia project on ODS is quoted to show staff capacity in the country. Here we are talking about a Senegal project, on UPOPs and ULAB. Aug. 23, 2012 Addressed	Yes
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?	NA	
	• 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?	Activities on UPOPs reduction is aligned with FA 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	Addressing open burning to reduce UPOPs emission is a priority area identified by NIP.	The project should aim at reducing or eliminating open burning in the two selected municipalities. Therefore output 3.7: - Open burning conditions

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?		to reduce UPOPs emissions improved - (B. Project framework) should be revised to reflect this objective. October 9, 2014 Comment addressed
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	No. It is not mentioned. Aug. 23, 2012 Addressed	
	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?	A list of GEF/Senegal(both national and regional) projects are quoted as baseline projects, together with a national ban on POPs pesticides and lead poisoning case. Yet there is no mentioning of national efforts in the areas the proposal intends to work on. 30 July 2012 Project component 1 mentions " Sound management of open burning" which does not appear to be very meaningful. The idea here is to avoid open burning practices. Please, edit this component to reflect the sound management of municipal and hazardous wastes with the view to reducing UPOPs. It would not be very efficient to invest in Mbeubeuss due to the complexity of issues associated with this discharge. GEFSEC would like to see first what would come out from the activities initiated with IDA and AFD. GEF grant should be limited to demonstarting BAT/BEP for municipal and hazardous waste management	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>through establishing controlled landfills and promoting recycling in two of the selected municipalities (Tivaouane, Ziguichor and Kaolack) and addressing ESM of ULABs.</p> <p>The role of municipalities should be clearly specified. Activities relating to the management of municipal wastes should be under the responsibilities of the municipalities. We recommend UNIDO to involve the "Association des Maires du Senegal" as a key partner for this component, in particular for the establishment of controlled landfills and for possible replication of the project in other cities of the country.</p> <p>Aug. 23, 2012 Addressed</p>	
	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?	This will be assessed when baseline is well defined.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>No.</p> <p>At the surface level, it seems to be a project on ESM of municipal waste and hazardous waste to reduce UPOPs emission. However, the specific activities also include constructing and field testing of pilot facility for ULAB collection, improving technical</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		infrastructure of a laboratory to prepare for GMP, assessing POPs in soil and water. It is unclear how these activities are designed into a coherence package to achieve project goals. GMP related activities should be carried out under GMP project. Component 3 can not be supported with GEF funding.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	To be assessed when baseline is ready.	
	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?	Socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions are described.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	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 risk is not identified. Please provide such information since reducing open burning of waste does have a CC perspective.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	GEF/Senegal(both national and regional) projects are mentioned.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	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?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		The involvement of private companies in the project is not clearly articulated. GEFSEC would expect clear and strong involvement of Waste management companies to run the future engineered landfills, in particular in the municipality of Ziguinchor. October 9, 2014 Comment addressed.
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	4.5% of GEF resources. Aug. 23, 2012 PMC is increased to 9%.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	To be assessed when the incrementality of project activities is confirmed.	Under Annex E: GEF Budget, I noted a budget of \$ 110,000 for International workshops. What International workshops are you referring to and why the GEF has to pay this large amount? October 9, 2014 Comment addressed.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	1:4. About 30% of co-financing is in cash. How private sector contributes to the project with inkind cofinancing needs to be further justified.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	UNIDO is bringing an inkind contribution of 50,000 to the project.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>No. Above mentioned issues need to be addressed.</p> <p>30 July 2012 UNIDO needs to still address the following issues; - Edit component 1 under the logframe; - Limit the project activities to the demonstration of BAT/BEP relating to ESM of municipal and hazardous wastes (through establishment of controlled landfills) in the two selected municipalities. These activities should be under the responsibilities of the two selected municipalities - Please involve the "Association des Maires" du Senegal for possible replication of the project in other cities of the country.</p> <p>Aug. 23, 2012 All the above comments are addressed.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		The PIF has been technically cleared for potential inclusion in an upcoming Work Program, subject to availability of resources in the GEF Trust Fund, as well as being considered a priority in light of considerations such as geographical and focal area balance. The inclusion of a PIF in a Work Program will be decided by the CEO. Technically cleared projects that have not been selected for an upcoming Work Program may still be considered for subsequent ones.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	At CEO endorsement stage, please identify CHEM-3 in FA Strategy Framework as well, since this project also mentioned management of e-waste and lead in batteries which fall under Sound Chemicals Management.	
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?		Not at this time. Please address GESEC comments October 9, 2014 All comments have been addressed. CEO clearance is recommended.
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 03, 2012	September 24, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)		October 09, 2014
	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?	
	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.