



**GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND**

GEF ID:	9570		
Country/Region:	Gambia		
Project Title:	Capacity building for PCBs and U-POPs in The Gambia		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5908 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Chemicals and Waste
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CW-2 Program 3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$1,998,000
Co-financing:	\$9,055,000	Total Project Cost:	\$11,053,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Masako Ogawa	Agency Contact Person:	Jacques Van Engel

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	MO August 29, 2016 Yes. Gambia ratified the Stockholm Convention in 2009 and is updating NIP. Gambia signed the Minamata Convention in 2013 and conducting MIA	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MO August 29, 2016 (1) PCB NIP in 2009 recommended undertaking comprehensive PCB inventory and proposed key	(1) The NIP update project, which is currently being implemented, includes an update of the preliminary PCB inventory. Since the previous preliminary PCB inventory, 58 tons of

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>management options of PCB. Please clarify if ongoing NIP review and update is implementing PCB inventory and proposing activities on PCB management. Also please explain alignment of this proposed project with draft NIP update.</p> <p>(2) UPOPs</p> <p>Please explain if draft NIP update prioritizes the activities to reduce UPOPs, and please explain which sources of UPOPs are prioritized. Also please explain alignment of this proposed project with draft NIP update.</p> <p>MO March 14, 2017 All comments cleared.</p>	<p>identified PCB-contaminated transformers have become unaccountable; most of these were sold as scrap metal to metal dealers. The latest inventory, which covered 275 transformers and is still under development, has so far identified 19 PCB-contaminated transformers that are currently in use (weighing 20 t), 18 decommissioned PCB-contaminated transformers (weighing 18.5 t), and 1 pure PCB transformer (weighing 1.5 t). A comprehensive PCB inventory is still required to obtain a more precise understanding of the amount of PCBs in the country. Furthermore, based on the amount of pure PCB quantities identified in the NIP update, pure PCB projections have been adjusted from 50 t to 15 t. Since the NIP update did not include a comprehensive assessment of the entire national stock of transformers and capacitors, the exact amount of pure PCBs will only be known during the project implementation phase. However, based on data from the NIP update, cross contamination seems to be prevalent. Therefore, the proposed project includes an estimated 60 t of contaminated oil, soil, and other materials. A more complete and reliable set of data will be generated during the implementation phase.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>(2) The NIP update project also revisited the U-POPs inventory to identify additional sources of U-POPs particularly in the informal sector, which has grown with the Gambia's population increase in recent years. The updated U-POPs inventory confirmed that among the country's priority problems is the "uncontrolled open combustion in dumpsites". The findings and related proposed actions outlined in the updated U-POPs inventory are in line with the first NIP and 2000 preliminary U-POPs inventory, as well as the activities in the proposed project.</p> <p>Text added to PIF on page 8, 9, 10, and 12.</p>
<p>Project Design</p>	<p>3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>MO August 29, 2016 Yes. In Gambia, there are no regulations on PCB and UPOPs, and adequate facilities and practices are not available to reduce these chemicals. The project will introduce legislations and technologies to dispose PCB and reduce UPOPs emissions. These legislations and enforcement measures will support the scale-up and replications.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound</p>	<p>MO August 29, 2016</p>	<p>In relation to section 2) and Baseline</p>

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>In the section 2) on baseline projects, please explain baseline projects on UPOPs.</p> <p>In the section 4) on incremental cost reasoning, please revise the table on page 18 and 19 as follows;</p> <p>(1) Please change the column "baseline" to "baseline scenario and baseline projects" and include information the relevant activities of baseline projects.</p> <p>(2) Please change the column "alternative scenario" to "incremental reasoning" and explain the activities the GEF financing will support.</p> <p>MO March 14, 2017 All comments cleared.</p>	<p>projects on UPOPs:</p> <p>Additional baseline waste management projects that are relevant to the proposed U-POPs reduction activities include the: "Building Capacity for Sustainable Waste Management for Coastal Communities through Women and Youth Livelihoods" project, which produced "The State of Solid Waste Management in The Gambia" a review", established a local waste training and entrepreneurship centre, and developed reprocessing technologies; a Kanifing Municipal Council (KMC) project on the rehabilitation of the Bakoteh dumpsite, which has not yet commenced; initial activities to revise the 2007 Waste Management Bill; awareness raising related to the NIP has led to improved practices on the types of materials used for burning activities related to fish smoking, animal skin smoking, or charcoal production; and activities executed by KMC, Project Lighthouse, and others such as the development of a KMC area waste generation database. Coordination with these projects / activities, which are supporting the development of the national infrastructure for waste management, will be ensured to build on the lessons learned and coordinate with any planned activities. The proposed project will be closely coordinated with</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>these waste management activities and related outputs to ensure that the most effective approach to U-POPs reduction is applied.</p> <p>In relation to section 4 and the table on pages 18-19:</p> <p>The GEF financing will be used to support non-burn activities including: strengthening sustainable national coordinating mechanisms; development of an awareness raising strategy and related activities; establishing sustainable training programmes (at both national and local levels, including assessment of national learning needs and institution training capacities to develop the national training strategy); promoting and strengthening the 3Rs of the waste management hierarchy at the national and local levels; promoting non-burn alternative approaches in the agricultural sector including undertaking pilot studies; and strengthening enabling legislation.</p> <p>The above will include (i) the development and dissemination of guidance and training materials that discourage open burning of wastes and biomass in the local communities and agricultural activities; (ii) pilot activities to test and identify the most appropriate and effective approaches; and (iii) undertaking national training involving</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>municipalities, local authorities, and communities (including households) regarding the hazards of open burning and U-POPs, and alternative approaches such as composting. The pilot activities will build on previous waste management efforts in the Gambia and other similar countries, include in-depth consultations with stakeholders, and focus on relevant technologies and approaches to increase recycling, repurposing, and composting. Social and economic impacts and encouraging private sector participation will also be considered and appropriately addressed. The pilot activities will also facilitate regular communicating with stakeholders and measuring medium-term progress in achieving reductions in open burning and therefore U-POPs. The Ministry of Agriculture, for example, will be closely engaged to promote alternative and sustainable methods of farming that discourage open burning of biomass and instead benefit agricultural production. Pilot activities will also take place regarding biomass open burning. Similarly, guidance and training activities will take place at the main dumpsites to equip the personnel with the skills to reduce open burning of waste at the dumpsites.</p> <p>Text added to PIF on pages 11, 15, 17</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			and 18.
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>MO August 29, 2016, (1) On regulatory and institutional framework on mercury-added product, please see box 1. (2) On output 1.1.2, please explain what are the inventory and the feasibility study. (3) Both output 1.1.2 and 2.2.1 have training on PCB management. Please revise and avoid overlapping. (4) On PCB inventory, please see box 2. (5) On output 4.3.1, please develop website not for the project but for the environmental management of PCB and UPOPs, and designate the authorities to manage and update the website, so that sustainability and scale-up will be achieved after this project.</p> <p>MO March 14, 2017 All comments cleared.</p>	<p>(1) Not applicable as mercury activities have been removed</p> <p>(2) The inventory and feasibility study referred to in output 1.1.2 are the "comprehensive PCB inventory" and "feasibility study of available, robust, and cost-effective technologies to promote ESM and disposal of PCBs" that will be undertaken under output 2.1.1 and completed prior to output 1.1.2. Under 2.1.1, the Gambia will assess its data needs and develop protocols and procedures for data collection, sampling and analysis, processing, and storage. A comprehensive PCB inventory will be conducted during the implementation phase of the project and will include the sampling and analysis of phased-out and in-use equipment (ca. 3,000). A national database will be developed, which will also provide a platform for characterisation of PCB waste streams. This characterization will then facilitate undertaking a feasibility study of using available, robust, and cost-effective technologies to promote ESM and disposal of PCBs. The evaluation of disposal options will take into account the levels of PCB concentrations and the condition of the equipment.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>(3) The training provided under output 1.1.2 is mainly addressed to staff of relevant Ministries and environmental authorities, including the members of the National Project Committee and project staff, on the national and international regulation concerning PCBs, on the design of a sound PCB management plan. The training will also cover strategies for a better enforcement of the legislation on PCBs, and key steps on PCB management. On the side of U-POPs, this training will also include the reduction of U-POPs through the adoption of BAT/BEP in the management of waste. Instead, the training provided under output 2.2.1 will only cover practical aspects of PCBs management, and will consist in class and on-site lessons concerning sampling and testing of dielectric oil from transformers, key operations on PCB contaminated transformers like draining, dismantling, retrofilling, packaging for transportation, etc. and will target those who will physically undertake the various PCB management tasks leading up to export for disposal of PCB contaminated oil and transformers. This practical training will build the technical capacity of the operators to ensure that risks are minimised and environmentally sound management is applied.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>(4) Please see response in box 2 above.</p> <p>(5) The activities on the website have been adjusted to focus on a PCB and U-POPs management website. In addition, UNDP (particularly through its Country Office) and UNITAR will provide training to the relevant stakeholders in the Gambia on website development, use of social media, and other electronic means of communication, so that capacity is developed in the long run at the level of the national agency on maximising outreach of key information to the general public through appropriate media.</p> <p>Text added to PIF on pages 13, 14, and 16.</p>
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MO August 29, 2016 Yes.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?		
	• The focal area allocation?	MO August 29, 2016 Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	MO December 2, 2016 Not at this time. Please address the comments in box 2, 4 and 5. MO March 14, 2017 All comments cleared. The Program Manager recommends PIF clearance.	
Review Date	Review	August 29, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 14, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council • Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.