



Chemicals and Wastes Financing Partnership Facility (CWFPF)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11681

Countries

Global

Project Name

Chemicals and Wastes Financing Partnership Facility (CWFPF)

Agencies

ADB, UNIDO

Date received by PM

9/20/2024

Review completed by PM

9/24/2024

Program Manager

Anil Sookdeo

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

Project Type

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

Please include the co-financing information.

October 22, 2024 - Comment cleared

Agency's Comments

22 Oct 2024

Co-financing information has been expanded in the front and also the tables

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

1. Some outputs, particularly under Component 3, could benefit from more precise definitions of deliverables and their direct contribution to the project objective. For instance, Output 3.2 mentions creating a "CWFPF policy hub and marketplace," but the specific features and functions of these platforms could be further elaborated. Similarly,

Output 3.3 lists several pilot/demonstration sectors, but a brief explanation of the expected outcomes and GEBs from each pilot could enhance clarity.

2. While the components, outcomes, and outputs generally align with the core indicators, establishing more explicit connections between specific outputs and the indicators they are intended to influence could strengthen the project's Theory of Change. This would ensure a clearer understanding of how each project activity contributes to the desired GEBs.

3. The concept of "partner-managed funds" is mentioned multiple times, but their precise role, relationship with the CWFPF, and contribution to GEBs could be further clarified. Providing a brief explanation or examples of such funds would enhance understanding of their significance within the project's framework.

4. While private sector engagement is mentioned, providing more specific examples of how private sector entities will be involved in project activities, beyond general statements, would strengthen this aspect. This could include outlining potential partnerships, collaboration mechanisms, or specific roles for private sector actors in achieving project outcomes.

5. The risk assessment section could be expanded to include a broader range of potential risks and their corresponding mitigation measures. This would demonstrate a more comprehensive understanding of the challenges the project might face and the strategies to address them

October 22, 2024 - comments cleared.

Agency's Comments

22 October 2024

expanded. Additional information, including expected GEBs, have been added to Output 3.3.

2. In relation to the comment under 5.1., the connection between project outcomes and GEBs have been elaborated in a separate table under component 3 (under the project description) and through the Annex on GEBs.

3. Section on PMFs expanded.

4. Output 3.3 revised accordingly.

5. Risk assessment table has been modified.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

Gender Dimensions: The proposal emphasizes the importance of a gender perspective in understanding and addressing chemicals and waste pollution challenges. It highlights the disproportionate impact on women and children and outlines strategies to ensure gender inclusivity throughout the project. A gender specialist will be engaged during project preparation, and a Gender and Social Inclusion Plan will be developed.

Knowledge Management: The proposal dedicates a component to knowledge management, learning, and communications. It outlines plans for a knowledge management and learning (KML) strategy, a policy hub, and a marketplace to facilitate knowledge sharing and learning throughout the project.

Monitoring and Evaluation: The project includes a dedicated component for monitoring and evaluation (M&E). It outlines plans for a performance monitoring system, a mid-term review, and a terminal evaluation to track progress and assess the project's effectiveness.

Agency's Comments

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

On the PMC Proportionality: there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$258,800,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$12,940,000 instead of \$2,500,000 (which is 0.96%). As the costs associated with the project management must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might

be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion. A more definitive estimation of PMC will be presented and adjusted at CEO Endorsement stage.

The PMC is within the 5% cap allowed for FSPs.

October 22, 2024 - comments addressed.

Agency's Comments

22 Oct 2024

PMC proportionality for co-financing adjusted to policy requirement.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

While the PIF touches upon the interconnectedness of various factors, a more explicit articulation of the system dynamics, feedback loops, and leverage points could enhance the systemic perspective.

While the PIF identifies key drivers, a deeper analysis of the underlying root causes, such as unsustainable consumption and production patterns, could provide a more nuanced understanding of the systemic challenges.

The connection between climate change and chemical pollution could be further elaborated, highlighting the specific vulnerabilities and potential cascading effects.

A more explicit and structured identification of enablers, along with an analysis of their potential to overcome the identified barriers, could strengthen the project's strategic approach.

October 22, 2024 - comments cleared.

Agency's Comments

22 Oct 2024

Narrative added.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

While the project justification is sound, some additional information would strengthen the project.

The document could further elaborate on specific strategies to ensure resilience, such as:

? Scenario Planning: Exploring potential future scenarios and their implications for the project's design and implementation.

? Flexibility and Adaptability: Incorporating mechanisms for adjusting project activities and strategies in response to changing circumstances.

? Monitoring and Evaluation: Establishing robust systems to track progress, identify emerging risks, and inform adaptive management.

A more detailed description of the lessons learned and experiences from previous investments, and how these will inform the design and implementation of the CWFPF, could strengthen the project's justification.

The stakeholder analysis could be further enhanced by:

? More Detailed Stakeholder Mapping: Identifying and mapping a wider range of stakeholders, including potentially marginalized or vulnerable groups, and analyzing their interests, influence, and potential impact on the project.

? Clearer Articulation of Roles and Responsibilities: Providing a more explicit outline of the specific roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders throughout the project cycle, ensuring clarity and accountability.

October 22, 2024 - Comments Cleared

Agency's Comments

22 Oct 2024

Narrative strengthened.

References to Scenario Planning, Flexibility and M&E are addressed in other sections.

Scenario Planning: Is referenced in the policy hub and marketplace section.

Exploring potential future scenarios and their implications for the project's design and implementation.

Flexibility and Adaptability: referenced in a few places. The implementation guidelines for the CWFPPF and associated Trust Fund will build in various mechanisms to allow for adaptive management through the course of its life. This is based on prior experience with other ADB Trust Funds. For example, measures could be taken to accelerate the disbursement of funds to facilitate on the ground actions that are time sensitive through a ?direct charge? mechanism. Similarly, allowing for minor change of scope within project implementation as long as the overall object and GEB targets remain.

Monitoring and Evaluation: Expanded under Output 6.1

For output 3.3., additional information related to stakeholder mapping has been included in section project description/theory of change

The matrix in the Stakeholder engagement section described possible roles in the project (which will be expanded and refined during PPG)

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

The project proposal presents a concise Theory of Change (ToC) that outlines the project's logic, including the contribution of design elements to the objective, expected causal pathways, and key assumptions.

While most components have clearly defined outputs, some could benefit from further elaboration. For example, the specific features and functions of the "policy hub and marketplace" under Component 3 could be more clearly articulated. Additionally, the

expected outcomes and GEBs from the pilot/demonstration projects could be more explicitly defined.

October 22 2024 - comments cleared

Agency's Comments

22 Oct 2024

The description of Output 3.2 "policy hub and market place" has been revised and expanded

Outcomes and GEBs from the pilot/demonstration projects have been further elaborated in a separate table which discusses incremental cost reasoning,

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments

To strengthen the justification for GEF funding, the project proposal could include a more explicit discussion of incremental cost reasoning. This could involve:

Identifying the baseline scenario: Clearly defining the situation without GEF intervention, including the expected level of investment in CWP projects and the associated environmental outcomes.

Quantifying the incremental costs: Estimating the additional costs required to achieve the project's global environmental benefits compared to the baseline scenario.

Demonstrating the need for GEF funding: Clearly articulating how GEF funding will cover these incremental costs and catalyze additional investments, leading to outcomes that would not be possible without GEF support.

October 22, 2024 - comments cleared

Agency's Comments

22 Oct 2024

An incremental reasoning table has been developed. As participating countries and specific investment project opportunities have not been selected yet, the baseline is necessarily general.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes, the institutional setting is outlined, and a rationale is provided. The project will be executed by both the ADB and UNIDO, with ADB taking the lead on financial aspects and UNIDO focusing on technical expertise. The rationale for this collaboration is to leverage the strengths of both organizations: ADB's financial capabilities and UNIDO's technical knowledge in chemicals and waste management. The document also mentions the involvement of other partners, such as UNEP and the BRS Convention Secretariat, in a consultative and partnership development role.

The project explicitly states that both ADB and UNIDO will play an executing role. It describes their responsibilities, which include technical and financial oversight, project cycle management, reporting, and ensuring the achievement of global environmental impacts. It also details the establishment of a Project Steering Committee (PSC) and an Executive Committee (EC) for project oversight and advisory inputs. As this is a global project that creates a finance facility that requires direct agency oversight it is appropriate and justified for self-execution., however, as it has been the case for all PIFs that have a similar situation, please note that the clearance of this PIF cannot be taken as the approval of the implementing agency to execute the project because further analysis on the country's reasoning for this request is warranted.

The project describes potential coordination and cooperation with several ongoing GEF-financed projects and other initiatives and highlights the intention to establish joint work programs, co-organize events, share knowledge, and support infrastructure development.

Yes, the proposal adequately describes the elements for capturing and disseminating knowledge and learning outputs, as well as strategic communication. It emphasizes integrating knowledge management throughout the project, aligning it with GEF, ADB, and UNIDO policies. It outlines plans for:

Knowledge Management and Learning (KML) Strategy: To be finalized during the PPG phase, ensuring integration across project outcomes and outputs.

Communication and Visibility Plan: To be drafted during implementation, including protocols for information flow, communication between agencies and stakeholders, and guidelines for project events.

Specific KML Actions and Products: These include articles, policy briefs, media releases, learning modules, website content, workshops, and social media engagement, tailored to different project outcomes.

Agency's Comments

22 Oct 2024

Thank you.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes, however the core indicator targets for core indicator 9 could be more ambitious given the scope of the resources being requested.

October 22, 2024 - Comment cleared on the understanding that they will be improved when the pipeline of investments is developed during the PPG and during implementation.

Agency's Comments

22 Oct 2024

Indeed the concept only includes GEBs achieved directly through the pilots conducted in Component 3. For these pilots, a more detailed estimate of the POPs and mercury possibly leading to an increase, will be developed at PPG, even through selection of interventions that can maximize the GEB.

Some GEB estimates for the potential ADB loan projects in the pipeline have also been extrapolated. There is now an additional potential pipeline projects under Output 4.1 of ADB which contributes to Core Indicator 9.6 ? which is has been adjusted to 14,240 MT (from 9,200 MT). A revised note on the GEB assumptions and estimates is annexed

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

The project proposal demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of potential risks and a commitment to managing them effectively. The risk assessment and mitigation measures are well-articulated, the risk ratings reflect the residual risk after considering mitigation, and the screening process aligns with the requirements of the GEF policy.

Environmental and social safeguards: We note that the project's overall ESS risk is classified as moderate, and UNIDO Environmental and Social Screening Template and ADB's Rapid Environmental Assessment Checklist were attached. However, the ADB's Rapid Environmental Assessment Checklist is blank and there is no project checklist information.

- Please provide ADB's Rapid Environmental Assessment Checklist with project information.

October 22, 2024 - comments cleared.

Agency's Comments

22 Oct 2024

ADB compliance review and ESS checklist is now attached (for the baseline project referenced at the beginning of the PIF), as an example of a typical assessment.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments The project demonstrates a strong potential for integration, durability, and transformative impact. It also exhibits potential for innovation and scaling-up and is expected to contribute to improved policy coherence. These factors collectively enhance the project's likelihood of achieving its objectives and promoting sustainable chemicals and waste management practices.

Agency's Comments

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments The project demonstrates a strong alignment with the GEF focal area strategies, relevant international conventions, and the strategic priorities of the implementing agencies

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments In addition to the explicit mention of Target 7, the project's broader objectives and activities indirectly contribute to other targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. For instance, by promoting sustainable management of chemicals and waste, the project can indirectly contribute to Target 2 (reducing threats to biodiversity) and Target 8 (minimizing the impact of climate change and ocean acidification).

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments **Yes**

Agency's Comments
8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

While the proposal provides a general overview of the expected co-financing, it needs to be more specific in identifying co-financiers and their commitments. Additionally, the Co-

Financing table needs to be completed, and a clearer distinction between Investment Mobilized and other co-financing should be provided to fully comply with the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines.

October 22, 2024 - comment cleared

Agency's Comments

22 Oct 2024

Efforts have been made to strengthen the co-financing information which would be required at PIF stage.

The Co-financing table has been adjusted.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country's(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

As a global project, endorsements are not required.

Per the outputs, it looks like some GEF financed activities will take place in some countries during implementation ? examples of these activities are below:

1.2 Capacity building at national and subnational levels on policy formulation and implementation conducted.

3.3 Pilot / demonstration carried out as proof of concept in specific C&W sectors (to be confirmed):

a) Electronics

b) Buildings

c) Textiles

d) Environmentally persistent pharmaceuticals (EPP)

e) New POPs / Hg-Chemical additives in products

4.1 Specialized project preparation support provided to eligible institutions, leading to formulation of at least 6 investment projects covering a range of priority products, processes and sectors, of which at least 2 investment projects support new approaches to facilitate access to capital by CSOs, women and youth-led businesses into in urban CWP prevention, abatement and elimination projects.

4.2 At least one investment project piloting new approaches to attract private capital in CWP prevention, abatement and elimination.

While it is understood that Countries have not yet been selected, once these countries are selected, LoE signed by the official OFPs are required ? they must be presented by the time of CEO at the latest.

Agency's Comments

22 Oct 2024

This is noted with thanks.

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments As a global project which aims to attract investment opportunities, the production of a map is not possible as predicting the location of investments cannot be done at this time.

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments October 22, 2024 - Technical comments have been addressed.

Agency's Comments

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments Improve GEBs

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

First Review	10/3/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/22/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	