

# Strengthening the value chain for WEEE management in Colombia.

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

<b>GEF ID</b>	11558
<b>Countries</b>	Colombia
<b>Project Name</b>	Strengthening the value chain for WEEE management in Colombia.
<b>Agencies</b>	UNDP
<b>Date received by PM</b>	6/17/2025
<b>Review completed by PM</b>	7/28/2025
<b>Program Manager</b>	Evelyn Swain
<b>Focal Area</b>	Chemicals and Waste
<b>Project Type</b>	FSP

## CEO

### Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please align the executing partner section with decision the the implementation arrangements.

ES. 11/18/25: Comment addressed. UNDP is not included as EA.

Agency ResponseThe Executing partner section was aligned to the Full NIM implementation arrangements.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency ResponseN/A

## **2. Project Summary.**

**a) 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 outcomes?**

**b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?**

**c) [If a child project under a program] Does the project summary include adequate and substantive link with the parent program goal and approach?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The GEBs in the project summary are not consistent with the core indicator table. Please adjust so that they are consistent.

The project summary does not make it clear that this is a child project in a program and does not include information on how it will contribute to the program. Please provide less background and more project summary in this section.

ES, 11/18/25: Comments addressed.

Agency Response

The GEBs were adjusted properly in the summary section. Inconsistency was found in Core Indicator 9.1 and was aligned to the amount of 21.2 tonnes.

The project summary has been updated including requested information.

## **3. Project Description Overview**

**a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**

**b) [If a child project under a program] Is there a project Theory of Change that is aligned and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?**

**c) 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?**

**d) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?**

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

**f) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The project description does not make it clear that this is a child project in a program and does not include information on how it will contribute to the program.

"Outcome 4.1. Knowledge management platform established to support sharing and learning, capacity building, awareness raising among various stakeholder to achieve sectoral transformation." Outcome 4.1 should be adjusted. This project should not set up a KM platform, but should contribute to the KM platform developed by the project. The adjust this component.

We would like to request the Agency to include sex disaggregated indicators in the Results Framework, such as in Indicator 11, 12.s, 13, 16.bb.

The average budget amount of the GEF funded part for the M&E component for projects from USD 5 to USD 10 million is around 3% but for this project it is 4%. Please request the agency to revise down.

ES, 11/18/25: Comments addressed.

### Agency Response

The project description has been reviewed indicating the child Project in Colombia has been designed and will be implemented within the framework of the Global GEM Program. In addition, it was indicated how Colombia will benefit from the Program as well as how it will contribute. Finally, the narrative of contributions (within the TOC section) was strengthened, emphasizing its linkage and coordination with the Global Program.

Component 4 was revised, and the following Outcomes and Outputs were adjusted to ensure contributions to the Global GEM Knowledge Management Platform (and not creating a new one) as well as alignment with the Global GEM Program:

?Outcome 4.1 Contributions to the global gem knowledge management platform ensured to support sharing and learning, capacity building, awareness raising among various stakeholder to achieve sectoral transformation.

Output 4.1.2 Knowledge management infrastructure designed and set up, aligned to the Global GEM Knowledge Management Strategy and Platform.

Outcome 4.2 Coordination and linkages amongst the relevant global and national stakeholders and global gem knowledge management platform established.

Output 4.2.1 The global program and child projects introduced and linked to existing relevant platforms, including the Global GEM Knowledge Management Platform. Coordination mechanism between the global program and the child projects designed and implemented.?

Component 4 was revised, and the following Outcomes and Outputs were adjusted to ensure contributions to the Global GEM Knowledge Management Platform (and not creating a new one) as well as alignment with the Global GEM Program:

?Outcome 4.1 Contributions to the global gem knowledge management platform ensured to support sharing and learning, capacity building, awareness raising among various stakeholder to achieve sectoral transformation.

Output 4.1.2 Knowledge management infrastructure designed and set up, aligned to the Global GEM Knowledge Management Strategy and Platform.

Outcome 4.2 Coordination and linkages amongst the relevant global and national stakeholders and global gem knowledge management platform established.

Output 4.2.1 The global program and child projects introduced and linked to existing relevant platforms, including the Global GEM Knowledge Management Platform. Coordination mechanism between the global program and the child projects designed and implemented.?

As suggested and when appropriate, sex disaggregated indicators were included. The following were updated indicator 6, indicator 7, indicator 8, and indicator 12.

M&E budget has been revised down aligned to 3% = USD 165,000

#### **4. Project Outline**

##### **A. Project Rationale**

- a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?**
- b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?**
- c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, the project rationale is clear.

The role of stakeholders will take a significant effort given the mechanisms described.

Agency Response N/A

##### **5 B. Project Description**

**5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?**

**b) [If a child project under a program] Is the Theory of change aligned with and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?**

**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? [If a child project under a program] Does the description include how the alternative aligns with and contributes to the overall program goal and approach?**

**d) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and**

critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

e) **Incremental/additional cost reasoning:** Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

f) **Other Benefits:** Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

g) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?

h) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?

i) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?

j) **Gender:** Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?

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

l) **Policy Coherence:** Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

m) **Transformation and/or innovation:** Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? [If a child project under an integrated program] Are the specific levers of transformation identified and described? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The Theory of change is included as well as the key assumptions.

Stakeholders are identified and included in the project description.

Agency ResponseN/A

**5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project**

a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?

b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?

c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).

d) [If a child project under an integrated program] Does the framework for coordination and collaboration demonstrate consistency with overall ambition of the program for transformative change?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please reconsider if COS to NIM is needed. For other focal areas the country and OFP have identified other institutions that can support execution, such as ?Fondo para la Vida? and others, which can perform these tasks.

ES, 11/18/25: The project will be full NIM. Comment addressed.

Agency ResponseThe Implementation Modality has been updated to Full NIM. The initial implementation arrangement has been revised in accordance with the GEF Secretariat?s request.

UNDP's implementation support has been withdrawn. Due to time constraints, the appropriate executing agency will be confirmed after CEO Endorsement, and a minor amendment will be subsequently informed to formalize the change.

### 5.3 Core indicators

- a) **Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)? [If a child project under a program] Is the choice of core indicators consistent with those prioritized under the parent program?**
- b) **Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?**

### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Core indicators are in line with or have increased from PIF stage. Please align the core indicators with the project summary.

ES, 11/18/25: Comment addressed.

### Agency Response

The GEBs were adjusted properly in the summary section. Inconsistency was found in Core Indicator 9.1 and was aligned to the amount of 21.2 tonnes.

### 5.4 Risks

- a) **Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- 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 assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please describe how the Overall risk rating was identified.

ES, 11/19/25: Under the Key Risk table, please describe how the Overall risk rating was identified.

ES, 11/20/25: Comment addressed.

### Agency Response

The overall risk rating was identified by applying the highest risk level of all the individual risks.

UNDP 19/11/2025:

Information was added in the comments of the overall risk rating: "The overall risk rating was identified by applying the highest risk level of all the individual risks".

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

### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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

**6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?**

**b) [If a child project under an integrated program] Is the project adequately aligned with the program objective in the GEF-8 programming directions?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes, this is in line with the GEF-8 CW strategy.

Agency Response N/A

**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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes, this project is in line with the Chemicals MEAs.

Agency Response N/A

**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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response N/A

**7 D. Policy Requirements**

**7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response N/A

**7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response N/A

**7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response N/A

**7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

a. According to the project description, this is a national project, and Annex 9 (ESMF) indicates it will be mainly implemented in urban areas. In Colombia, approximately 20% of Indigenous Peoples live in urban settings, depending on the cities selected. The project must clarify how these Indigenous Peoples will be meaningfully included at each step of the project wherever applicable. Not living in their traditional territories cannot be used as a reason to bypass FPIC.

b. In Annex 5 (UNDP's ESS), please revise Standard 6 in light of Comments 1 and 3, to reflect the presence and rights of Indigenous Peoples in urban areas.

- c. In the project description, Section D acknowledges the role of Indigenous Peoples and local communities' knowledge. Ensure that Indigenous knowledge holders are meaningfully engaged in accordance with FPIC, to avoid knowledge extraction, e.g. IPLCs will be engaged to learn from their traditional knowledge and practices.
- d. For any component related to infrastructure development, please ensure accessibility for persons with disabilities is considered and integrated.

ES, 11/18/25: Comment addressed.

### Agency Response

The following documents were updated based on the acknowledge of Indigenous People including a new Risk ?There is a risk that some of the project's activities could be developed in areas where the indigenous population could have influence.?

Annex 5: SESP ? Social and Environmental Screening.

Annex 8: Stakeholder Engagement Plan

Annex 9: Environmental and Social Management Framework.

#### **8 Annexes**

#### **Annex A: Financing Tables**

**8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: 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 comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency ResponseN/A

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency ResponseN/A

**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency ResponseN/A

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency ResponseN/A

**SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency ResponseN/A

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency ResponseN/A

### **8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)**

**a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please list the activities implemented during the PPG phase to better assess the validity of each. These items require more details to be validated: ?Traning, Workshops and Conference?, ?Audio Visual and Print Production Costs?.

ES, 11/19/25: Annex D: a lead PPG consultant and a PPG coordinator are duplicative positions - this expenditure in two coordination positions does not align with the value-for-money provision included in the Minimum Fiduciary Standards policy - please ask the Agency to not spend the committed amount for the Lead PPG consultant.

ES, 11/20/25: Comment addressed.

Agency Response

Please find the details of the required items:

- Audio Visual & Print Prod Costs: printing of materials required for different consultations and workshops with stakeholders; translation services for project document.
- Training, Workshops and Confer: Inception and Validation Workshops, bilateral / groupal meetings, and workshops conducted with key stakeholders engaged during the PPG pase.

Descriptions were changed in Annex D.

UNDP 19/11/2025:

UNDP apologizes for the confusion created with the information provided; Descriptions were updated to clearly identify those 2 positions, which were:

- International Project Development Specialist (GEF PPG Team Leader)
- National PPG Planner, institutional and Policy Expert

There was not duplication in their functions.

### **8.3 Source of Funds**

**Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?**

**Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency ResponseN/A

**8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

**e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-**

kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request There is significant co-financing from the private sector which is expected for this type of project.

Agency Response N/A

**Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:**

**Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response N/A

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response N/A

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response N/A

**Annex C: Project Results Framework**

**8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?**

**b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)**

**c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?**

**d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?**

**e) [If a regional/global coordination child project under an integrated program] Does the results framework reflect the program-wide result framework, inclusive of results from child projects and specific to the regional/global coordination child project? [If a country child project under an integrated program] Is the child project result framework inclusive of program-wide metrics monitored across child project by the Regional/Global Child project?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The core indicators in the results framework are different than what is included in the core indicator table. Please make them consistent.

ES, 11/18/25: Comment addressed.

Agency Response UNDP did not find any difference among the indicators within the PRF and the Core Indicator Table.

**Annex E: Project map and coordinates**

**8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

**Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating**

**8.8 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response N/A

**Annex G: GEF Budget template**

**8.9 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?**

**b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?**

**c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

a. A ?Project Coordinator? is charged 100% to projects components. The provided TORs indicate a balanced profile with around 60% of tasks related to a managerial position. Per guidelines, the costs associated with the project?s execution must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. Please request the agency to reflect this in the budget table.

b. \$240,000 is being set aside for ?One administrative/finance assistant? which seems very high for an assistant position. Please request the agency to revise.

c. Considering that dual execution is not expected, the agency needs to update the budget table accordingly, removing the items currently allocated for UNDP support services.

d. We will review the budget table again upon resubmission and provide comments as appropriate.

ES, 11/19/25: The budget table included in this version (see first file attached) is very different from the version included in the version of June (see second file attached). The unlike the first version that presented each position itemized with individual costs, the second (current) file presents several positions in one budget line, preventing the assessment of each position / expenditure. Please ask the Agency to present the budget table with each expenditure - position in one budget line and following the 2025 update of the guidelines on the project cycle which requires to include a sub-total row for each category in the budget table. Per the resubmission, we will review the budget table again and provide comments if appropriate (note: the cost of personnel (staff + consultants must be around 30% or so).

ES, 11/20/25: Comment addressed.

Agency Response

The Budget has been revised according to the Full NIM and the Project Coordinator is now 100% charged to PMC.

UNDP 19/11/2025:

The budget table was updated with each expenditure ? position in one budget line and including a sub-total row for each category in the budget table (according to the 2025 guidelines).

The cost of personnel (staff + consultants) was ensured to be around 30%.

**Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes**

**8.10 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.**

**b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.**

**c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response N/A

**Additional Annexes**

**9. GEFSEC DECISION**

**9.1. GEFSEC Recommendation**

**Is the project recommended for approval**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Not at this time.

ES, 11/19/25: Some issues remain.

ES, 11/20/25: Comments addressed. Project is recommended for approval.

**9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**9.3 Review Dates**

	<b>CEO Approval</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	7/28/2025	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	8/19/2025	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	11/18/2025	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	11/19/2025	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	11/20/2025	