

[Home RoadMap](#)

# KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE AND INSTITUTIONAL PARTNERSHIPS TO REDUCE ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH RISKS FROM EXPOSURE TO HARMFUL CHEMICALS AND WASTE

**Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation**

## **Basic project information**

**GEF ID**

9855

**Countries**

Regional (Africa)

**Project Name**

KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE AND INSTITUTIONAL PARTNERSHIPS TO REDUCE ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH RISKS FROM EXPOSURE TO HARMFUL CHEMICALS AND WASTE

**Agencies**

World Bank

**Date received by PM**

8/2/2018

**Review completed by PM**

4/30/2020

**Program Manager**

Ibrahima Sow

**Focal Area**

Chemicals and Waste

**Project Type**

FSP

**PIF**

**CEO Endorsement**

**Project Design and Financing**

**1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

Yes. With details provided in the Knowledge exchange and institutional...document and in the different child projects

**Response to Secretariat comments March 16 2020:** Noted Thank you. No Response required.

**2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

Yes. We note that the GEF funding will create the enabling environment for sound management of Hg and POPs in the beneficiary countries. The project will provide assistance to support institutional strengthening and capacity building as well as knowledge, policy dialogue and regulatory enhancement to generate greater awareness of the expected impacts. However, we encourage the Bank to develop appropriate strategies for an effective enforcement of the legal and regulatory measures that will be put in place. We would also like to see how the Bank is concretely engaging with stakeholders, in particular the private sector for the establishment of treatment facilities related to e-waste management.

Please correct para 12 under C (Relevance to higher level objectives) page 72. The country should be Tanzania, not Zambia.

10 April 2020: Comments cleared

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

**March 16 2020:** The document has been revised to better clarify strategies within the platform to ensure effective enforcement of the regulatory measures (Pg 12-13, Component description) and the engagement with the private sector stakeholders (Pg 17-18, Stakeholders). The Program will work closely with community-based organizations, private sectors, NGOs and local communities, who are invested in e-waste and pollution management issues, including opportunities for establishing treatment facilities for income generation and green job opportunities. More specifically in the country child projects, countries working on e-waste management will be encouraged to involve relevant private sector entities in the preparation and implementation of Component 3 on Demonstrating application of technological tools and economic approaches - for reduced environmental health risks due to mercury and e-waste.

**3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** Yes. The CE of UPOPs and mercury has been appropriately developed for the different child projects

**Response to Secretariat comments March 16 2020:** Noted Thank you. No Response required.

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)

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** Yes

**Response to Secretariat comments March 16 2020:** Noted Thank you.

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

Confirmation of cofinancing is expected during negotiations with the beneficiary countries

10 April 2020: Comments cleared.

**Response to Secretariat comments March 16 2020:** Supporting letters to confirm cofinancing has been attached to the re-submission.

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** Yes.

**Response to Secretariat comments March 16 2020:** Noted Thank you.

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**Response to Secretariat comments** N/A

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** Yes, in particular with the UNEP/GEF ChemObs project.

**Response to Secretariat comments March 16 2020:** Noted Thank you.

**9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** Yes

**Response to Secretariat comments March 16 2020:** Noted Thank you.

**10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** Yes.

**Response to Secretariat comments March 16 2020:** Noted Thank you.

**Agency Responses**

**11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:**

**GEFSEC**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** Yes.

**Response to Secretariat comments March 16 2020:** Noted Thank you for the clearance

**STAP**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** Comments addressed

**Response to Secretariat comments**

**GEF Council**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** Comments addressed

**Response to Secretariat comments**

**Convention Secretariat**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**Response to Secretariat comments**

**Recommendation**

**12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

Please address comments in section 2

Not yet.

Assuming that the GEB will come from the implementation of the child project, we recommend to remove the inputs for the core indicators for the coordination mechanism and institutional partnerships platform.

For example under the section on stakeholders at the end of the text it says “See document for further information”. Please include all the information relevant to the stakeholders in this case including an engagement plan in the text and not as an attached document. This is true for almost every section of the project where you put a summary and refer to an attached document.

10 April 2020

On finances: there is \$1 difference in table D of this child project compared with the parent program’s table D  
Please amend the \$ amount in table D, otherwise the Trustee will not accept the CEO Endorsement letter:

4 May 2020: Please enter the region (Africa) or countries in the portal submission, otherwise the portal cannot correctly route this to the Regional Coordinator

I recommend

1.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

**April 16, 2020:** The difference in Table D is due to rounding off and has now been corrected.

The Project teams kindly requests for technical clearance of CEO package quickly to allow for the project negotiations to take place in a timely manner. It is scheduled for April 24-28, 2020. Thank you.

**March 16 2020:** Comments have been addressed in the documents. Revised Project document as a complete CEO package has been resubmitted in the GEF portal.

Core indicators. While we agree with the reviewer that the core indicators will be measured through child projects, as in any program the coordination project/Platform will aggregate and collate the overall targets of the program for reporting purposes. Therefore it is important to reflect the aggregate targets in the

GEF data sheet. As agreed in the bilateral discussion clarification has been made in the notes for the core indicators and also each child project reports on specific indicator as applicable.

Following pre-appraisal the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) has been prepared which includes information by country. Attached in the GEF portal. Additional information has been included and as suggested edits made in the sections. It may however be important to note that the portal limits the length of text inserted and therefore the entire document text is not possible to include in the data sheet. Thank you.

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

Environmental sound management of harmful chemicals and waste in urban cities and in areas with Artisanal gold mining activities – mainly rural areas - is a critical issue in most African countries due to the lack of technical, financial and managerial capacity to demonstrate results on the ground, and set up institutional mechanisms to promote innovative techniques, practices and approaches for the elimination and reduction of harmful chemicals and waste. Poverty and lack of alternative livelihood opportunities also attract a large percentage of rural poor to ASGM and to informal e-waste recycling.

The project objective is to reduce environmental health risks related to POPs and mercury through strengthened institutional partnership and capacity in management in an integrated manner. A regional partnership platform is designed and aimed at recognition of the need for a common platform to assess the legal and regulatory frameworks



to address common issues such as cross-border and illegal movement of mercury and novel approaches. The objective is to formalize the informal ASGM sector, and to improve solid waste management and electronic waste through a development of area-based approach towards environmental improvements and capacity building to reduce the environmental health risk. Interventions will not simply focus on a single issue or site, but rather on the mechanisms and underlying enabling conditions that influence the incentives for pollution management.

A coordinating knowledge management exchange platform will be in place to facilitate coordination, efficiency and effectiveness of the national activities. This platform will focus on leveraging economies of scale and delivering results more quickly through coordination and knowledge management, across the suite of program interventions focusing on reducing the risks of exposure to harmful and toxic chemicals. The project includes the following components: i) a regional platform for strengthening regional partnerships and policy dialogues; ii) A knowledge management and communication component; iii) A program Coordination and Implementation.

This Program will innovate across technology, finance and governance pillars to address environmental health risks. Using an integrated approach, the Bank will work in collaboration with other key donors and interventions to shift the baseline for pollution management such that the risks of noncompliance will outweigh potential rewards of inaction. Building good policies, strong legislation and the capacity to implement strong institutions across the waste management chain will establish the enabling environment for reducing the environmental health risks. The long-term sustainability of improved pollution management will rest in the hands of the environmental regulators, the sector agencies such as mining and urban ministries, and the local communities, the private companies and NGOs. Securing alternative development pathways that rely on enhanced commercial value of reclaimed land and associated community benefit due to reduced environmental health risks. The project will seek to create stable situations on the ground where there is proper enforcement along with local communities affected by localized pollution that generate local benefits while generating regional environmental benefits.