

Improved Management Of Ewaste And Healthcare Waste To Reduce Emissions Of Unintentionally Produced POPs (UPOPs)

Basic Information

GEF ID

10879

Countries

Egypt

Project Title

Improved Management Of Ewaste And Healthcare Waste To Reduce Emissions Of Unintentionally Produced POPs (UPOPs)

GEF Agency(ies)

World Bank

Agency ID

World Bank: 172548

GEF Focal Area(s)

Chemicals and Waste

Program Manager

Ibrahima Sow

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The title of the project differs from the Letter of Endorsement to the Portal. Please request the agency to request a corrected LoE or update the title in Portal.

Agency Response

10/06/2021

thank you. The issue is resolved, the title is as in the Project Paper and the Letter of Endorsement

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion On the PMC proportionality: there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5.0%, for a co-financing of \$136,120,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$6,806,000 instead of \$5,880,000 (which is 4.3%). As the costs associated with the project management have to 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.

Agency Response

10/06/2021

Cofinancing amount of PMC is amended to match GEF PMC ratio (now cofinancing PMC is at 5% of the subtotal table B online template)

Co-financing

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, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please include all the GEF and co-financing amounts in Table B (even if zero) and confirm that all financing types are accurate – for example Component 4: Enhanced Capacity, Behavioral Change and Communication *and* Component 5: Project Management and M&E seem to be more a Technical Assistance than an Investment.

On the PMC proportionality: there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5.0%, for a co-financing of \$136,120,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$6,806,000 instead of \$5,880,000 (which is 4.3%). As the costs associated with the project management have to 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.

7 October 2021: The first comment is still not addressed i.e components 4 and 5 are still marked investment in the PIF

Agency Response

10/06/2021







Noted, thanks. requested changes were made in table B.







Cofinancing amount of PMC is amended to match GEF PMC ratio (now cofinancing PMC is at 5% of the subtotal table B online template)





10/07 2021









thank you. components 4 and 5 are marked as TA now. However GEF and cofinancing amount entered as 0.00 show as no value at Review stage (we Save, and at Review stage amounts are not showing 0) - see screenshot below. IT seems this is GEF portal's technical issue:

as we enter:

Project Component	Component Type	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Co-Financing(\$)	
Component 1: Enhancing the Air Quality Management & Response System	INV	GET	0.00	0.00	 
Component 2: Support the Operationalization of SWM Master Plans in Greater Cairo	INV	GET	0.00	126,000,000.00	 
Component	INV	GET	0.00	0.00	 

3: Vehicle Emission Reduction					
Component 4: Enhanced Capacity, Behavioral Change and Communication	TA	GET	0.00	6,200,000.00	 
Component 5: Project Management and Monitoring & Evaluation	TA	GET	0.00	3,040,000.00	 
Component 6: Enhanced	TA	GET	8,697,551.00	0.00	 

Project Component	Component Type	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Co-Financing(\$)	
Component 1: Enhancing the Air Quality Management & Response System	INV	GET	0.00	0.00	 
Component 2: Support the Operationalization of SWM Master Plans in Greater	INV	GET	0.00	126,000,000.00	 

Cairo					
Component 3: Vehicle Emission Reduction	INV	GET	0.00	0.00	 
Component 4: Enhanced Capacity, Behavioral Change and Communication	TA	GET	0.00	6,200,000.00	 
Component 5: Project Management and Monitoring & Evaluation	TA	GET	0.00	3,040,000.00	 
Component 6: Enhanced	TA	GET	8,697,551.00	0.00	 

as it shows after Save and before the resubmission to GEFSEC:

Project Component	Financing Type	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
Component 1: Enhancing the Air Quality Management & Response System	Investment	GET		
Component 2: Support the Operationalization of SWM Master Plans in Greater Cairo	Investment	GET		126,000,000.00
Component 3: Vehicle Emission Reduction	Investment	GET		
Component 4: Enhanced Capacity, Behavioral Change and Communication	Technical Assistance	GET		6,200,000.00
Component 5: Project Management and Monitoring & Evaluation	Technical Assistance	GET		3,040,000.00
Component 6: Enhanced E-Waste and HCW management for Reduction of uPOPs	Technical Assistance	GET	8,697,551.00	
Sub Total (\$)			8,697,551.00	135,240,000.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
Component 1: Enhancing the Air Quality Management & Response System	Investment	GET		
Component 2: Support the Operationalization of SWM Master Plans in Greater Cairo	Investment	GET		126,000,000.00
Component 3: Vehicle Emission Reduction	Investment	GET		
Component 4: Enhanced Capacity, Behavioral Change and Communication	Technical Assistance	GET		6,200,000.00
Component 5: Project Management and Monitoring & Evaluation	Technical Assistance	GET		3,040,000.00
Component 6: Enhanced E-Waste and HCW management for Reduction of uPOPs	Technical Assistance	GET	8,697,551.00	
Sub Total (\$)			8,697,551.00	135,240,000.00

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes

Agency Response

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion No PPG requested

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Core indicator 10 included in the WB paper on the proposed additional grant (PDA) is mentioned but not in the PIF. Please harmonize

We also note from the PDA document that additional work on intermediate indicators and targets will be undertaken at Appraisal phase; We would expect those indicators to include climate change benefits, i.e.; GHG mitigated (indicator 6 under core indicators section)

Agency Response

10/06/2021

Specific estimates for indicator 10 will be made during project preparation. At this stage there is not enough sufficient information to add this indicator in the GEF core indicators list.

Yes, GHG calculations will be included at the endorsement stage. This is particularly appropriate given the parent project's focus on carbon emissions

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes.

Agency Response

art II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes. Yes,

Agency Response

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, in particular through the approach to COVID-19 response strategy and impact on Country program.

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please provide some information on consultations with key stakeholder held to inform project design.

Agency Response

10/06.2021

The project concept was developed in close collaboration with UNDP/GoE and in line with stakeholder participation of the parent project preparation. During appraisal further stakeholder participation will be sought to ensure their input inot project design, especially for vulnerable groups, such as women and the Zabaleen. This information is added in the stakeholders' section of the online PIF

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please ask the Agency to provide some additional information on any planned gender analysis/assessments to be carried out during project preparation stage.

Agency Response

10/06.2021

Additional information on beneficiaries will be gathered at the time of appraisal, which will include a gender analysis to ensure that activities are appropriately targeted and designed to ensure the needs of women are fully taken into account and to ensure their participation.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

On the e-waste component, take-back schemes and enhancing engagement with the private sector is mentioned. However it's not clear how the private sector will be engaged. E-waste recycling is generally covered by the informal sector. Sustainable e-waste management cannot occur without a dedicated and well established private sector based on enforceable regulations and standards. Please articulate the clear role of private partners in the context of this project.

On HCW, please provide some elements specifying the mechanisms that would be put in place to address segregation, collection and final disposal. Is a centralized system envisaged or in-situ treatment preferred? Please explain and justify the selected options.

Agency Response

10/06.2021

With regard to eWaste recycling, the project will build upon earlier work in formalizing the informal sector in order to license these operators and provide them with support in the form of training or other needed technical assistance.

The government has already updated its regulatory framework to enable oversight of the industry. Continuing to formalize the participants in this area will enable them to be supported in meeting these regulatory requirements.

In addition, the government is exploring ways to support upgrading recycling facilities in planned industrial areas. Project activities focused on ewaste recycling will take advantage of this timing.

Finally, the government has been working with vendors to support their participation in take-back schemes for small-scale electronics. The project envisions expanding this to develop possible new avenues for recycling these items, such as

'Recycling ATMs' in malls and universities and other innovative approaches.

HCW management will work with a targeted segment of hospitals to provide an integrated 'systems' approach to moving these facilities towards emissions mitigation.

Activities will be designed with the entire process of waste generation, segregation and disposal in mind to ensure gaps and barriers will be dealt with fully and shifts the institutions systems for waste management

rather than addressing only pieces of the process. The parent project's waste management activities will significantly support the sustainability of this component's activities.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please explain how the project complements the GEF funded project on Sustainable Persistent Organic Pollutant Management implemented by UNDP which includes a component on the management of dioxins and furans.

Agency Response

10/06.2021

The project was designed with UNDP/GoE team to ensure that the activities are: a) building on successes of the UNDP implemented project, i.e., continuing the work of formalizing the recycling sector and b) filling identified gaps, i.e., addressing printed circuit boards.

The project also allows continued technical support to the government as it moves forward with its implementation of the BaT/BEP on management of dioxins and furans established under the UNDP supported project

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The project is addressing key POPs issues. However, it's not clear to what extent it is addressing the priorities identified under the of Egypt. Please explain. On another note, the current NIP has been prepared in 2005. Is Egypt planning to prepared an updated NIP?

Agency Response

10/06.2021

Addressing dioxins and furans is a key priority in the NIP. Egypt's updated NIP has just been completed and is going through review and approval processes.

During the appraisal, the project document will be revised as necessary to ensure alignment with any recent updates.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

We cannot find relevant knowledge management approach in the PIF, Project paper on a proposed additional grant, and Project Appraisal document on a proposed loan. Please provide information about: 1) how existing lessons informed the project concept and plan, 2) plans to learn from ongoing relevant projects and initiatives, 3) proposed tools and methods for knowledge exchange, learning and collaboration, 4) proposed knowledge outputs to be produced and shared with stakeholders, 5) a discussion on how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project impact and sustainability, and 6) plans for strategic communications.

Agency Response

10/06.2021

The information below is included in the PCN and PID.

1. The project concept was designed in close collaboration with the UNDP and the GoE, as well as with the benefit of LLs from the parent

project to ensure complementarity, understanding of current and possible future issues and risks and the impact of the current context, such as COVID and new and updated policy and regulatory frameworks.

2) During the appraisal, further discussions will be held with other agencies, such as GIZ , private sector assoc, and NGOs and analyses of the needs and inputs of women and vulnerable populations (e.g, the Zabaleen) will be undertaken.

3) The project will benefit from the work of the parent project on both public awareness campaigns and other communications initiatives.

In addition, the parent project's knowledge sharing through south-south exchange may be modified to include eWaste and HCW management LLs. This will be further refined during appraisal.

4) The project will build on the stakeholder engagement plan and citizen participation activities of the parent project to build in appropriate knowledge projection and sharing with stakeholders.

5) Citizen and overall stakeholder engagement is crucial to the sustainability of results, these may include: participation and understanding of take-back schemes; on-going successful operation of trained individuals and institutions in integrated HCW management practices; collaboration and cooperation with the informal/recently formalized eWaste recyclers.

6. The project team will work with the Parent project communications specialist at the appraisal stage to build in strategic communications approaches where needed in the project.

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GPP Operational Fund Board and by the relevant institution board?

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) 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 in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

7 October. Not yet. Please address the comment on co-fanancing (components 4 and 5 still marked as investment)

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	9/29/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/7/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

