

AFLDC-2 Scaling-up Investment and Technology Transfer to Facilitate Capacity Strengthening and Technical Assistance for the Implementation of Stockholm and Minamata Conventions in African LDCs

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10218

Countries

Regional (Africa, Angola, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guinea, Liberia, Mauritania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo, Uganda, Zambia)

Project Name

AFLDC-2 Scaling-up Investment and Technology Transfer to Facilitate
Capacity Strengthening and Technical Assistance for the Implementation of
Stockholm and Minamata Conventions in African LDCs

Agencies

AfDB

Date received by PM

12/13/2020

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Satoshi Yoshida

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

Project Type

FSP

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Jan 8, 2021: Yes, with changes from the PIF. However, please see comments on the alternative scenario section.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SY, Jan 8, 2021: There are some changes in the structure of the project from the PIF. Please see comments in alternative scenario and GEBs.

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Jan 8, 2021:

1. Please upload all the co-financing letters or equivalent. Please clarify the nature of co-financing and linkages with project components, including component 3 under the relevant section of the CEOER.
2. Please provide descriptions on major changes from the PIF stage. Please explain why the total co-financing decreased and how the project will cover the decrease of co-financing to achieve the objectives of the project.
3. Some types of co-financing are inaccurate on the portal. Please fix them (e.g. Donor Agency, not GEF Agency). Some recurrent expenditure co-financing may be in-kind instead of grant. Please review the type of resources.
4. Descriptions on? how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified? are the same as in PIF. Please update them.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SY, Jan 8, 2021: Yes.
Please see comments on co-financing.

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SY, Jan 8, 2021: Not yet.
Please upload the Annex C.

Agency Response
Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
SY, Jan 8, 2021:

1. The total GEBs on indicator 9 decreased by more than 45 percent while maintaining the amount of the GEF funding. Please consider increasing the targets by reformulating the outputs of participating countries with national priorities, utilizing co-financing resources.
2. There are many discrepancies in GEB's in Annex AB and the CEOER on the portal. For example, indicator 9.2 has mercury reduction of 38 tons in total in all 11 countries while the result framework and country sheets indicate only 2 countries will participate in output 3.5, which is described to achieve 57 tons of reduction. There are some cases with no GEBs by investments while there are some investment activities in the countries.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Jan 8, 2021: While many relevant barriers are described, how the project address such barriers is not clear in this section and the other parts of the CEOER document.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Jan 8, 2021: Please include regional and international baseline projects relating to POPs and mercury reductions, on top of country-specific baselines. Co-financing baseline projects described in this section are not directly related to POPs and mercury reductions and linkages with the alternative scenario (in the portal and in country annexes) are not clear.

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SY, Jan 8, 2021: The proposed alternative scenario needs modifications and clarifications for further assessments.

1. Overall comments: It is not clear how the project will scale up investments and technology transfer, as the project title describes, including through financial, and regulatory and enforcement mechanisms while few outputs include public/private financial schemes. The linkages between components (e.g. 1 and 3) and between outputs within component 3 are not entirely clear or strong although there are some descriptions in this section. Clarifications are needed on co-financing to support each output, in particular investments under component 3 (or under a section of co-financing contributions). Activities in the country annexes do not match the overall descriptions of outputs in the portal with several discrepancies (e.g. Gambia is included in output 3.1 in annex while the main document does not include.).
2. ToC: There are three ToCs but they are almost identical. Unless there are significant differences among targeted POPs and mercury, please merge them

in a single ToC. Barriers should be aligned with root causes that will be addressed by this project including lack of financial incentives. ?LDCs need support? is not a barrier. There should be linkages between components 1-3 as opposed to stand-alone components and outcomes.

3. Component 1: It is not clear how the project facilitates enforcement of laws and regulations to reduce POPs and mercury emission in particular where countries already have them. It seems that the interventions of this component are not adequate to achieve the objectives. While EPR is referred, no specific activity is described (throughout the document). While the PIF included ?enhanced mechanisms for the take up of BAT/BEP,? it is not clear how the project will enhance such mechanisms throughout the CEOER. Output 1.2 and 1.4 describes trainings but they will not be sufficient to address the underlying issues related to POPs and mercury releases. Output 1.3 seems a stand-alone output and it is not clear how this output will lead to reduction of POPs and mercury emissions outside the project.
4. Component 2: Please provide a rationale why outputs 2.1 and 2.2 are separated from outputs 1.2 and 1.4 and clarify if there is no overlap. Output 2.3a covers broader activities including reduction or alternatives to POPs pesticides while relevant outputs under component 3 have only waste and obsolete stockpile destruction and it is not clear AfDB projects will help participating countries utilize this output and achieve the objectives (which also applies to other outputs). Output 2.3c and 2.3d may have some overlaps with output 3.4. Output 2.4 needs to prioritize approaches and targets to increase the effectiveness and focus on mobilizing these stakeholders rather than heavy spending on communications.
5. Output 3.1: Please clarify how much and which GEBs will be generated by this output within and outside the project. Please also clarify what measures will be placed to ensure stored targeted chemicals in interim transfer stations will be environmentally safely disposed or destroyed and how these chemicals will be transported safely from which sources. How the project will mobilize investments including co-financing to build such facilities is not clear. Also please elaborate the relationship between this output and other outputs under component 3 (there is a description on a linkage in some countries between 3.1 and 3.2). This is a stand-alone activity solely focus on the interim storage and will be conducted only three countries (plus two other countries for short-term storages). Please explain if other countries have already such facilities for sound disposal of hazardous chemicals.
6. Output 3.2: Please explain why Senegal is not included in this output while the output 3.1 includes Senegal, and the destruction itself will be not conducted in Zambia (Senegal has only output 3.1 for investments.). In order to secure safe disposals, the section should establish a mechanism throughout the chain of the hazardous chemicals covering from the collection to the final disposal. Transboundary transport of hazardous chemicals may need further safeguards and a tracking system to safely dispose with certainty. Please clarify if wastes

this output deals with include chemicals controlled under the Bamaco Convention. Please provide indicative/potential locations for final disposals if they will be conducted outside the concerned countries. Although Civil Society and other stakeholders are mentioned to oversee the national inventory, some are not listed in the country specific stakeholder engagement plans.

7. Output 3.3: While there are descriptions that PCB-contained products may be used for other purposes due to their economic values, it is not clear how the project address them through financial or regulatory schemes to ensure PCB-contained products will be securely collected with a detailed plan. Please include establishing a safeguard mechanism in this output to ensure the safe and secure transportation, dismantle/treatment, and destruction/disposal of PCBs and their wastes avoiding accidents, leakages and contaminations. Please provide indicative/potential locations for final disposals. Please explain how the project ensures the transport of PCBs and their wastes will be in compliance with the Basel, Bamaco and other conventions and international rules.
8. Output 3.4: (a1) In general costs of producing plastics from wastes are higher than ordinary plastics, on top of costs of collection and transportation. Please describe a financial mechanism to ensure the recycled plastic production will continue after the project. (a2) Collection of recyclable plastics will not be easily achieved without proper waste management system in the concerned countries where separation of waste is not a practice at household and other levels. Therefore, it is important to clarify how the project will identify cities to intervene where some waste management systems already exist. Please explain how the project will improve the existing waste management mechanisms and be aligned with them. (b) Please clarify what kind of concrete investments will be provided for the promotion of alternatives to plastics as the current descriptions seem technical assistance for assessments.
9. Output 3.5: (a) Please clarify indicative targeted mercury products for investigations. (b) For hand-held XRF analyzers, the plan of enforcement of import/export restrictions should be integrated to the plan of provision of such equipment and trainings. Please clarify the linkage with component 1 in this regard. (c) How the project will safely collect, transport, and destruct/dispose mercury-contained products is not clear. The two countries participating in this output are not overlapped with countries participating in the output 3.1 while it is stated that collected mercury-contained products will be stored in interim transfer stations established by output 3.1. It is not clear if hospitals and relevant facilities will be included in the scope which may be a large source of mercury-contained products.

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Jan 8, 2021: CW-EA is not directly linked and there is no funding from it.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Jan 8, 2021: Please use the most relevant baseline projects and scenarios based on the descriptions in the baseline scenario section. Some AfDB projects listed seem not relevant to the project's interventions such as a road project and it is not clear how it would contribute to achieving project objectives. It is not clear if contributions from AfDB projects are co-financing or baseline projects. Co-financing from other organizations are not described. Please complete.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Jan 8, 2021: Yes. However, please see comments on GEBs.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Jan 8, 2021:

Innovation: Noting circular economy approaches are highlighted here, they are not necessarily emphasized or embedded in the entire document except output 3.4 of recycling plastics and using alternatives to plastics. Awareness raising may not fully address the cost issues of recycled plastics. In terms of the direct linkages between national action plans and development financing, it is not clear what linkages exactly this project will make. Please highlight technologies, approaches and mechanisms the project will implement that are currently not available in participating countries. Sustainability: Polluter pay principles and EPR and other mechanisms mentioned in this section are not clearly described in the sections of relevant outputs. Please reconcile these and clarify what mechanisms and embedded systems including knowledge

management will make sure the outcomes and effectiveness of the project will continue after the project interventions and financial support.

Scaling up: While there are some descriptions on scaling up from AFLDC-1, please rather describe how the project will embed mechanisms to scale up the outcomes of the project.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Jan 8, 2021: Yes. However, please add other maps if detailed intervention areas are identified.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Jan 8, 2021: Please ensure that the stakeholders involved in all outputs are included in the stakeholder plan as some key stakeholders are missing from the plan (e.g. countries have output 3.4 do not have organizations relating to municipal waste management). Organizations who co-finance or conduct baseline projects should be included in the stakeholder engagement plan for smooth coordination. Please consider

the inclusion of gender-related CSOs in relation to gender action plan, as appropriate. Please see the comment on the private sector engagement.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Jan 8, 2021: Gender analysis and gender action plan are provided. However, there is no gender-sensitive indicators included (as in a stand-alone framework or in the project results framework).

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Jan 8, 2021: While some engagements with the private sector are described, please briefly describe key engagements with stakeholders relating to component 2 and 3. Engagements with private sector co-financiers are not described.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Jan 8, 2021: There are some missing elements in this section. Please address.

1. COVID-19: The risks and measures should be identified at this stage, from communications to investments. Please provide more detailed analysis based on the

COVID-19 project design and review considerations circulated to GEF Agencies last year.

2. Risks related to climate change may include the increase of energy consumption from transport, recycling and other activities related to chemicals and waste management.

3. Investments related to interim storages may be at risk for leakages. ?Chemical accidents during sampling, transport, storage, or disposal? is categorized as a low risk while the reasoning is not clear. International transportation of hazardous POPs will have another level of risks including tracking them until the final disposal is complete.

4. Alternatives to concerned chemicals or plastics: Switching to alternatives may increase the cost or may cause shortage of supply as indicated in the document. Please consider including the risk with mitigation measures.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Jan 8, 2021: Not at this stage. It is not clear who will be involved in the execution. The ?Part I Project Information? on the portal, which has no names of regional centers, does not match the information contained in this section. The roles of regional centers (and UNITAR) and national executing entities are not clearly defined as well. Please correct information and clarify the roles in the portal and the organizational chart in this section with reasoning.

In terms of coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives, this project can collaborate with other projects including recently approved GEF project ?Phasing out mercury measuring devices in healthcare.? Please explore more for knowledge management and coordination purposes.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response
Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Jan 8, 2021: Knowledge management section is not elaborated from the PIF. For example, how the project will learn from lessons learned of previous projects and experiences including those in other countries should be elaborated. Knowledge management approaches withing participating countries in the project are not well defined, which will impact the overall outcomes of the project. There are few concrete collaborations described with GEF-funded and non-GEF funded projects. Please also add timelines for deliverables of knowledge products.

Agency Response
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 CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Jan 8, 2021: Yes, please see relevant comments in this review sheet in particular relating to Risks.

Agency Response
Monitoring and Evaluation

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Jan 8, 2021: The budgeted M&E plan (both GEF funding and co-financing) is not on the portal or in the Annex I (Monitoring Plan). Please clarify how much will be allocated to AfDB in the implementation of MTR and TE. Please address this.

Agency Response
Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Yes.

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
SY, Jan 8, 2021: Not at this stage. Please add missing annexes B and C. Also please address the below.

1. Please upload the associated project document in accordance with the paragraph 11 of the Project and Program Cycle Policy.
2. Annex of the budget is not attached while there is a budget table in Annex F. The budget table, which may serve as an internal information, does not clarify 1) who administers what budget (including AfDB's budget on M&E if any), 2) PMCs, 3) M&E, among others. Please fully revise the budget table and use the template in accordance with the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy updated in July 2020.

Agency Response
Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SY, Jan 8, 2021: End of project targets do not match the final outcomes of each output. For instance, output 3.2's target of destroying 334 tons of POPs is not listed in the project end target, which is "Re-packaging, removal and destruction of identified pesticides conducted in at least 5 of the 6 countries undertaking this output." Also, such targets related to POPs, uPOPs, and mercury emissions should be linked with expected GEBs. Please revise and adjust such targets while taking into consideration other comments in this review sheet.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SY, Jan 8, 2021: Please see the relevant comment in the review sheet.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SY, Jan 8, 2021: Please see the relevant comment in the review sheet.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Jan 8, 2021: Not at this stage. Please address the comments above.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review	1/8/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations