

# Reduction of unintentionally-produced persistent organic pollutants and mercury through an environmentally-sound approach on health care wastes management in the Philippines with a special focus on the pandemic

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10798

**Countries**

Philippines

**Project Name**

Reduction of unintentionally-produced persistent organic pollutants and mercury through an environmentally-sound approach on health care wastes management in the Philippines with a special focus on the pandemic

**Agencies**

UNIDO

**Date received by PM**

6/10/2022

**Review completed by PM**

9/22/2022

**Program Manager**

Yuki Shiga

**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

2022.8.24:

Cleared.

2022.8.11:

Table A is missing focal area outcomes.

Agency Response

2022.8.16

Focal area outcomes have been duly filled out.

**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

2022.8.24:

Cleared.

2022.8.11:

There is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. Please amend or provide justification.

Agency Response

2022.8.11

The co-financing contributions have been re-assessed and co-financing for PMC has been duly increased to required proportionality.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

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

2022.8.4:

Cleared.

2022.7.1:

- In kind? is typically ?recurrent expenditure?. Please further provide an explanation to why the in-kind contribution from some private sector co-financiers are indicated as

investment mobilized and not recurrent expenditure (e.g., Integrated Waste Management Inc.).

- There is no proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC in Table B.
- While significant increase in co-financing is welcome (\$33 million at PIF to \$72 million), outcomes and expected results in indicators remain more or less at the PIF level. Please further elaborate on why increase in co-financing is not resulting in more outcomes.

#### Agency Response

19.07.2022

- i) Elements of the co-financing have been revisited and revised, as appropriate.
- ii) Co-financing commitment received has been re-evaluated and co-financing figures were adjusted.
- iii) The increase in the co-financing mainly came from the private sector partners which are mainly based in the regions to be assisted by the project. The outcomes of the project essentially remained the same as they respond to the objectives set. However, the targets in each of the outcomes have been re-aligned and expanded to reflect the increase in the co-financing commitment. These are envisaged to result to: (i) expansion of the coverage of the interventions to include more regions requiring assistance; (ii) increase in the number of main beneficiary institutions (a total of 10 facilities will benefit from project interventions from only 2 envisaged in the PIF ); (iii) better aligned outputs (in terms of technical assistance which is not limited to equipment donation but enhancement of current technology being used (assessment of equipment donated by WHO in Tacloban, upgrade of SLFs and curtailment of the septic vault system for M501 wastes as mandated by DOH) and; (iv) higher volume of M501 wastes that can be facilitated for treatment.

#### 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 Yes.

#### 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 Yes.

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 Yes.

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

2022.8.4:

Cleared.

Please also elaborate on root causes.

Agency Response

19.07.2022

Section A have been revised to fully elaborate root causes and barriers of the global environmental problems to be addressed by the project.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

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

2022.8.4:

Cleared.

2022.7.1.:

- The CEOER indicates that it will cover ?Technology Transfer/Innovative Low-Carbon Technologies? sector. However, this is unclear in the alternative scenario.
- Output 1.1.6: Supporting startups seems to be very effective and interesting approach. Please further elaborate on how this is planned and is expected to contribute to the Outputs and Outcomes of the projects.
- Outcomes 1.2 and 2.2.: Please further provide explanation and information on possible technologies taken up under each Outcome and associated Outputs.

Recommended action: Please consider the above point(s).

Agency Response

19.07.2022

i) The detailed technology transfer/low-carbon technology being proposed is mentioned under para 75, where it is explained that the project intends to do, among others:

- ? Assess existing TSD facilities in terms of procedures and technologies being adopted and the potential need for upgrading in order to become BAT/ BEP compliant;
- ? Demonstration of safe technologies for the sterilization of healthcare wastes after use, so that these can be stored for longer time pending their disposal.
- ? This could potentially avoid a significant release of U-POPs (PCDD/F). Potential technologies to be adopted in this regard will be small scale and low cost.

In the description of Output 1.2.2 (Output 1.2.2 Low or zero emission technologies for the pre-treatment and disposal of wastes generated during pandemic, implemented in a cluster of healthcare facilities and TSDs), para 99, the low-carbon technologies being proposed include steam or dry autoclave or microwave disinfection. A brief description of the technologies to be deployed is also provided in this section.

ii) The project proponents also recognize the importance of supporting MSMEs which will be done under both Outputs 1.1.5 and 1.1.6. Outputs 1.1.5 focuses on the provision support to PPE makers, while Output 1.1.6 is open to all kind of enterprises operating in

the field of Health Care Waste and related equipment, and is more intended to provide assistance in identifying financial opportunities and providing technical assistance on the development of proposals and loan applications.

Concerning output 1.1.5, as the demand of face mask soared with the onset of pandemic, and very likely will remain high even after the pandemic ends, it is intended to identify technical alternatives from a life-cycle and circular perspective to ensure that such PPE are made in a sustainable way, made in such a way that they can be reused after a disinfection procedure, and that they can be easily recycled as material if properly collected and treated. This is already described clearly under Output 1.1.6. This output intends to eliminate a significant amount of such PPE from the waste streams by pursuing a more circular approach in their manufacturing, use and recycling.

For Output 1.1.6, after several stakeholder consultations, it is clear that one of the main issues of Green Financing is, indeed, not the availability of funds, but the complexity of the procedures and capability of small and micro enterprises to apply. Such enterprises may lack financial and technical resources to embark in the development of the documentary requirements and to provide the financial guarantees required. Therefore, the project will dedicate resources to assist enterprises in the preparation and submission of project, activities, or equipment which may sustain a more circular approach as well a environmentally sound approach in the management of healthcare waste. The project will use co-financing and GEF grant to mobilize national and international experts with the purpose not only to assist in the preparation and submission of dossier, but also in the actual improvement and development of the projects seeking for financial support. In this sense, bringing and improving such initiatives and leading them from the design stage to implementation will obviously have an impact on the main project goals in terms of safer and more circular management of healthcare waste and reduction of U-POPs and mercury releases. This tangential benefit has been, conservatively, not considered in the development of core indicators.

iii) An elaborated description of technologies which maybe deployed under the projects are provided in para 99 and 115.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, CW-1-1 in Table A is aligned with GEFTF Programming Direction.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

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

Yes.

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

2022.8.2:

Cleared.

2022.7.1:

Please consider including startup support under innovativeness, sustainability and/or scaling up. Please refer to the earlier comment under Section II-3.

Agency Response

19.07.2022

Support to MSMEs guarantees the sustainability of the project outputs. This is reflected in para 142.

**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

Yes.



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  
N/A

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  
Yes.

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  
Yes.

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

Yes.

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

Yes.

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

Yes.

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

Yes.

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

Yes.

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

Yes.

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

2022.10.10:

Cleared.

2022.9.29:

Annex E:

Thank you for providing more detailed information on each activity but still some issues need to be addressed:

- o We don't see lines 67,68 and 69 in the provided table - please review and include in the budget where these expenses should be charged to.
- o There is a budget line namely 'Sundries' for \$9,100 with no explanation. Please explain what 'Sundries' entails (as it is, unspecified sundries it cannot be covered by GEF resources).
- o With the current format it is not possible to understand what type of activities / expenditures have been charged to PMC, Project Components and M&E, reason why one cannot assess the reasonability of charging those expenses to the above mentioned sources. For example: in the budget line 'National Experts?', despite the explanations provided in the notes, it is impossible to understand what portion of which consultant was charged to the project components, which portion was charged to M&E and which portion was charged to PMC. Please provide the information in the way one can assess the reasonability of charging activities / expenditures to the different sources (GEF PPO has extensively discussed this with the Agency). GEFID 10543 could be another example/reference.

Please attach a project budget table.

Below is a summary of the budget table. For more information on the budget, calculation of expenses, cost distribution of PMC, etc. please refer to the uploaded Annex E.

Expenditure category	Detailed description *	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	Component 4	Subtotal (Component 1-4)	M&E	PMC	Total (Subtotal + PMC)
International Consultants	1, 5, 8, 13, 17, 21, 25, 28, 34, 37, 42, 45, 49, 53, 57, 61	227,400	81,000	45,000	50,400	403,800	50,400	0	403,800
National Experts	2, 6, 9, 14, 22, 26, 29, 35, 38, 43, 50, 54, 58, 62	224,000	192,000	66,800	69,600	552,400	69,600	202,400	754,800
Subcontracts	10, 13, 30, 39, 46, 51, 55, 59, 66	293,150	618,000	270,000	0	1,181,150	0	0	1,181,150
Travels	3, 7, 11, 15, 18, 24, 27, 31, 36, 40, 44, 47, 52, 56, 60, 63	135,250	111,600	58,800	33,400	339,050	33,400	10,000	349,050
Sundries		0	0	0	0	0	0	9,100	9,100
Equipment	18, 32, 48, 64	1,585,200	500,000	0	8,000	2,093,200	8,000	3,000	2,098,200
Workshop/Training	4, 12, 16, 20, 33, 41, 65	23,550	4,600	37,900	14,350	80,400	14,350	3,500	83,900
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>2,488,550</b>	<b>1,507,200</b>	<b>478,500</b>	<b>175,750</b>	<b>4,650,000</b>	<b>175,750</b>	<b>230,000</b>	<b>4,880,000</b>

Budget notes

1	2 International consultants providing expertise and sharing knowledge on international policies and regulation on health care waste for a total number of 8 working days at 600 USD/day. 1 International consultant providing technical assistance and expertise on regulation for the prevention of U-POPs and mercury from healthcare waste management for a total of 10 working days at 250 USD/day.
67	52 National Travels estimated each as one round flight at 200 usd plus one day accommodation at 250 USD/day. 3 International Travels estimated as one round flight at 2500 usd plus 10 days with a DSA of 250 USD/day for each travel package
68	Inception workshop expenses for an overall amount of 9750 USD. Two small workshops for the presentation of the results of the mid term review and terminal evaluation for an overall amount of 4600 USD
69	Contractual services for implementation partner, including salary cost for project management staff, supplies, travel, insurance financial institution arrangement and sundries as detailed

2022.9.20:

Annexes A and B: some outputs/outcomes are off the margins. Please adjust.

Output 1.1.2 Inventory procedures and guidelines for the calculation of additional waste generated during pandemic, with special reference to the current COVID-19 pandemic established.

Outcome 1.2. Environmentally-sound technology for the collection, treatment and recycling of wastes generated during pandemic implemented.

## Annex B: Response to Project Reviews

(from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion, and responses to comments from the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

### A. GEF Secretariat Comments at PIF/Work Inclusion

Comments	Response
Please take into consideration the comments for the preparation for CEOER in above boxes and the below.  1. GEBs: Please further improve the estimation of all indicators under 9 and 10, including avoided mercury emissions (flow) by this project and u-POPs emissions reduction in terms of percentage of waste reduction during the period of each intervention.	A detailed discussion of the project's GEB is presented in Section F of the project document.  The estimate, updated to January 2022, consider the waste generation from ordinary beds and from COVID-19 beds. Estimates of UPOPs reduction were also based on direct (pilot facilities) and indirect contribution of project activities.  The project will strongly support proper management of HCW and mercury waste through waste prevention, segregation, and non-burning pre-treatment. Also, limited intervention in landfills, to increase safety and prevent deliberate or accidental open burning, is envisaged. These are seen as main contributory to UPOPs and mercury reduction.  The estimates did not include the reduction of U-POPs and mercury from the stack of existing pre-treatment facilities as the main way to achieve GEBs considering that HCW incinerators are not available as a disposal option in the Philippines.
2. Component 1: Please elaborate what measures to be placed to prevent unnecessary disinfection with chlorine-based disinfectant and improper management of waste in the two locations and beyond with more accurate estimated reduction of u-POPs	The indiscriminate use of disinfectant on healthcare waste is seen as one of the alarming issues on this sector. As there are very few references on this subject, the project aims to provide practical studies and guidelines on the use of disinfectants on HCW.

2022.8.30:

Annex E: The budget table has the same budget line structure throughout all the components including M&E and PMC: (a) International consultants; (b) National Experts; (c) Subcontracts; (d) Travel; (e) Sundries; (f) equipment; (g) Workshop/Training. The lack of detail prevents any type of analysis to assess whether or not the project's activities are reasonably charged to the three different sources (project's components, M&E and PMC). Please provide the details that would allow a proper analysis of the budget. If necessary, please refer to other recent projects such as 10827 and 10681.

2022.8.11:

Please include them in the right Annexes A, B and E in Portal (not only as attached).

2022.7.1:

Annex B: Response to project reviews is incomplete. For example, response to comments to several Council Members and STAP seem to be missing.

## Agency Response

2022.10.8

The format of the budget table has been revised once again and now follows the suggested sample of GEF ID 10543. The portal entry is kept on Component/Outcome level, as the entire table was not legible. It is however uploaded as an annex in excel format. An explanation for what falls under sundries has also been included.

2022.9.22:

Annexes A and B have been reintroduced and adjusted to fit the margins of the respective section when extracted as PDF.

2022.9.20:

As done for recently approved projects, the format of the budget table has been revised to present information on component level, M&E and PMC in columns, instead of the yearly distribution. Furthermore, additional information on the expenditure categories was provided in the respective textbox. Unfortunately, the Portal does not seem to support a larger table, so a summary has been introduced within the CEO document.

For more information on the budget, calculation of expenses, cost distribution of PMC, etc. please refer to the uploaded Annex E.

*Unrelated remark - apologies for the delay in our response. Due to technical reasons, UNIDO had no access to the portal for weeks.*

2022.8.16

Annexes A, B and E have been duly incorporated in the project document. The same are also included as attachments.

19.07.2022

Annex B has been revised to complete the responses to project reviews. UNIDO would like to thank the Council Members - USA, Norway, Denmark, Germany and Canada - and the STAP for their support to the project and for the inputs made which further strengthened the CEO endorsement document.

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2022.8.4:

Cleared.

2022.7.1:

Annex B: Response to project reviews is incomplete. For example, response to comments to several Council Members and STAP seem to be missing.

Agency Response

19.07.2022

Annex B has been revised to complete the responses to project reviews. UNIDO would like to thank the Council Members and STAP for their support to the project and for the inputs made which further strengthened the CEO endorsement document.

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2022.8.4:

Cleared.

2022.7.1:

Annex B: Response to project reviews is incomplete. For example, response to comments to several Council Members and STAP seem to be missing.

Agency Response

19.07.2022

Annex B has been revised to complete the responses to project reviews. UNIDO would like to thank the Council Members and STAP for their support to the project and for the inputs made which further strengthened the CEO endorsement document

**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 Yes.

Agency Response

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

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

2022.10.10:

This CEOER is recommended for technical clearance.

2022.9.29 /2022.9.20 /2022.8.30 /2022.8.11 /2022.7.1:

Not yet. Please refer to the review items and resubmit for consideration (please highlight the change).

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>7/1/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>8/4/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>8/11/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>8/24/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>8/30/2022</b>	

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**