

Fortifying Infrastructure for Responsible Extinguishments (FIRE)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11110

Countries

Regional (Egypt, Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, South Africa)

Project Name

Fortifying Infrastructure for Responsible Extinguishments (FIRE)

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

4/12/2023

Review completed by PM

5/3/2023

Program Manager

Anil Sookdeo

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

Project Type

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

The project is eligible, however please list the countries that will be part of the project in the project information.

May 15, 2023 - Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments The project countries Egypt, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Kenya and South Africa have now been listed in the project information.

2. Project Summary

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 results?

Secretariat's Comments

Please include in the summary the countries that will be part of the project and include the core indicators and GEB in the summary, including the percentage of the core indicator target that the estimated targets represents.

May 15, 2023 - comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

12/05/2023

Country names have been added as has the following to the project summary. The paragraph has been amended as suggested including the information on the % of GEB estimated targets included in the text as follows: Implementation of phaseout plans will be supported in at least 10 airports across 5 countries resulting in a total reduction of 4,118 tonnes of PFAS contaminated material which is approx. 1.4% of the core indicator target (9). Additionally, the project directly benefits to 10,000 people (11); and five LMEs with reduced pollution (5.2).

Other contextual information has been removed to stay within the 250 word limit.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) 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?

Secretariat's Comments The project activities are clearly defined and a theory of change is presented that builds on the barriers defined in the project,

Agency's Comments Noted with Thanks.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

The project needs to define the relevant gender considerations for the project, and reflect gender equality considerations in the project description and in the relevant components of the project as per GEF Gender Equality Policy .

Knowledge Management: This is an interesting proposal. However, an overall approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has not been adequately provided in the Project Description. While it is briefly stated that "The Knowledge management is an important function because this project will be one of the first major efforts in this thematic area. It is therefore essential that adequate budget be allocated to sharing the gained knowledge and the lessons learned to other relevant stakeholders.", there is no further explanation on KM provided in line with GEF expectations at PIF stage. Component 3 addressed knowledge management and makes brief references to dissemination of guidance notes and lessons learned; but for a \$11.5 million GEF project with \$35 million in co-financing, proposed KM&L deliverables seem rather insubstantial (like a missed opportunity, especially in terms of learning, training awareness-raising, replication and scale-up) and there is also no mention of a communications strategy/plan for the project. Therefore, there is need for more reflection.

The agency is requested to better describe the overall KM&L approach for the project by considering key GEF KM&L expectations at PIF stage as follows:

i. an overview of existing lessons and best practice that inform the project concept, if available

ii. plans to learn from relevant projects, programs, initiatives & evaluations

iii. processes to capture, assess and document info, lessons, best practice & expertise generated during implementation

iv. tools and methods for knowledge exchange, learning & collaboration, including knowledge platforms and websites

v. knowledge outputs to be produced and shared with stakeholders (at community, national and international levels as appropriate)

vi. a discussion on how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project impact and sustainability

vii. plans for strategic communications and outreach

Accordingly, please consider broadening KM&L objectives and deliverables into existing project components (i.e. presenting them in a separate sub-component dedicated to knowledge capture, exchange, capacity development/learning). It should also include a brief description of a Communications Strategy/Plan for outreach, awareness raising and dissemination of project outputs/results. This should be properly reflected in the project's budget.

M&E outputs and Outcomes are missed in Indicative Project Information Table ? please amend

May 15, 2023 - Comments cleared

Agency's Comments

12/05/2023

We are grateful to the reviewer for these constructive and detailed comments. We have addressed them through multiple changes to the Project Description, including the inclusion of a new output under Component 3: ?Output 3.1: Knowledge captured to improve project implementation.? All additions are in red font in PIF. Significant changes include the hiring of a knowledge management expert, the development of a project

webpage, further description on the importance of capturing and utilizing lessons learned, and assurance of the implementation of the Gender Action Plan. For easy reference, the updated component is pasted below having more information:

The Knowledge Management Approach for the project will be closely linked to the monitoring and evaluation function and coordinated by the EA. Knowledge management is an important function because this project will be one of the first major efforts in this thematic area. Thus, lessons learned during implementation will be documented and inform future project phases. In so doing Knowledge Management will contribute to the overall impact and sustainability of project. It is therefore essential that adequate budget be allocated to sharing the gained knowledge and the lessons learned with other relevant stakeholders. These will be propagated at international academic and trade group conferences. Target constituencies include airport owners and operators, firefighters and the chemical industry among others. The outcomes will provide the required information to the Stockholm Convention Secretariat to assess the need of continued use of PFAS in fire-fighting foams. To ensure adequate processes to capture and distribute key information, a Knowledge Management expert will be engaged by the EA.

Output 3.1: Knowledge captured to improve project implementation.

- ? Generate communications and knowledge management plan entailing targeted outreach to stakeholders;
- ? Aggregate lessons learned from previous efforts in a manner amenable to use in the current project;
- ? Develop processes to capture, assess and document information, lessons learned, best practices and expertise generated during implementation;
- ? Assess adherence to Gender Action Plan and report findings to PMU.

Output 3.2: Guidance documents developed in coordination with the BRS Secretariat and ICAO

- ? Assess needs of stakeholders with regard to available guidance and develop list of documents to be developed. Potential documents may include: BAT/BEP on firefighting foams at airports, guidance for procurement officers, instructions for assessment of residual PFAS in foams and equipment, ICAO handbook on phaseouts and a cost benefit analysis;
- ? Document lessons learned during the development and implementation of phaseouts;
- ? Amend guidance documents as necessary for use in non-project countries;
- ? Share guidance documents with stakeholders and adapt based on feedback.

Output 3.3: Lessons learned shared

- ? Share lessons learned and guidance development through UNEP and ICAO networks;
- ? Develop project webpage on appropriate platform such as ICAO website for sharing of guidance documents and lessons learned;
- ? Hold technical workshop in year 4 for non-project countries;
- ? Promote guidance documents and lessons learned at international academic and trade group conferences.

Additionally, reference to the GEF's Gender Equality Policy has been made in the alternative scenario and will be further detailed during the project development in PPG phase.

M&E outcomes and outputs have been added in the project information and at corresponding places.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

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

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes, however the co-financing is lower than expected. Please note that while the BRS Secretariat is listed in the co-financing table the financing amount is blank.

The co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportionate compared with the GEF contribution to PMC, but also the GEF contribution is above the cap of 5% (5.2%). If the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$34,000,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$1,700,000 instead of \$1,500,000 (which is 4.4%). 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.

May 15, 2023 - comments cleared

Agency's Comments

12/05/2023

Indicative co-financing has been increased by USD 9.5 million to USD 45,000,000. This includes an indicative amount of co-financing expected to be met by F3 manufacturers through R&D, attendance to trade conferences, and support with guidance document development. The amount also includes USD 225,000 in support from the BRS Secretariat as well as increased allotments for the Egyptian, Ethiopian, and Nigerian governments. Further, the PPG consultations intends to encourage stakeholders to increase co-finance contributions further.

Contributions by the GEF to the GEF financed subtotal have been adjusted to 4.98 % and those from co-financing have been adjusted to 5.1 % of the co-financed subtotal.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

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?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes, however: Stakeholder Engagement: The project states that it has consulted civil society organizations in project design, it is however unclear from the list provided who these are. Please clarify and elaborate on approach for stakeholder consultations/engagement in project development.

May 15, 2023 - comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

12/05/2023

Niall Ramsden and Ian Ross were co-authors of a key IPEN (NGO) document that informed the development of the concept. Mr. Ramsden also heads a nonprofit industry consortium on fire safety. Samia Galal Saad is a University Professor. However, because both Mr. Ramsden and Dr. Ross are primarily associated with private sector entities, and because Dr. Galal was interviewed in the context of her role as advisor to the government, we have removed the reference to civil society consultation in PIF development. During the detailed project development, series of consultations will be carried out to include various stakeholders including CSOs/NGOs, academia, research organizations, private sector, airport regulatory and management authorities, fire safety groups etc.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

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

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

The core indicator targets are lower than expected. Please indicate if these targets can be enhanced.

May 15, 2023 - Comment cleared

Agency's Comments

12/05/2023

The core indicator targets has been increased in the project information from 2,581 to 4,118 tonnes. Initial indicators were set conservatively to reflect the innovative nature of the project but have been changed in response to this comment. Values will be verified and modified, as needed and efforts will be made to improve targets further during the

PPG phase in consultation with airports, foam producers/suppliers and ICAO to reflect improved baseline data.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?

b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

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

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

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's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

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's Comments

Please provide an indication if the project addresses any of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

May 15, 2023 - comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

12/05/2023

Thanks for the useful recommendation. The following text has been added to the section C of the concept: ?The project will directly contribute to Target 7 (b) of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework by reducing the emissions of highly hazardous chemicals.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 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's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

8.3 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?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes, however the financing from the BRS Secretariat has not been included in the table.

May 15, 2023 - comment cleared

Agency's Comments

12/05/2023

USD 225,000 of indicative co-financing has been allotted to the BRS Secretariat.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country?s(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

Please provide the endorsement letters of Kenya and Egypt.

For the endorsement from Ethiopia, a new OFP letter is needed as the OFP on record at the time of submission is not the OFP that signed the letter.

May 15, 2023 - the Egypt letter is not linked in the portal. Please address and please note that there are internal UNEP emails attached to the LOE in the documents section of the portal.

May 15, 2023 - The letter is now linked along with the email from the Government with the date of submission of the letter. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

12/05/2023

Correct OFP letters for Egypt, Ethiopia and Kenya attached.

15/05/2023

The Egypt LoE is now linked in the portal.

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) 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 to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments The project PIF and PPG are recommended for technical clearance.

Agency's Comments

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	5/3/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/15/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		