

Shifting to Zero Waste Against Pollution (SWAP) Initiative

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11211

Countries

Global (Sierra Leone, Tunisia, T?rkiye, Uruguay)

Project Name

Shifting to Zero Waste Against Pollution (SWAP) Initiative

Agencies

UNDP

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 and fits within the focal area strategy. The submission date is missing from the general project information.

May 16, 2023 - comment cleared

Agency's Comments

Added. Also added information on co-financing in Tunisia for which the identification of the co-financer was missing, as well as new identified co-financing for Sierra Leone.

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

Yes, however please provide in the project summary the expected GEBs along with any relevant sub-indicators. Please express the CI targets both in absolute amounts as well as a percentage of the GEF 8 targets.

May 16, 2023 -comment cleared

Agency's Comments

The detail of the expected GEBs in absolute amounts and percentage of the GEF 8 targets was introduced in Project Summary.

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 objective is not written to be measurable as it is unclear how "promoting integrated chemicals and waste management" would be measured. Suggest revising the objective so that indicators can be set that will enable it to be measured and evaluated.

It is unclear what the role of municipal and city governments will have and how the work at the city level will be scaled nationally. It is also not clear how capacity will be built and how it can be accelerated by way of curriculum changes etc.

While the GEBs under CI 10 are significant, the targets for CI 9 can be improved, particularly looking at how the interventions planned will overall eliminate the use of hazardous chemicals and chemicals of concern.

May 16, 2023 - Comments cleared

Agency's Comments

? The Project Objective has been revised to ?Reduce chemical pollution in the value chain, and wasting of resources, by supporting pilot cities in emerging economies and Least Developed Countries towards a zero-waste vision in line with green chemistry, circular economy, and waste hierarchy principle for sustainable production and consumption?.

? Municipal governments have the authority to implement regulations and policies at local level, such as the regulation with respect to BRS, Minamata convention, conduct the inventory of POPs at city level and clean up the POPs/mercury pollutions. Cities are responsible for reducing pollutants? emissions from the production and waste management process by converting to clean production, as well as the monitoring of pollutants? emissions and waste leakage to the environment in their jurisdiction. Cities play an important role to coordinate stakeholders to build the eco system and partnership to close loops for circular economy.

Local Governments will also work in close coordination with ministries at the national level relevant to the scope of the project. This articulation is ensured through the activity defined under Output A.1 in Component 1, where a steering committee will be established, and suitable coordination mechanisms will be defined to improve cooperation and coordination among local and national key stakeholders and will serve as a mechanism for the exchange, collection, and analysis of information for the development of the Waste Management Plan and the Zero Waste Strategy, as well as working as the informing body for the development of the required policy, legal and regulatory framework under Output A.4 to support zero waste vision.

Scaling up of results to national level will be enhanced through building business models and demonstration activities (Output C2, C3, C4) in the pilot cities as well as making available financial instruments that could be replicated in other cities.

SWAP will facilitate the city-to-city leaning and knowledge exchange at the national level to provide guidance, and work with finance institutions to scale up the best practices. Furthermore, it is relevant to highlight that: i) T?rkiye already has the nationwide zero waste city network and they will facilitate the learning between cities through the SWAP project.; ii) Uruguay is involving the three major cities of its country, Tunisia and Sierra Leone are participating through their capital cities, which represent significant share of economic activities of the country and are of great relevance for the scaling up at the national level.

Through Component 2, the project foresees the development of a Strategy (Output B4) that will analyze the options and define the pathway to ensure the Replication and Scaling Up of results obtained by the project through its different interventions.

Lastly, through the Global Component the establishment of a Zero Waste Platform will contribute for the results? scale-up since it will favour South-South cooperation, exchanges of experiences, knowledge and technologies between urban stakeholders that face comparable challenges within similar socio-economic environments.

? The project through its different Outputs supports the strengthening of skills, knowledge and resources of various groups of stakeholders (government, private sector, CSO, citizens) relevant to the project which aim building their capacity. In particular the following activities can be highlighted: trainings and education programmes; technical assistance (underlining mainly those foreseen within the demonstration activities and pilot projects); networking and collaboration (such as City Twinning and Clearing House); data collection and analysis (Waste Management Plan and Zero Waste Strategy); policy and regulatory support; funding measures and financing mechanisms assessment; engaging in advocacy efforts and public awareness campaigns to promote the importance of sustainable consumption and waste management practices, building support for waste

reduction and recycling initiatives. The project will work with key national universities in each of these 5 countries to introduce zero waste modules within academic curricula.

? Core Indicator 9. Chemicals of global concern and their waste reduced.

Both CI9.6 and CI9.8 targets have been increased by evidencing gradual reduction from the 3rd year of project implementation onwards.

Indicator 9.6

Total 11,410 MT of POPs/Hg containing waste reduced.

Indicator 9.8

Total 954,144 MT of plastic waste avoided.

Further detail was introduced in the PIF.

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Agency's Comments

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

Agency's Comments

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 The project is globally coordinated to ensure communications and knowledge functions serve to enhance better practices. The global coordination will be executed by UNDP except one key activity in the global component is to provide policy and technical advice to five pilot cities through a clearing house which will be operated by a non-profit entity (Avfall Sverige) as a responsible party. and the national level activities will be executed by government executing entities.

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

Yes

Please confirm the CCM benefits and Please increase the GEBs under core indicator 10. For Core Indicator 11. on Direct beneficiaries. The target appears to be quite large. Please review the number to ensure it includes only direct beneficiaries. Pages 24-25 of the GEF-8 Results Measurement Framework Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01) provide examples of what might be counted as direct beneficiary.

May 16, 2023 - comment cleared

Agency's Comments

Core Indicator 6. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated

CCM benefits are confirmed but these benefits will be evidenced in Indicator 6.2 Emissions avoided outside AFOLU Sector ? there was a mistake in our initial submission that recorded it under Indicator 6.1, which has been corrected.

Core Indicator 9. Chemicals of global concern and their waste reduced.

Both CI9.6 and CI9.8 targets have been increased substantially (aligned to previous comment). Details were introduced in the PIF.

Core Indicator 10. Persistent organic pollutants to air reduced.

The target remained unchanged as it was let that there were no margins for increase at this point, from an already relatively high amount of uPOPs reductions to be achieved.

Core Indicator 11. People benefiting from GEF financed investments.

Direct beneficiaries were adjusted as per guidelines.

Target was redefined to 4,902,665 (2,476,271 women; 2,426,394 men)

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, however please provide an indication of which of the Global Biodiversity Framework Targets are relevant to this project.

May 16, 2023 - comment cleared

Agency's Comments

Target 7 and Target 16 of the Global Biodiversity Framework are fully relevant to this project.

Text has been introduced into the revised PIF in the 'alignment with GEF-8 programming strategies and country/regional priorities' section.

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 of which of the Global Biodiversity Framework Targets are relevant to this project.

May 16, 2023 - comment cleared

Agency's Comments

Target 7 and Target 16 of the Global Biodiversity Framework are fully relevant to this project.

Text has been introduced into the revised PIF in the 'alignment with GEF-8 programming strategies and country/regional priorities' section.

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

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

Agency's Comments
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

The project will include activities in China but no Letter of Endorsement has been uploaded in the portal. Please request the agency to include the LoE.

The portal stipulates 5 national agencies as executing entities. Nevertheless, the Letters of endorsement stipulate that the project will be executed by UNDP. If UNDP will be co-executor, then letters of support signed by the OFPs are required.

After adding up the total amounts provided in each of the 4 LoEs (\$21,473,000), the result does not match what is requested by the Agency in the portal (\$26,700,000).

Considering that each participant country presented its LoE with an individual allocation, this information has to be also presented individually in GEF Financing + PPG Tables (as opposed to an aggregated amount). Please amend all tables and LoEs figures need to match. Otherwise, new LoEs indicating the whole amount are required.

May 16, 2023 - comments cleared

Agency's Comments

6.	<i>The project will include activities in China but no Letter of Endorsement has been uploaded in the portal. Please request the agency to include the LoE.</i>	<p>There are 4 participating countries to SWAP at this point (Sierra Leone, Tunisia, Türkiye, Uruguay). The fifth country will be added at the latest during the PPG stage. This will not impact on the GEBs or the total funding of the FSP.</p> <p>This is based on the guidance of the GEF on Project and Programme cycle policy (<i>Annex 1 on LoEs, paragraph 7: For global or regional projects with GEF project-funded activities in countries, all participant countries may not be identified by the time of PIF submission. If, during the preparation phase, a new country is identified, the GEF OFP Letter of Endorsement for the new participant country needs to be submitted by the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval request at the latest.</i>).</p>
----	---	---

7.

The portal stipulates 5 national agencies as executing entities. Nevertheless, the Letters of endorsement stipulate that the project will be executed by UNDP. If UNDP will be co-executor, then letters of support signed by the OFPs are required.

There are 1 global component (DIM by definition, as no activity is attached to one city in particular) and 5 national components.

There will be only one CEO Endorsement document, and this is why direct execution modality was mentioned because of the global overall nature of the SWAP project.

The 4 national components will all be executed following UNDP's National Implementation Modality, i.e. with national level implementing partners these 5 Government entities are listed below:

Uruguay: Ministry of Environment

Turkiye: Ministry of Environment, Urbanisation and Climate Change

Sierra Leone: Sierra Leone EPA

Tunisia: Ministry of Environment

The fifth country will be added at the latest at the PPG phase.

As to letters of support by GEF OFPs regarding execution roles in the project:

- One letter of support, for Uruguay, has already been provided indicating Country Office supported modality (uploaded on the portal) requesting UNDP CO support to the National Implementation Modality.
- The range of execution services is being confirmed by the 3 other UNDP Country Offices and the Implementing partners at the respective national levels. The letters could be provided at the early stage of the PPG phase. This will be the case as well for the 5th country that will be added to the global project at the PPG stage. In case a Government would decide not to issue such letter at the beginning of the PPG phase, the national component in that country would be executed using the full National Implementing Modality.

We understand that this would be in line with the GEF Guidelines on the GEF Project and Programme Cycle Policy, as the 2020 update indicated regarding the OFP LoE's stage in the cycle: it is clarified that implementation/execution arrangements may be specified if the GEF Agency and/or OFP prefer **but are not required at this stage**.

8. After adding up the total amounts provided in each of the 4 LoEs (\$21,473,000), the result does not match what is requested by the Agency in the portal (\$26,700,000).

The total funding is broken down in the following way:

Components	FSP amount	PPG	Total without Fees	Total with fees
Sierra Leone	4,660,000	40,000	4,700,000	5,123,000
Tunisia	4,960,000	40,000	5,000,000	5,450,000
Turkey	4,960,000	40,000	5,000,000	5,450,000
Uruguay	4,960,000	40,000	5,000,000	5,450,000
Fifth country (to be added)	4,960,000	40,000	5,000,000	5,450,000
Global	2,200,000	100,000	2,300,000	2,507,000
Grant Total	26,700,000	300,000	27,000,000	29,430,000

The total funding requested (without fees) is \$27,000,000.

Please note that, in addition to the global component and the 4 countries having submitted LOEs, a 5th country will be added at the PPG stage..

<p>9. <i>Considering that each participant country presented its LoE with an individual allocation, this information has to be also presented individually in GEF Financing + PPG Tables (as opposed to an aggregated amount). Please amend ? all tables and LoEs figures need to match. Otherwise, new LoEs indicating the whole amount are required.</i></p>	<p>The tables entered on the portal have been edited as per the comments, showing the required breakdown.</p>
---	---

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, however please also upload the maps into the main portal template for the project.

May 16, 2023 - comment cleared

Agency's Comments

They have been uploaded (requested to the portal technical support as there was a technical issue).

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 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 If another country is to be added during PPG please ensure that the LoE is included as well as geo-referenced coordinates and other required information.

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

First Review	5/3/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/16/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		