

Reduced risks on human health & the environment through reduction of POPs & U-POPs in Eswatini

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11272

Countries

Eswatini

Project Name

Reduced risks on human health & the environment through reduction of POPs & U-POPs in Eswatini

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

4/12/2023

Review completed by PM

5/17/2023

Program Manager

Ibrahima Sow

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

Project Type

FSP

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

- a) Yes, the project is eligible for funding under the C&W focal area.
- b) Please correct the entry under Region: It should be Africa, not Eswatini

For some reason the submission date does not show up. Please include this and/or let us know if any issues?

Project title in LoE (*Reduced risks on human health & the environment through reduction of POPs & U-POPs in Eswatini*) is different than in Portal's PIF entry (*Reduced risks on human health & the environment through reduction of POPs & U-POPs through ESM of HCW, E-waste and plastic waste*). Please ask modify the title in Portal and include the Title in LoE (note that the title can be modified later on):

Agency's Comments

Since this is a country level project, Eswatini was selected.

The date has been adjusted in the Portal.

Suggested title to keep: ?Reduced risks on human health & the environment through reduction of POPs & U-POPs in Eswatini.?

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, The project will promote an integrated solid waste management and circular economy vision for Eswatini and will focus of the waste stream related to healthcare waste, e-waste and plastic waste.

However, I request the Agency to describe the enforcement strategies that would be in place to make sure that the revised and upgraded regulatory framework and guidelines related to solid waste management, hazardous chemicals, healthcare waste, circular economy and EPR scheme will deliver tangible results.

Agency's Comments

An output on enforcement strategies was added to the Indicative Project Overview (output 1.4).

The output was also added under component 1.

A section on enforcement strategies was added as **Annex G** to the Library under Roadmap.

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

a) Yes

b) Please add an output related to enforcement strategies as suggested in section 2.

Output 4.5: please elaborate a bit on the centralised technologies for HCW technologies that will be established. What types of technologies are at stake? What are the comparative advantages compared to the in-situ treatment which appears to be more appropriate in terms of potential infection risks.

Agency's Comments

Output was added to the **Indicative Project Overview**; Output 1.4: Enforcement strategies for implementation of updated regulatory framework, on page 3. Added the same under Component 1: Output 1.4 on page 21. Added section on enforcement strategies as Annex 3 on page 39.

Output 4.5: A section on centralized technologies for HCW has been developed and added under Outcome 4;

In Eswatini, the availability of utilities like water and electricity and safe transportation can be challenging in some areas. In such a situation, a combination of centralized and de-centralized disposal of healthcare waste would provide the safest and most reliable solution. Generally, larger-scale disposal technologies are more efficient, have a reduced environmental impact, and a lower treatment cost compared to small-scale disposal technologies. Additionally, staff at centralized facilities are more skilled in waste treatment as they are dedicated to the task full time. Therefore, healthcare facilities connected to a centralized facility through a reliable transportation system would achieve savings and more safety by relying on a centralized system.

However, small-scale de-centralized systems at the level of healthcare facilities may still be necessary for several reasons. For example, to ensure the disinfection of healthcare waste when their transportation cannot be arranged timely, to provide healthcare waste treatment for very small-scale clinics located in the area, or to ensure the immediate treatment of highly infectious waste. The project aims to establish a self-regulating network of technologies of different capacity and scope to ensure the prompt and safe treatment of the generated healthcare waste in any condition.

Regarding treatment technologies, small-scale equipment established at healthcare facility level would generally include a small autoclave or microwave technology supplemented by a shredder. On the other hand, a centralized facility could host a range of technologies, including larger steam-high-pressure autoclaving, safe storage, and specific treatment processes for different kinds of liquid waste, pharmaceutical waste, safe storage for radioactive waste, and mercury waste pending their shipment to the final storage site. However, the project will not support the establishment of incinerator, plasma, or pyrolytic plants due to the lack of monitoring capacity for U-POPs (PCDD/F) in the country. Additionally, the investment needed for a medium-scale incinerator compliant with the Stockholm convention BAT/BEP guidelines is too high to be supported with project resources.

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

Secretariat's Comments

On Gender please integrate gender equality considerations in Component 4, Outcome and Outputs on knowledge products, platforms and dissemination/outreach.

On Knowledge Management : An overall approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been provided in the Project Description. Proposal includes KM&L deliverables that enable and enhance generation and access to knowledge and information through a knowledge hub, project website, training events, awareness raising activities and various knowledge products including reports and multimedia materials. However, there is no reference to an overall Communication Strategy/Plan. Thus, the agency is requested to provide a brief description of the project's Communications Strategy/Plan for outreach, awareness raising and dissemination of outputs/results

Agency's Comments

The following text has been added under Component 4 of the project:

Under this component, specific care will be dedicated to ensure that the current gender disparities in Eswatini, of which the most relevant to this project are:

- ? laws affecting women's decisions to work and women's pay,
- ? laws affecting women's work after having children,
- ? constraints on women starting and running a business, are at least partially addressed.

As the project has specifically reserved some job opportunities to women, (under Output 3.2. Women entrepreneurship in the sector of circular economy promoted and Output 4.1. Women access to jobs and women entrepreneurship in the HCW sector ensured) under component 4 the information on how to access such opportunities will be provided and disseminated. Component 4 will also include sections related to the specific risk for women and children associated to exposure to POPs and U-POPs, safety at work with specific reference to waste management topics, and the role of women in the development of the country Circular Economy.

Knowledge management: A Communication Strategy and Plan will be developed during PPG stage to ensure that there is targeted communication with key stakeholders ? the strategy will be supported by a stakeholder engagement plan that will ensure that the target audience is well defined. The plan will identify actions that need to be taken to ensure there is strategic outreach, awareness raising and dissemination of the project results.

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 No funds from the co-financing portion have been reserved for the PMC. 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 so the approximately \$1,577,000 USD (from co-financing) should be reserved to the PMC. As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion. A more definitive estimation of PMC will be presented and adjusted at CEO Endorsement stage.

Agency's Comments

The funds for co-financing of PMC have been updated in the Indicative Project Overview.

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

a) The ToC has been adequately designed

b) Yes, key outputs of each component have been well defined

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 This section needs to be developed.

Agency's Comments

As this section was not part of the template, it has been developed and added as Annex H to the Library under Roadmap.

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

a) On the executing agency: the LoE stipulates that the Environment Authority and the Ministry of Health will execute the project. The portal mentions the Ministry of Tourism. Please the Portal entry to match the executing partner in LoE (this can be modified later on).

c) The section "Coordination and Cooperations with ongoing initiatives and projects" is completely blank ? please complete:

Agency's Comments

a. Corrected as requested.

c. Indeed the coordination with ongoing project is already reported under the section 'Baseline projects', where a list of ongoing projects and the reason and modality for coordination is detailed. As requested, a summary of such information has been reported under the section 'Coordination and Cooperations with ongoing initiatives and projects'

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

On core indicators : The title of project is 'Reduced risks on human health? Please consider including a target for core indicator 11 as it looks like some people will be benefiting from GEF-financed investments directly.

b) Yes

17 May 2023

•Core Indicator 11. This indicator covers only Direct beneficiaries, not indirect ones, as per the definition available in pages 25-26 of the GEF-8 Results Measurement Framework Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01). Please exclude any indirect beneficiaries. Upon the comment, the agency has revised the target from zero to 1.2 million beneficiaries which seems large. Please note the focus on 'direct' beneficiaries is precisely to avoid encompassing the whole population of a given area in the context of policy support. Please revisit this target and ensure it covers only direct beneficiaries. The agency explanation does not confirm this.

Agency's Comments

Indicator 11 has been added. In response to the comment, Indicator 11 has now been changed to include direct beneficiaries only. the direct beneficiaries are 600 people of which 300 women. 500 people will benefit directly through trainings (50% of which women), 100 people will benefit directly from job creation (50% of which women).

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

Secretariat's Comments NA

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, the project is well aligned with CW2

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

The project is well aligned with the country priorities as described in the project rationale

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 NA

Agency's Comments

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 (On Stakeholder engagement): It is very well noted that the project has provided a list of stakeholders consulted during project design, including civil society organizations. It would be good if Agency more clearly could describe its approach to consult with these stakeholders further during project development and as part of its plans to develop a Stakeholder Engagement Plan before CEO Endorsement in the Project Description (Section B).

Agency's Comments

A few sentences have been added;
The stakeholders consulted during PIF development are reported in the list provided under section ?Stakeholder Engagement?. The stakeholders will be further engaged during PPG stage through stakeholder workshops to ensure that their inputs are considered in the development of the project document and the Stakeholder Engagement Plan. A stakeholder mapping exercise will be conducted as part of the stakeholder engagement strategy to ensure that the list of stakeholders is comprehensive and updated.

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 NA

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments NA

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 Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

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

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 NA

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

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

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

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 NA

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments

2 May 2023. The project is not ready yet for clearance..

Please address the comments

17 May 2023

Please address the last comment on core indicator 11

18 May 2023: All comments addressed. the PIF is 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

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	5/2/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/17/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/18/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		