

Reduction of UPOPs through Waste Management in a Circular Economy

Basic Information

GEF ID

10803

Countries

Lebanon

Project Title

Reduction of UPOPs through Waste Management in a Circular Economy

GEF Agency(ies)

World Bank

Agency ID

World Bank: P172770

GEF Focal Area(s)

Chemicals and Waste

Program Manager

Evelyn Swain

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, this project is in line with the GEF-7 CW programming directions.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The project outcomes are not shown in Table B, rather they are listed above the table. Can the outcomes be added to the table?

Component 4 does not include any GEF funding, is this correct?

This project is now well designed and will compliment World Bank lending in the country. The project takes a circular economy approach that includes upstream aspects such as green chemistry, extended producer responsibility, and green procurement. Downstream aspects are also included such as the 3Rs approach so that the entire lifecycle of waste will be addressed.

ES, 4/21/21: Component 4 has been deleted.

Agency Response

4/19/2021

Project outcomes information is updated. However, Table B in the GEF portal on the Bank side does not have a column to add outcomes. Therefore we listed outcomes in the space dedicated for outcomes above table B. It seems that is rather how it is designed in the GEF portal - see below the screenshot how it shows on our side:

B. INDICATIVE PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY ⓘ

Project Objective

Project Objective: to assist Lebanon in avoiding and reducing unintentionally produced persistent organic pollutants through promoting circular economy and improving open dumpsites in the waste sector.

Project Outcomes

1.1 Key regulatory and economic instruments (green chemistry, EPR and green public procurement) and product standards supporting circular economy transition developed or adopted by MOE

1.2 2017 National Implementation Plan updated in compliance with Article 7 of the Stockholm Convention

Project Component	Component Type	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Co-Financing(\$)
-------------------	----------------	------------	---------------------------	------------------

Component 1: Strengthen Regulatory Framework and	Technical Assistance	GET	3,023,602.00	4,000,000.00
--	----------------------	-----	--------------	--------------

Component 4 is removed from Table B - this is a Project Management or PMC, which is reflected in the PCN and PID as a separate component.

Co-financing

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, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes, co-financing is robust and includes WB lending through the "National Comprehensive Environmental Management Program" and may also include additional lending from the ProClean Trust Fund once it is launched later in 2021.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes, table D is fine.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes this is in line with the CW allocation.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Rationale for an increased PPG has been provided.

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Core indicator 10 includes 20,502,014 gTEQ. This number is far too high. It also differs from the PCN document which says 20 gTEQ. Please correct core indicator 10.

The PCN indicates that there will be climate benefits from this project. Is it possible to estimate the climate benefits in Table F Indicator 6?

The explanation on how targets are calculated is missing. Please add this information after table F.

ES, 4/21/21: these comments have been addressed.

Agency Response

4/19/21

Core indicator 10 amount is corrected.

Climate benefits: To be estimated during project preparation once the participating governorates and open dumpsites are identified and accounted/recorded during project implementation through project progress reporting and completion reporting. CO2 target number will be included at the time of project endorsement.

Explanation on indicator 10 calculation is included after table F

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Key words are tagged. There is no Table G in the GEF portal.

Agency Response

4/11/2021

Table G is reflected in the taxonomy in Part I of the GEF portal entry. We also attach the taxonomy annex as a separate document in the GEF portal

art II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, the problem and root causes is clear.

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The this project should also coordinate with the GEF funded MedProgram in the country.

ES, 4/21/21: the comment has been addressed.

Agency Response

4/19/21

Thank you. This was mentioned in both PCN and PID, para 21

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, this is well described.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, this project is aligned with the CW focal area.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, incremental reasoning is well described

Yes, incremental reasoning is well described.

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The GEBs need to be checked in core indicator 10 and CCM GEBs should be articulated. Information on how GEBs are calculated is also needed.

ES, 4/21/21- this comment has been addressed.

Agency Response

4/19/21

Core indicator 10 amount is corrected.

Climate benefits: To be estimated during project preparation once the participating governorates and open dumpsites are identified and accounted/recorded during project implementation through project progress reporting and completion reporting. CO2 target number will be included at the time of project endorsement.

Explanation on indicator 10 calculation is included after table F

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, this project takes an innovating circular economy approach. The associated WB lending will ensure sustainability and scale.

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, information is included on CSO, private sector, and other stakeholder engagement.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The document makes it clear that a full gender assessment will be conducted during PPG phase, however we would expect some information on gender aspects would be provided at PIF stage. Please provide some gender context.

ES, 4/21/21: this comment has been addressed.

Agency Response

4/19/21

thank you. Information on gender aspects (situation in the country, issues) is added in the online template and project documents (para 38).

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes the private sector is a key payer in this project.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, risks including governance and climate risks are assessed.

Agency Response

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes. This project will be executed by the Ministry of Environment. The project should be coordinated with the GEF funded MedProgram and the WB lending in the country.

ES, 4/21/21: this comment has been addressed.

Agency Response

4/19/21

Thank you. Information on coordination is added in the project documents (paras 21 and 29 of the PCN and PID)

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, this project is in line with the country's NIP under the Stockholm Convention.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, there are KM components.

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) 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 in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

4/20/2021

Response to GEF PPO comments:

1. Amount was reduced, the issue with the PPG is resolved and justification is provided per GEF PPO advice
2. Cofinancing PMC amount was increased to \$2.8M to address this comment.

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Not at this time. Some issues need to be addressed.

Comments from PPO:

1. Amount requested in Portal for GEF Financing is higher than the allocated amount in the LoE – please ask the Agency

either reduce the amount in Portal or request a new LoE with the same amount as requested in Portal.

2. On the PMC Proportionality: there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 4.9%, for a co-financing of \$61,000,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$2,989,000 instead of

\$1,000,000 (which is 1.6%). 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 ask the Agency to 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.

ES, 4/21/21: All issues have been addressed. PIF and PPG are recommended for technical clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/8/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/21/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

This project aims to assist Lebanon in avoiding and reducing unintentionally produced persistent organic pollutants (UPOPs) through promoting circular economy and improving open dumpsites in the waste sector. This project will work along the entire lifecycle of waste, including upstream efforts like green chemistry, extended producer responsibility, green procurement, and product standards. It will also address downstream aspects of waste including reuse and recycling. The GEF funding will be accompanied by a World Bank lending package for Lebanon and the project will also coordinate with the EBRD/UNEP MedProgram. The World Bank Loans and MedProgram together with this project will address sustainable chemicals and waste management in the country. Best available techniques and best available practice will be demonstrated in two or three open dumpsites. The project will lead to global environmental benefits including reduction of 20 gTEQ UPOPs emissions.