



Global Electronics Management (GEM) Program

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11553

Countries

Global (Philippines, Türkiye, Peru, Cambodia, Colombia, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Somalia, Kazakhstan, Viet Nam, Botswana, Eswatini, Lesotho, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa)

Project Name

Global Electronics Management (GEM) Program

Agencies

UNIDO, AfDB, UNDP, UNEP

Date received by PM

3/20/2024

Review completed by PM

4/9/2024

Program Manager

Anil Sookdeo

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

Project Type

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET**1. General Program Information**

a) Is the Program Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat's Comments

Please specify the countries in the Africa in the list of countries. Please provide a justification for the Government of Kazakhstan not being identified as the executing agency for the Kazakhstan child project. Please separate into individual rows the executing agencies for the AfDB child projects as three are grouped together.

04/18/2024- Comment Cleared. On a non-state executing agency for Kazakhstan, and considering the approval of the OFP, at CEO endorsement please present a clear plan for ensuring capacity on working in this sector is transferred to all relevant State entities.

Agency's Comments

17.04.2024

1. African countries participating in the Regional Horn of Africa (Hoa) and Southern African Development Community (SADC) have been specified.
2. The Kazakhstan Government has endorsed the proposal of having the Cooperation for Sustainable Development of the Republic of Kazakhstan Center (CSD Center) as executing agency (EA) of its child project based on the Center's experience of working with UNEP on electronics and plastic waste management projects in the past. In addition, the CSD Centre has demonstrated significant and long standing experience of working with other international organizations such as UNDP, UNITAR, FAO, ITU, GIZ, EU etc. Therefore, it is assessed that the EA has the capacity to carry out the project execution in the country. A HACT assessment will be undertaken as part of the PPG phase to further ascertain its execution capacity.
3. Executing agencies for the AfDB child projects have been individually listed.

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

2. Program Summary

- a) Does the program summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the program objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?
- b) Is the program's geographical coverage explicit, as well as the covered sectors? Does the summary explain how the program is transformative or innovative?

Secretariat's Comments Well defined program summary has been presented containing the key elements and impacts of the program.

Agency's Comments

3 Indicative Program Overview

- a) Is the program objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
- b) Are the components and outcomes sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the program objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the program components and appropriately funded?
- d) Are the GEF program Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 5%? If above 5%, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat's Comments The program overview is well defined and clearly articulated.

Agency's Comments

4 Program Outline

A. Program Rationale

- a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the program design?
- b) Has the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other program outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?
- c) Is the baseline situation and baseline projects and initiatives well laid out and how the program will build on these?
- d) Have lessons learned from previous efforts been considered in the program design?

e) For NGI, is there a brief description of the financial barriers and how the program ? and the proposed financial structure- responds to these financial barriers.

Secretariat's Comments The program rationale is clear and convincing.

Agency's Comments

5 B. Program Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the program logic, including how the program design elements are contributing to the objective, a set of identified key causal pathways, the thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust solution and listing the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences?

c) Are the program components described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the program approach has been selected over other potential options?

d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Have the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline programs been described? Is the program incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)?

e) Are the relevant levers of transformation identified and described?

f) Is there an adequate description on how relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) will contribute to the design and implementation of the program and its components?

g) Gender: Does the description on gender issues identify any differences, gaps or opportunities linked to program objectives and have these been taken up in component description/s?

h) Are the proposed elements to capture, exchange and disseminate knowledge and lessons learned adequate in order to benefit future programs? Are efforts for strategic communication adequately described?

i) Policy Coherence: How will the program support participating countries to improve, develop and align policies, regulations or subsidies to not counteract the intended program outcomes?

Secretariat's Comments

The program is very clearly defined and articulated and the roles of stakeholders and gender are clearly described into each component of the program. Further a clear description of the role of the global project in supporting and amplifying the child projects have been provided in each component.

On gender: In Outcomes 1.1 and 1.2, please ensure that the strategies and regulations developed are gender-responsive. As a good gender mainstreaming practice, please include in the Indicative Project Overview table, relevant gender equality considerations included in the component descriptions. Under M&E, please ensure that gender-related results are monitored and reported on, and a Gender Action Plan developed.

04/18/2024 - Comment Cleared.

Agency's Comments

17.04.2024

1. UNIDO is cognizant of the importance of gender mainstreaming in and gender responsiveness of the program. The program proponents has engaged the UNIDO Gender Unit to ensure that all program components reflect gender-related actions. Thus, for Outcomes 1.1. and 1.2, the narrative under the outcomes shows clearly that strategies, polices and regulations to be developed will be gender responsive.

Under Component 4 a new paragraph is added to ensure that a gender action plan is developed. To quote: *"A program-level gender action plan will be developed during the PPG to ensure that gender responsive activities are identified and appropriately executed during the program implementation. This action plan will be communicated to each child project to ensure harmonization of actions to achieve the program targets."*

2. The M&E Section para 79 has been further strengthened to clearly include gender and environmental and social safeguards monitoring and their specific indicators and results monitored and reported.

5.2 Program coherence and consistency

a) How will the program design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and allow for adaptive management needs and options?

b) Is the potential for achieving transformative change through the integrated approach adequately described? How is the program going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

c) Are the countries or themes selected as child projects under the program appropriate for achieving the overall program objective?

d) Are the descriptions of child projects adequately reflective of the program objective and priorities as described in the ToC?

e) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate to meet the program objectives?

Secretariat's Comments

There is a clear alignment of country priorities with the programmatic approach and the design is aimed towards broader scalability in the wider electronics sector, particularly through work with equipment producers and government regulators. The financing is adequate to meet the objectives however in the finance tables please separate into individual rows each participating country in Africa.

04/18/2024 - Comment cleared

Agency's Comments

17.04.2024

Country rows have been separated.

5.3 Program Governance, Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Programs

a) Are the program level institutional arrangements for governance and coordination, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has a program level organogram / diagram been included, with description of roles and responsibilities, and decision-making processes?

b) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed initiatives, projects/programs (such as government, private sector and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the program area, e.g.).

Secretariat's Comments

There is an indication that a GEF agency will have an execution role in the program but the specific agency or agencies along with a justification has been provided. Please provide.

04/18/2024 - Comment Cleared

Agency's Comments

17.04.2024

Para 87 is further elucidated to reflect possible execution arrangements:

87. UNIDO will be the lead agency in the program and will execute the global child project. The organization will ensure close coordination with participating agencies - African Development Bank, UNDP and UNEP - in the program and child projects implementation. UNIDO is cognizant of the tasks and resources required to manage and execute the program. Thus, based on comparative advantages and mandates, other executing partners maybe identified during the project preparatory phase. Initial discussions have been held with the Circular Electronic Partnerships and UNEP on execution possibility. ITU may also be tapped to execute relevant activities.

5.4 Program-level Results, Monitoring and Reporting

a) Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified? Does the PFD describe how it will support the generation of multiple environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF program?

b) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01/GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

c) Are the program's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) / adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

d) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the program at the global, national and local levels sufficiently described?

e) Is the described approach to program level M&E aiming to achieve coherence across child projects and to allow for adaptative management?

Secretariat's Comments Both preliminary program level indicators and clear core indicators along with socio economic benefits have been clearly identified and described.

Agency's Comments

5.5 Risks to Achieving Program Outcomes

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks and impacts adequately screened and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

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

6.1 a) Is the program adequately aligned with Focal Area and IP Elements, and/or LDCF/SCCF strategy?

***For IPs: is the program adequately aligned with the Integrated Program goals and objectives as outlined in the GEF 8 programming directions?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

b) Child project selection criteria: Are the criteria for child project selection sound and transparently laid out?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the program alignment/coherent with country / regional / global priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat's Comments

Please provide the taxonomy worksheet in the main portal page.

04/18/2024 - Comment Cleared

Agency's Comments

17.04.2024

The program taxonomy worksheet is provided in Annex F.

7.2 Environmental and Social Safeguards

Have safeguard screening document and/or other ESS document(s) attached and been uploaded to the GEF Portal? (annex D)

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

8 Other Requirements

Knowledge Management

8.1 Has the agency confirmed that a project level approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been included in the PFD?

Secretariat's Comments There is a clearly articulated KM&L strategy included in the program design.

Agency's Comments

9 Annexes

Financing Tables (Annex A and Annex H)

9.1 GEF Financing Table:

a) 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):

Country STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

Please separate into rows the countries in Africa that are participating in the program.

04/18/2024 - Comment Cleared

Agency's Comments

17.04.2024

The financing table has been revised to reflect individual allocations of the countries in Africa participating in the regional HoA and SADC projects.

Non-STAR 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
IP Set Aside

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
IP Contribution

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

For Child Project Financing information (Annex H)

b) Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? Are the IP contributions aligned with the Program?

The allocated amounts (including Agency Fee) match those in LoE?

c) Project Preparation Grant Table: Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? The allocated amounts (including PPG Fee) match those in LoE? Is the requested PPG within the authorized limits set in Guidelines? (pop up information?) If above the limits, has an exception been sufficiently substantiated?

d) Sources of Funds Table: Are the allocated sources of funds for each and every one of the three STAR Focal Areas within the Country's STAR envelope by the time of the last review?

e) Indicative Focal Area Elements Table: (For IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area element corresponds to the respective IP?

f) (For non-IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area Elements are aligned with the respective Program?

g) Co-financing Table: Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing provided and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

9.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG): if PPG for child projects has been requested: has the PPG table been included and properly filled out adding up to the correct PPG and PPG fee totals as per the sum of the child projects?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

9.3 Sources of Funds for Country STAR Allocation

Does the table represent the sum of STAR allocations sources utilized for this program?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

9.4 Indicative Focal Area Elements

For non-IP Programs

Does the table contain the sum of focal area elements and amounts as per the sum of the child projects?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

9.5 Indicative Co-financing

Are the indicative amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequate and reflect the ambition of the program? Has the subset of co-finance which are expected to be investment mobilized been identified and defined (FI/GN/01)?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

9.6 Has the program and its respective child project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat's Comments

a. LOEs from Viet Nam, Botswana, Lesotho, and Mozambique are missing.

b. Name of Turkkiye child project differs between LOE and Portal's entry, please correct Portal entry for both child project and the PFD to match with the LOE.

c. Executing entity in the Peru LOE is "to be determined" while in Portal it is "Ministry of Environment". Please correct Portal entry for both child project and the PFD to match with the LOE.

d. LOE from Namibia and Colombia are missing the footnote that the designated executing entity is subject to capacity assessment by the Implementing Agency. Please obtain a revised LOE with such footnote or a confirmation email from the OFP agreeing to such condition.

e. For the two regional child projects (ID 11560- Electronics management for sustainable ICT solutions in the Horn of Africa (HoA) by AfDB, and ID 11562- Promoting circularity and resource efficiency in the electronics value chain across southern African countries by UNEP), please include individual participating country names in both the child projects and the PFD. Please also include budget allocation for each country if applicable in the financing table and PPG table of the child projects? entries.

04/18/2024 - Comments cleared, however please get the confirmation from Colombia and resubmit.

04/24/2024 - Colombia OFP has confirmed via email on the footnote. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

17.04.2024

a. Letters of Endorsements from Vietnam, Botswana, Lesotho and Mozambique have been uploaded in the portal.

b. A new LoE is received from the Government of Turkiye to harmonize the project title in both LoE, portal entry and child project concept note.

c. Executing entities for both Philippines and Peru have been corrected to "To be determined during the PPG".

d. A revised LoE from Namibia dated 15 April 2024 has been provided. Confirmation of the GEF OFP of Colombia on the footnote 'Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency' is awaited.

e. Individual listing of countries and GEF grant allocation for the two regional projects in Horn of Africa (HoA) and Southern African Development Community (SADC) have been reflected in the portal.

04/24/2024

1. The email confirmation of the Colombia GEF OPF on agreement to the footnote 'Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency' is received and submitted in the Records of Endorsement section together with the original letter of endorsement.

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

Secretariat's Comments

No, Please submit.

04/18/2024 - letters have been uploaded.

Agency's Comments

17.04.2024

Letters of Endorsements of GEF OFPs have been individually uploaded in the Records of Endorsement section. A compiled list is also provided as attachment together with the compiled child projects concept note in the annex.

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

Annex C: Program Locations

9.7 a) Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the program interventions will take place?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes* (*only for non IP programs)

9.9 a) Does the program 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.

b) Does the program provide a detailed reflow table to assess the program capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
Additional Annexes
10 GEFSEC Decision

10.1 GEFSEC Recommendation
Is the program recommended for clearance?

Secretariat's Comments
Please respond to the comments in the review.

04/18/2024 - one pending comment on the confirmation from Colombia.

04/24/2024 - All comments have been cleared. Program is recommended for clearance.

Agency's Comments
04/24/2024

1. An email confirmation from the GEF OFP of Colombia on agreement to the footnote is provided in the Records of Endorsement section together with the original letter of endorsement.

10.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency(ies) during the child project development.

Secretariat's Comments

1. Increase the GEBs particularly those related to new POPs
2. On a non-state executing agency for Kazakhstan (and also for any other child project), and considering the approval of the OFP, at CEO endorsement please present a clear plan for ensuring capacity on working in this sector is transferred to all relevant State entities.

Agency's Comments

1. The comment is noted and will be further evaluated during the child projects development.
2. The comment is noted and will be communicated.

10.3 Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/9/2024	4/17/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/18/2024	4/24/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/24/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		