



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	6928		
Country/Region:	Colombia		
Project Title:	Reducing UPOPs and Mercury Releases from Healthcare Waste Management, e-Waste Treatment, Scrap Processing and Biomass Burning		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5481 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Chemicals and Waste
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$5,800,000
Co-financing:	\$32,915,018	Total Project Cost:	\$39,015,018
PIF Approval:	September 03, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	October 29, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Evelyn Swain	Agency Contact Person:	Jacques Van Engel

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	Yes.	Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes.	Yes.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes.	Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	Yes, this is in line with CW-2 Program 3 for UPOPs and Program 4 for Mercury.	Yes.
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	Yes, it is in line with the NIP.	Yes.
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	Yes.	Yes.
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>Component 2,3,4, and 6 should consider adding mercury reduction.</p> <p>ES, 8/22/14- Mercury has been added to component 2, 3, 4, and 6. -Comment Cleared</p>	Yes, the project framework is clear. The mercury components have been increased.
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>The GEBs are clear for UPOPs, but mercury should be added.</p> <p>The e-waste component should consider ODS, PCBs, new POPs, mercury or other</p>	The project will achieve 100 gTEQ UPOPs reduction and 300 kg mercury reduction. Incremental reasoning is applied.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>applicable benefits.</p> <p>ES, 8/22/14- GEb for mercury has been added and the projected target will be further developed during the PPG. - Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		<p>Yes, gender is considered. During the PPG phase gender should be further analyzed. For example, there may be gender considerations in the health care, e-waste and biomass components because workers in these areas may be primarily women there for at increased risk of exposure.</p> <p>During the PPG a gender analysis was conducted. The results will contribute to the benefits of the project.</p>
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>Yes, risks are considered.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>The E-waste component should be coordinated with any appliance recycling programs for ODS under the MLF.</p> <p>ES, 8/22/14- Coordination with the MLF project has been confirmed. -Comment cleared.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>This project is innovative and takes a comprehensive approach to managing UPOPs for different priority sectors. The demonstration aspects should lead to the potential for scale up.</p>	<p>Plans for scale up and sustainability have been considered and built into the different sectors that will be addressed through the demonstration projects. Institutional strengthening and knowledge sharing will also contribute.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>There was a additional request for funding the mercury components because it was determined that that associated work was under estimated at the PIF stage. The additional request is \$200,000 or 3.6% of the total project cost. The increase has been justified.</p>
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		<p>Yes, the cost-effectiveness of this comprehensive project has been justified.</p>
<p>Project Financing</p>	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>Mercury should be added, so cost effectiveness will be re-evaluated with the addition of mercury in some components.</p> <p>ES, 8/22/14- Mercury has been added and a holistic approach will be used for ESM of UPOPs and Mercury waste in the</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		country. Funding is appropriate. - Comment Cleared.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	Yes, there is significant cash co-financing from the private sector.	Co-financing has increase since PIF stage and significant grant resources have been secured from the private sector.
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes.	Yes.
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	Yes.	Yes, a PPG update was provided.
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		STAP comments were provided and addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		None.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council? 		Comments were provided by Canada, Us, Germany and Switzerland. Please confirm that these comments were addressed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		None.
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Not at this time. Mercury should be addressed in the project. ES, 8/22/14- PIF approval is recommended pending available resources in the GEF trust fund.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Gender considerations should be further addressed.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		CEO endorsement is recommended
	First review*	August 19, 2014	March 24, 2016
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 22, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**