



GEF-6 REQUEST FOR PROJECT ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Reduction and elimination of POPs and other chemical releases through implementation of environmentally sound management of E-Waste, healthcare waste and priority U-POPs release sources associated with general waste management activities			
Country(ies):	Kingdom of Jordan	GEF Project ID: ¹	9189
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP (select) (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	5667
Other Executing Partner(s):		Submission Date:	
GEF Focal Area (s):	Chemicals and Wastes	Project Duration (Months)	60
Integrated Approach Pilot	IAP-Cities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Commodities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Food Security <input type="checkbox"/>	Corporate Program: SGP <input type="checkbox"/>	
Name of Parent Program	[if applicable]	Agency Fee (\$)	483,550

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK AND OTHER PROGRAM STRATEGIES²

Focal Area Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
CW-2 Program 3	Outcome 3.1: Quantifiable and verifiable tonnes of POPs eliminated or reduced	GEFTF	5,090,000	64,892,008
Total project costs			5,090,000	64,892,008

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Project Objective: Protection of human health and the environment through reduction and elimination of POPs, and other chemicals through implementation of environmentally sound management (ESM) for e-waste, healthcare waste and priority U-POPs release sources associated with general waste management activities						
Project Components/Programs	Financing Type ³	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
					GEF Project Financing	Confirmed Co-financing
Project Component 1: Development of ESM E-waste management system	TA	Outcome 1.1 Environmentally sound E-waste collection, processing and residuals management capability developed	Output 1.1.1 Effective policy implementation and regulatory control for ESM of E-waste in place; Output 1.1.2 Sustainable financial and business mechanism supporting E-waste management established and implemented; Output 1.1.3 E-waste collection and primary processing capability established; Output 1.1.4 Awareness and human resource	GEFTF	1,000,000	5,414,042

¹ Project ID number remains the same as the assigned PIF number.

² When completing Table A, refer to the excerpts on [GEF 6 Results Frameworks for GETF, LDCF and SCCF](#) and [CBIT programming directions](#).

³ Financing type can be either investment or technical assistance.

			strengthening for E-waste management delivered.			
Component 2: Achieving environmentally sound healthcare waste management	TA	Outcome 2.1 BAT/BEP healthcare waste management practice and technology implemented nationally	Output 2.1.1 Program of replacement of small sub-standard incineration facilities in 10 hospitals with non-combustion shredding/sterilization units fully implemented Output 2.1.2 Qualification to demonstrate international performance of high capacity incineration facilities providing regional services undertaken Output 2.1.3 Training and formal certification program for in-hospital waste management personnel developed and implemented Output 2.1.4 Development of optimized waste management service provider arrangements through private public partnerships pursued	GEFTF	2,300,000	22,030,508
Component 3. Developing waste diversion/resource recovery capacity for GHG and U-POPs reduction	TA	Outcome 3.1 Effective waste diversion/resource recovery capacity from HW and SW streams developed with associated GHG and U-POPs release reduction achieved	Output 3.1.1 Sustainable prevention of open burning through minimization, segregation, landfill surveillance in pilot waste basin and pilot MSW landfill. Output 3.1.2 Strategic plan and setting up a private entity for the management of hazardous waste Output 3.1.3 National energy from waste management capability through utilization of waste derived fuel in commercial cement kilns developed and qualified	GEFTF	1,400,000	36,995,340
Component 4. Project Monitoring and Evaluation	TA	4.1: Monitoring and evaluation; knowledge sharing and information	4.1.1 Monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment 4.1.2 Knowledge	GEFTF	150,000	

		dissemination	sharing and post-project action plan			
Subtotal					4,850,000	64,439,890
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⁴				GEFTF	240,000	452,118
Total project costs					5,090,000	64,892,008

C. CONFIRMED SOURCES OF CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY NAME AND BY TYPE

Please include evidence for co-financing for the project with this form.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grants	150,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	In-kind	75,000
Recipient Government	MoH, MOMA, RMS, MoEnv	Grants	35,167,231
Recipient Government	MoH, RMS, MoEnv	In-kind	11,599,435
Private Sector	Clean Cities, JUST, JoCycle, Lafarge/Holcim, FES	Grants	9,794,291
Private Sector	Clean Cities, JUST, JoCycle, Lafarge	In-kind	8,106,051
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
Total Co-financing			64,892,008

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES), FOCAL AREA AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country Name/Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee^{a)} (b)²	Total (c)=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	Kingdom of Jordan	Chemicals and Wastes	POPS	5,090,000	483,550	5,573,550
Total Grant Resources					5,090,000	483,550	5,573,550

a) Refer to the Fee Policy for GEF Partner Agencies

⁴ For GEF Project Financing up to \$2 million, PMC could be up to 10% of the subtotal; above \$2 million, PMC could be up to 5% of the subtotal. PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project financing amount in Table D below.

E. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS⁵

Provide the expected project targets as appropriate.

Corporate Results	Replenishment Targets	Project Targets
1. Maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society	Improved management of landscapes and seascapes covering 300 million hectares	<i>hectares</i>
2. Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes)	120 million hectares under sustainable land management	<i>hectares</i>
3. Promotion of collective management of transboundary water systems and implementation of the full range of policy, legal, and institutional reforms and investments contributing to sustainable use and maintenance of ecosystem services	Water-food-ecosystems security and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater in at least 10 freshwater basins;	<i>Number of freshwater basins</i>
	20% of globally over-exploited fisheries (by volume) moved to more sustainable levels	<i>Percent of fisheries, by volume</i>
4. Support to transformational shifts towards a low-emission and resilient development path	750 million tons of CO _{2e} mitigated (include both direct and indirect)	5220 metric tons
5. Increase in phase-out, disposal and reduction of releases of POPs, ODS, mercury and other chemicals of global concern	Disposal of 80,000 tons of POPs (PCB, obsolete pesticides)	<i>from 276 to 652 kg of c-PBDE. from 7 to 23 gTEq U-POPs metric tons</i>
	Reduction of 1000 tons of Mercury	<i>metric tons</i>
	Phase-out of 303.44 tons of ODP (HCFC)	<i>ODP tons</i>
6. Enhance capacity of countries to implement MEAs (multilateral environmental agreements) and mainstream into national and sub-national policy, planning financial and legal frameworks	Development and sectoral planning frameworks integrate measurable targets drawn from the MEAs in at least 10 countries	<i>Number of Countries:</i>
	Functional environmental information systems are established to support decision-making in at least 10 countries	<i>Number of Countries:</i>

F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A "NON-GRANT" INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Fund) in Annex D.

⁵ Update the applicable indicators provided at PIF stage. Progress in programming against these targets for the projects per the *Corporate Results Framework* in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#), will be aggregated and reported during mid-term and at the conclusion of the replenishment period.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF⁶

A.1. *Project Description*. Elaborate on: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed; 2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects, 3) the proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area⁷ strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project, 4) [incremental/additional cost reasoning](#) and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, CBIT and [co-financing](#); 5) [global environmental benefits](#) (GEFTF) and/or [adaptation benefits](#) (LDCF/SCCF); and 6) innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

There are no deviations from the original PIF at Component and Outcome level, including the project's budget. At output level the following changes were introduced, with the purpose to ensure more effective implementation of the project:

- The previous Output 3.1.1 "Open burning associated with smaller landfills assessed and effective prevention measures implemented" has been merged with the previous Output 3.1.2 "Pilot MSW landfill operation optimized to provide for effective diversion to environmentally sound management through treatment, recycling and/or resource recovery". The new Output 3.1.1 is called "Sustainable prevention of open burning through minimization, segregation, landfill surveillance in pilot waste basin and pilot MSW landfill".
- The previous Output 3.1.3 "Elimination of primary stockpiles of chemical waste at the national hazardous waste storage site supported" has been replaced by the new Output 3.1.2 "Strategic plan and setting up a private entity for the management of hazardous waste".

A.2. *Child Project?* If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

This is not a child project

A.3. [Stakeholders](#). Identify key stakeholders and elaborate on how the key stakeholders engagement is incorporated in the preparation and implementation of the project. Do they include civil society organizations (yes ☒ /no ☐)? and indigenous peoples (yes ☐ /no ☒)? ⁸

The stakeholder analysis, including the list of project stakeholder, is reported in section IV Results and Partnerships, Chapter iii. Partnership and Chapter iv Stakeholder engagement (Page 38) of the attached project document.

A.4. [Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment](#). Elaborate on how gender equality and women's empowerment issues are mainstreamed into the project implementation and monitoring, taking into account the differences, needs, roles and priorities of women and men. In addition, 1) did the project conduct a gender analysis during project preparation (yes ☒ /no ☐)?; 2) did the project incorporate a gender responsive project results framework, including sex-disaggregated indicators (yes ☒ /no ☐)?; and 3) what is the share of women and men direct beneficiaries (women X%, men X%)? ⁹

⁶ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF, no need to respond, please enter "NA" after the respective question.

⁷ For biodiversity projects, in addition to explaining the project's consistency with the biodiversity focal area strategy, objectives and programs, please also describe which [Aichi Target\(s\)](#) the project will directly contribute to achieving..

⁸ As per the GEF-6 Corporate Results Framework in the GEF Programming Directions and GEF-6 Gender Core Indicators in the Gender Equality Action Plan, provide information on these specific indicators on stakeholders (including civil society organization and indigenous peoples) and gender.

⁹ Same as footnote 8 above.

A gender situation analysis was carried out through a survey in the course of project proposal's preparation. An associated gender mainstreaming action plan, which has been incorporated in the project result framework and in the project budget as well, to make them "gender responsive", is reported in Annex 6 of the attached project document. It will be adhered to during the project implementation with required reporting on achievements to the GEF.

A.5 Risk. Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):

Risks are summarized in table format in the Annex I of the attached project document.

A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination. Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

Institutional arrangements are described in detail in section VIII on Governance and Management Arrangements (page 55) of the attached project document.

Coordination with other relevant GEF initiatives are described in section III Strategy, paragraph "Linkage and coordination with other GEF projects", (page 16) of the attached project document.

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

A.7 Benefits. Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

As described in section V Feasibility, chapter IV "Sustainability and scaling up" (page 43) of the attached project document, the project will bring not only environmental benefits but also social benefits. The right to have access to a safe and healthy environment is sanctioned by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

A specific gender mainstreaming plan has been integrated throughout all project component, and the activities related to the recycling of waste will generate – although at pilot stage – income and job opportunities for the local communities which will also benefit of specialized capacity building training and awareness raising activities.

At a higher level, the establishment of a market-based waste management system will represent a business opportunity for the providers of disposal services who, although already operating in the country, are currently facing challenges due to the unfair competition deriving from the persistence of substandard waste disposal practices.

A.8 Knowledge Management. Elaborate on the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user-friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

The Knowledge Management approach is reported in detail in Section IV Results and Partnerships, chapter VII. "Knowledge Management" (page 41) of the attached project document.

B. DESCRIPTION OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH:

B.1 Consistency with National Priorities. Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.:

The project is consistent with and constitutes an integral part of national strategies, priority plans and its current development priorities related to environmental protection as well as social and economic development in Jordan.

In terms of the three current primary chemicals related Conventions (Stockholm, Basel, Rotterdam), all of which Jordan is a party to and active participant in, the Project directly addresses strengthening national compliance, something that is a major priority of the country.

The project has a primary objective of reducing and eliminating POPs and other chemicals releases along with addressing control of trade issues associated with E-waste and used EEE, and generally promoting current overall solid and hazardous waste management approaches consistent with maximizing beneficial use and minimizing traditional unsafe disposal of such products. In that regard, the project is also well timed to support the implementation of new National Solid Waste Management Strategy. It also develops a linkage to GHG reduction through the development of environmentally sound RDF applications which is in line with Jordan's overall climate change mitigation policies and strategies. With regard to national development and specifically the country's situation in the region, the project fits well into Jordan's proactive and humanitarian policies related to accommodating refugees and economic migrants in a manner that both provides appropriate sanitation and medical services while ensuring maintenance of national and ultimately international standards in these areas.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M &E PLAN:

The budgeted M&E plan is reported in detail in section VII "Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan of the attached project document (page 51).

PART III: CERTIFICATION BY GEF PARTNER AGENCY(IES)

A. GEF Agency(ies) certification

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies¹⁰ and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO endorsement under GEF-6.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (MM/dd/yyyy)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, Executive Coordinator, UNDP Global Environmental Finance			Xiaofang Zhou, Director, MPU/Chemicals	00-1-212- 906-5782	xiaofang.zhou@undp.org

¹⁰ GEF policies encompass all managed trust funds, namely: GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF and CBIT
GEF6 CEO Endorsement /Approval Template-August2016

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

The project result framework is reported in section VI "Project Result Framework" of the attached project document.

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Source	Comment/Question	Response
United States	<p>The United States supports the proposed project. As the proposal is further developed, we request that UNDP reflects on the recommendations provided by the STAP. We also recommend that Output 3.1.4 on national energy from waste management capability through utilization of waste derived fuel in commercial cement kilns also address Minamata Convention requirements related to emissions from cement kilns and ensure that convention requirements are met in the sector.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the PPG stage of the project UNDP will address and incorporate as applicable the recommendations made by STAP (dated March 2/16) including consultations with STAP on specific issues, views, and priorities noted in their comments and recommendations. (See itemized responses to STAP comments below) • UNDP notes the point respecting consideration of Minamata Convention requirements and will ensure incorporation of these and any related guidance in the qualification protocols applied for the expanded use of RDF in cement kilns. It is the intention to ensure the promotion of BAT/BEP in this work and to ensure qualification of facilities be undertaken in accordance with recognized international standards and that the facilities meet internationally recognized emission and release performance requirements including those for mercury. More specifically, those applied by US EPA and the European Union will be utilized in this regard.
Germany	<p>Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account. Suggestions for improvements to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal. Germany acknowledges the reduction and elimination of POPs and other chemical releases through implementation of environmentally sound management of E-Waste, healthcare waste and priority U-POPs release sources associated with general waste management activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under component 1 the project includes as one risk mitigation strategy a producer pay system with direct incentives and awareness/training initiatives. Germany suggests that the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The issue of potential social displacement as the management of e-waste develops and evolves from informal to formal sector management will be addressed in Component 1. The current project framework proposed defines the overall the tools by which this can be pursued. Output 1.1.2 will be designed to support this transition by creation of a market based system ultimately having sustainable economies of scale which will provide employment and entrepreneurial opportunities for those in the informal sector. Output 1.1.3 can serve to stimulate these opportunities with provision of seed financing at all levels in the supply chain including those currently participating in the informal sector. Output 1.1.4 incorporates the awareness and training support that will be

	<p>project proposal outlines what kind of incentives are considered to prevent the social displacement of the informal sector.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the knowledge management approach for the project, it is not clear what kind of user-friendly form will be used and how the experience could be shared in detail in a systematic way. Germany hence recommends to define adequate outputs of component 4: project evaluation and monitoring in more detail. • The information on the financing type for component 3 in the indicative project description summary table is missing and should be completed. 	<p>needed to support this. These aspects will be more explicitly defined specifically through targeting the informal sector stakeholders during detailed preparation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The specific user-friendly forms of knowledge management to be employed will be elaborated in the PPG stage including how this will be shared in a systematic way. Specific outputs in this area will be elaborated for Component 4. • This component involves primarily investment type financing which will be specified as such in the Project Document and CER Endorsement request after the detailed preparation stage, noting that it has been inadvertently not specified in the PIF form.
STAP	<p>The PIF does not draw out any intention to include measures to decrease the Health Care Waste generated at source, which would also act to reduce uPOPs. STAP wishes to make broad suggestions to improve the project development process:</p> <p>(a) The resource materials from the 2008- 2014 UNDP/WHO Health Care Waste project should be of utility. The website for this project provides a resource overview page (currently with no active links), as well as an extensive list of downloadable training modules (http://www.gefmedwaste.org/trainings-overview).</p> <p>(b) The WHO Chapter on health care waste minimisation and management (http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/medicalwaste/058</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNDP notes the STAP recommendations related to ensuring the incorporation of waste minimization measures at source. UNDP's intention is to be guided by application of the accepted waste management hierarchy into the project generally. This will be a basic principle applied in Output 2.1.3 for medical waste being directed to specifically to source based capacity building. This will specifically include consideration of the use of resource materials referenced by STAP. Having said this, UNDP notes that the objective of this project is to target the upgrading of existing dedicated health care waste which would offer the greatest benefits in terms of U-POPs reduction in the near term. • With regard to STAP's reference to municipal waste generated by hospitals, the project specifically targets dedicated HCM facilities which in principle exclude municipal waste, noting that in Jordan a relatively mature system that ensures segregation of health care waste and

	<p>to060.pdf). There is practical advice to minimize waste such as reducing the use of injections and hence generation of PVC waste through use of pills. Other useful resource may be the WHO book on the issue released in 2014, with some specific recommendations for situations where resources are limited, providing some examples for addressing the issue http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/medicalwaste/wasteemanag/en/. See also case studies such as "Best Practices in Health Care Waste Management: Examples from four Philippine Hospitals" (http://www.noharm.org/lib/downloads/waste/Best_Practices_Waste_Mgmt_Philippines.pdf)</p> <p>(c) In addition, the USEPA website gives links to "Hospital Prevention (P-2) strategies" (California Department of Health Services), and a "Guide to Mercury Assessment and Elimination in Health Care Facilities" (http://www.epa.gov/region9/waste/p2/hospart.html) which gives a breakdown of equipment of concern, methods of planning and implementation of HCW strategies and plans, and could be a good practical guide of past experience, complete with cost-benefit analyses. The page also includes a section on Pollution Prevention for Health care Professionals, which could help inform any training packages put together for doctor and nursing staff.</p> <p>STAP strongly recommends that developers should examine appropriate non-GEF baseline experience in this field, given that the GEF has limited experience in this area of work.</p>	<p>general solid waste at source. Having said this the point is taken and will be monitored as an issue during preparation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAP comments related to the risk table are noted and will be explicitly addressed in the PPG stage. • The point related to waste reduction serving as a risk mitigation strategy is acknowledged and will be explored as applicable based on case study experience and incorporated into stakeholder and awareness activities. • Likewise the point related to transportation risk generally and its possible increase associated with climate change impacts is noted and will be examined. However, it is pointed out that the transportation risks involved will remain inherently relatively small remain given that the distances are generally modest, the standards of containment are robust, dedicated licensed vehicles are used, and the volumes small. Therefore the risks relative the normal transport of much higher risk dangerous goods and other hazardous wastes are low. • With respect to risks of inappropriate use of non-combustion techniques, it should be pointed out that in fact these techniques are inherently lower risk given that they are largely source based, involve well established mature technologies, better and simpler operating practice and controls, all of which allow their application to be largely seamlessly to the source based management systems which as pointed out should and would be governed by appropriate protocols, all of which will be more completely defined in the detailed project preparation. • The Dioxin Toolkit has been already used in the estimation of PCDD/F release impacts during conceptual project
--	---	---

	<p>Another aspect explicitly stated in the project is the reduction of the municipal type of waste generated by hospitals, which can make up about 80% of the total waste. Incineration of such waste leads to uPOPs as well, and it should be targeted in the overall training of the medical staff (see suggested guidance from EPA et. al.). Of course if municipal waste is simply shunted to the municipal waste stream, then this point is moot to some extent, though waste minimization should continue to be a goal for all.</p> <p>In the Risk table, though rated low, there is risk associated health care system persons reverting to tradition incineration techniques. However, cost-benefit analysis to show savings to the hospitals, and ultimate reduction of burden to workers managing smaller quantities of waste have often been the "selling point" that leads to successful implementation of HCWM in facilities. Acknowledging the stated intent to explore other project experiences, the STAP again emphasizes the need to do a thorough search of case studies, and to find ways to incorporate these benefits meaningfully into the various stakeholder trainings and awareness activities, such that each group can see the benefits brought to bear for their particular group and the facility as a whole.</p> <p>The risk table does not take into account any risks to transportation routing to centralized facilities associated with possible seasonal threats due to Climate Change. Should there be long distances be involved, this increases the chance of mishaps, spills and environmental and population exposure,</p>	<p>development and would be used in the PPG stage.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>which can be compounded by natural, weather-related events that may threaten transport (eg dust storms).</p> <p>In addition, STAP suggests that the risk associated with inappropriate use of non-combustible, decontamination techniques (e.g., infectious waste might "slip through the cracks" as the waste handlers learn new techniques) should also be considered. There needs to be some mention of this, and the risk mitigation protocols that will be put in place to make sure that the overall HCWM runs as planned.</p> <p>The Dioxin Toolkit might be used to obtain a more detailed and appropriate TEQ emission number for medical wastes disposed. STAP would like to see this being done as it would provide better quantitative indicators for project monitoring via the POPs tracking tool.</p>	
	<p>The proposed project design is unintentionally creating a tension within component 3, in trying to create a rationale for Refuse Derived Fuels whilst simultaneously trying to find financial tools and incentives (taxes and the like) to support recycling (in Component 1). Fundamentally, the inclusion of RDF could disincentivize recycling since the former at its core requires a sustained feedstock of waste. Indeed there is literature that explores this very issue, such as the EU Commission Report on Refuse Derived Fuel, Current Practice and Perspectives (http://docplayer.net/10821846-European-commission-directorate-general-environment-refuse-derived-fuel-current-practice-and-perspectives-b4-3040-2000-306517-mar-e3-final-report.html), work by the Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives (GAIA) (</p>	

	<p>burn.org/downloads/RDF%20Final.pdf) and the USEPA (http://www3.epa.gov/warm/SWMGHGreport.html) who have created the Waste Reduction Model (WARM) to help solid waste planners and organizations track and voluntarily report greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reductions from several different materials management practices, thereby providing some objective way of calculating the best waste management strategy. WARM calculates and totals the relative GHG emission and energy impacts of baseline and alternative materials management practices—source reduction, recycling, combustion, composting, and landfilling—using emission factors that EPA has developed based on a materials life-cycle approach. STAP proposes a thorough review of the literature on this topic, especially since the project is also seeking to enhance recycling.</p> <p>Finally, there should be some risk consideration to contemplate the transition from "business as usual" to a regulated waste market system.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP's final comment related to business as usual and a regulated market system is noted to is noted and will be followed up on during the PPG stage for elaboration noting its generality and lack of context.
--	--	---

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS¹¹

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: USD 150,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Component A: Technical Review	65,000	40,977	7,710
Component B: Institutional arrangements, monitoring and evaluation	45,000	94,397	
Component C: Financial planning and co-financing investments	25,000	5,444	
Component D: Validation workshop	15,000	1472	
Total	150,000	142,290	7,710

¹¹ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue to undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities. Agencies should also report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report.
GEF6 CEO Endorsement /Approval Template-August2016

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A