



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9189		
Country/Region:	Jordan		
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		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5667 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Chemicals and Waste
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		CW-2 Program 3;	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$5,090,000
Co-financing:	\$24,150,000	Total Project Cost:	\$29,240,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	October 01, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Lulwa Ali	Agency Contact Person:	Jacques Van Engel

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	Yes. It is relevant to the CW-2 Program 3 "Reduction and elimination of POPs", particularly to Outcome 3.1: "Quantifiable and verifiable tonnes of POPs eliminated or reduced", and Indicator 3.1: "Amount and type of POPs eliminated or reduced".	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies	Yes. The project is in line with Jordan's NIP and related ongoing	

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	update. It is also consistent with Jordan's national strategies and priorities to improve waste management practices and to mitigate the impacts associated with healthcare and municipal waste on environment and human health.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>Yes. However, it is recommended that the contribution to global environmental benefits (GEBs) stated in section F of the PIF be revised to ensure better estimates of the POPs reduction/ elimination targets and to reflect if any other POPs such as PEFOs will be included in the GEB targets.</p> <p>A brief section on innovation, sustainability and scaling up has been provided in the PIF document. Please elaborate further on these issues in the full project document and describe the potential market transformation of the e-waste sector from an informal sector to a more formal one.</p> <p>LA, 27 July 2015</p> <p>LA, 4 August 2015: comments have been addressed. Detailed inventory/ data collection applicable to e-waste and RDF will be undertaken during</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		the project implementation to provide further information on the GEB targets. The potential impacts with regard to market transformation from informal to formal sector management of E-waste in the context of sustainability will also be assessed during the PPG stage.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Yes	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>The project focuses on implementing environmentally sound management of three different waste streams including e-waste, health care related waste and U-POPs release sources associated with general waste management activities. To ensure successful realization of the project objectives and targets, it would be necessary to adequately address/ clarify at appropriate sections of the PIF document the following issues:</p> <p>1. Include more information on the Jordan's overall waste management strategy and clarify how the waste streams addressed in this project fit in within this strategy. Also, describe the approaches taken towards the integrated management of the waste issues addressed in this project.</p> <p>2. On the e-waste:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - General E-waste management 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>falls under the SIACM window with while POPs in e-waste are managed under Stockholm Convention, and mercury under Minamata convention. Please clarify activities of each of the above as relevant to the project's components to enable better assessment and allocation of the funds from relevant GEF resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How is the value chain for e-waste being addressed? - Is there sufficient volumes in Jordan that will make it attractive for the private sector to invest in e-waste management? - Are the new POPs in the e-waste streams being considered? If so what is being proposed and if not, what are the reasons? <p>3. On the HCW:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are the opportunities for introducing recycled plastics in Jordan's health sector as a mean to minimize this waste steam and the associated potential emissions? - Are mercury containing/contaminated materials included in the HCW? What measures will be taken to handle these wastes? - Please justify the need for GEF US\$ 1,600,000 funding indicated in output 2.1.1 for the installation of non-combustion units, 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>considering the big capital investment (US\$4,800,000) availed by private, public and military sectors as well the Kuwait Fund.</p> <p>4. Other general notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Co-financing amounts from Gulf Fund, US AID and European Commission needs to be identified. Please provide confirmation of this co-financing along with at the CEO request for approval. - Provide information on the timeframe for implementing the different related component activities including overlapping activities. Also describe how the expected results for each individual stage/ activity would tie-up to achieving the overall objective of the project. Please consider adding a dedicated section on this in the PIF document and elaborate on the same in the full project document. <p>LA, 27 July 2015</p> <p>LA, 4 August 2015. Comments have been adequately addressed. However, further clarification on the e-waste component is needed with regard to the focus of the e-waste component in the project: Is it to develop the enabling infrastructure/ capacity for the collection and primary processing</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>of e-waste with the aim of reducing the POPs? Is there a potential for e-waste trade flow and if so, what are the associated impacts on POPs reduction/ control?</p> <p>LA, 12 August, 2015. Responses were provided and indicated that the focus of the e-waste component is the avoidance of environmentally unsound crude processing or disposal practices typically involving low combustion resulting in U-POPs release. Moreover, an element of internationally trade flow is envisaged where local level of generation does not support complete processing. Comments cleared</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>There is a brief description in the PIF on how the project is likely to `gender equality and women's empowerment. However more details on the gender elements as well as CSOs participation and potential impacts on vulnerable populations, among other socioeconomic aspects are needed and expected during the PPG. Please ensure that the project document fully address the above issues when submitted to GEF for CEO endorsement.</p> <p>LA, 27 July 2015 LA, 4 August 2015: comment cleared.</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		The socioeconomic aspects will be further elaborated during the PPG.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	NA	
	• The focal area allocation?	Yes	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• Focal area set-aside?	NA	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>Not at this stage. Pending satisfactory responses to the above review comments. LA, LA, 27 July 2015</p> <p>Not at this stage. Please address the comment in Box 5. LA, 04 August 2015</p> <p>Yes. the Program Manager recommends CEO PIF/PFD clearance LA, 12 august, 2015</p>	
Review Date	Review	July 27, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 04, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.