



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

GEF ID:	9048		
Country/Region:	Ethiopia		
Project Title:	Ethiopian Urban NAMA: Creating Opportunities for Municipalities to Produce and Operationalise Solid Waste Transformation (COMPOST)		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5541 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-2 Program 3; CCM-2 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$6,667,123
Co-financing:	\$47,112,888	Total Project Cost:	\$53,880,011
PIF Approval:	April 28, 2015	Council Approval/Expected:	June 04, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Xiaomei Tan	Agency Contact Person:	Robert Kelly

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?	XT, July 20, 2016: Minor changes are justified.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	XT, July 20, 2016: 1) Please clarify if the proposed waste collection also cover waste in slums and squatter areas, as well as in commercial areas - hotels, restaurants, and office complexes. 2) How will non-household waste be segregated if the answer to question 1) is yes? 3) Please provide an estimate of the share of household-generated waste in total waste in	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>the six pilot cities.</p> <p>4) Transport of waste is often the bottleneck of efficiency in most developing countries cities. Please briefly describe the transport vehicles' capital costs, carrying capacity, life expectancy, loading speed and maintenance costs.</p> <p>5) Please provide an estimate of the investment and operation costs of the proposed composting plants.</p> <p>6) In many developing countries cities, most of the budget for SWM is consumed in salaries of sanitation workers and transport of waste. Very little is set aside for actual treatment and disposal of waste. Please explain the funding sources of the proposed composting plants.</p> <p>7) Please explain if the six pilot cities levy SWM tax or user fees for door-to-door collection.</p> <p>8) Regarding the private sector involvement, please answer the following questions: a) what is the best way to ensure fair competition among bidders on a contract? b) what size of contract will be attractive for the private operator but avoid the creation of a monopoly? c) what is the best payment structure to make the contract sustainable – levy of user fees, charges, or taxes?</p> <p>XT, August 25, 2016: All comments are cleared.</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	XT, July 20, 2016: the cost-effectiveness of the project is contingent on how well the questions in box 2 are answered. XT, August 25, 2016: all comments are cleared.	
	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)	XT, July 20, 2016: Yes. Climate change risks are fully considered and the mitigation measures are sound.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	XT, July 20, 2016: Yes.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	XT, July 20, 2016: Yes.	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	XT, July 20, 2016: N/A.	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	XT, July 20, 2016: Strengthened coordination with investments by multi-lateral and bi-lateral donors is expected. Please see comments in box 11. XT, August 25, 2016: comment cleared.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	XT, July 20, 2016: Yes.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	XT, July 20, 2016: Learning from previous MSW investment experience in the country is expected. Please see comments in box 11.	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		XT, August 25, 2016: Comment cleared.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ¹ stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEFSEC 	XT, July 20, 2016: Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP 	XT, July 20, 2016: Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council 	XT, July 20, 2016: 1) German and French council's suggestion on strengthened coordination need to be fully incorporated into the project design. Please briefly describe the coordination plan during the project implementation. 2) French council's suggestion on learning from previous experience needs to be incorporated into the project's knowledge management component. XT, August 25, 2016: comment cleared.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat 	XT, July 20, 2016: N/A.	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	XT, July 20, 2016: Not at this time. Please address comments in boxes 2, 3, 8, 10, and 11. XT, August 25, 2016: recommended for CEO endorsement.	
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

¹ 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.