



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

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|------------------------------|
| GEF ID: | 4392 | | |
| Country/Region: | Egypt | | |
| Project Title: | Protect Human Health and the Environment from Unintentional Releases of POPs Originating from Incineration and Open Burning of Health Care- and Electronic-waste | | |
| GEF Agency: | UNDP | GEF Agency Project ID: | 4567 (UNDP) |
| Type of Trust Fund: | GEF Trust Fund | GEF Focal Area (s): | POPs |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF | Objective (s): | CHEM-1; CHEM-1; CHEM-3; CHEM-3; Project Mana; | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | \$140,000 | Project Grant: | \$4,100,000 |
| Co-financing: | \$17,568,000 | Total Project Cost: | \$21,808,000 |
| PIF Approval: | August 08, 2012 | Council Approval/Expected: | April 12, 2013 |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | Anil Sookdeo | Agency Contact Person: | Mr. 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. Egypt is a party to the Stockholm convention and submitted its NIP 3/16/06. | |
| | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? | Yes. Endorsement letter provided by GEF Operational Focal Point 9/16/10. Oct. 20, 2011_OFP send a confirmation letter on April 11, 2011 to affirm its support to the proposed GEF/UNDP project. | |
| Agency's Comparative Advantage | 3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? | Yes, UNDP has managed a global health care waste POPs project and has programs on mainstreaming chemicals management, which are important | Yes |

*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 11-22-2010

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| | | elements of this project. UNDP mentioned the partnership with the Basel Convention on computing equipment (PACE) working group. Please elaborate more on this partnership and explain UNDP's work that could inform us about its CA on e-wastes. AS - Response adequate/ Comment Cleared. 21/03/11 | |
| | 4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it? | N/A | |
| | 5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country? | Yes, UNDP has in-country environmental staff working on complementary efforts. | Yes |
| Resource Availability | 6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply): | | |
| | • the STAR allocation? | | |
| | • the focal area allocation? | | |
| | • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access | | |
| | • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? | | |
| | • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund | | |
| Project Consistency | | | |
| | 7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework? | Yes. The project fits squarely within the POPs Objective CHEM-1, Outcome 1.3, POPs releases to the environment reduced, and Indicator 1.3 Amount of unintentionally produced POPs releases avoided or reduced from industrial and non-industrial sectors. | Yes, the project addresses a number of chemical issues within the ambit of single project. the project addresses both POPs and Mercury in health care waste and e-waste. |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|--|--|
| | 8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified? | Yes, Outcome 1.3 as described above, and Outcome 1.5, Country capacity built to effectively phase out and reduce releases of POPs. | Yes |
| | 9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP? | Yes. Consistency with national priorities and plans is clearly described in the document, including the 2010 Health Care Waste Management strategy of Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency and Ministry of Health and Population, and the Ministry of Communications and Information Technology's Green ICT strategy. HCW is a priority identified in NIP, as is open burning as typical of e-waste processing. | Yes |
| | 10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes? | The project addresses mainstreaming, legislative and policy strengthening, and replication throughout the country. However, the project does not provide detail about the technical and organizational approaches to be used in both HCW and e-waste management. Please clarify. Jan 24, 2012 - Clarified - Comment cleared | Yes |
| | 11. 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? | Yes, the ongoing and recent initiatives in this area are well described and should be further elaborated during the PPG phase. | Yes |
| | 12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits? | | The project is consistent with other projects approved for health care waste. it should be noted the number of these types of projects is too limited to make an assessment of the costs and the agency is encouraged to report on the |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
| Project Design | | | costs of the project during PIR, MTR and TR. |
| | 13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning? | <p>More detail will be needed in full proposal regarding the technical and organizational approaches planned in the project. In e-waste in particular, there are a host of chemicals released and significant organizational challenges to proper e-waste management. It is unclear if and how the project will address just UPOPs from e-waste, in isolation from other issues, or conversely, how this project can sufficiently address the challenges in e-waste to enable the UPOPs reductions.</p> <p>Component 1 proposes development of a national chemicals management situation report. Unclear why this is needed since the country has a NIP. If this is a very low cost follow-up to the NIP may be justified, but full proposal needs to justify or remove this activity.</p> <p>Proposal also calls for development of guidance for proposed inventory of UPOPs in HCW from one governorate. Should instead use existing guidance and validate. This activity should be justified or removed.</p> <p>Jan 24, 2012 - Comment addressed - cleared</p> | Yes |
| | 14. Is the project framework sound and | Yes. Component 2 discusses both the | Yes |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|---|--|
| | sufficiently clear? | guidance on baseline assessment of dioxin releases developed under GEF/UNDP/WHO HCW project, and the UNEP dioxin toolkit. It will be important to use standardized methodology as presented in the UNEP toolkit. | |
| | 15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate? | Yes, but in full proposal please describe timeframes for achieving the indicative results. There is a good initial description of GEB, pending further elaboration through PPG phase: Reductions of 40g/TEQ/year for HCW and 10 g-TEQ/year increasing to 30 for ewaste. | Yes |
| | 16. 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? | Yes, the socioeconomic setting for both health care waste and ewaste is well described. Importance and risks of both sectors in terms of public health and income generation is well described. As noted above, other important and related chemicals issues within these sectors, including mercury, and impacts on vulnerable populations should be described in the full project proposal. | Yes |
| | 17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly? | Yes, there is strong emphasis on stakeholder involvement. Additional detail on, for example, percentage of health care workers who are women, and percentage of e-waste workers who are women and children, would strengthen full proposal. | Yes |
| | 18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience) | Yes. The project does not describe climate risks which would seem negligible in this context, but does a good job in describing other potential risks. | Yes |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-------------------|--|---|--|
| | 19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region? | It seems to be well coordinated with other initiatives; however, additional description of what those projects are accomplishing on UPOPs, POPs, and other chemicals, the remaining gaps, and the ways in which the project will build on these will be needed in the full proposal. | Yes |
| | 20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate? | Yes | Yes |
| | 21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes? | | Yes |
| | 22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included? | | N/A |
| Project Financing | 23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate? | <p>Yes, 10%.</p> <p>Oct. 20, 2011_PMC needs to be reduced to no more than 5% of total GEF grant.</p> <p>Jan. 5, 2012_JP GEF contribution vs. cofinancing contribution for PMC should be comparable to the overall cofinancing ratio of the project, which is over 1:4. Please adjust and make sure that future submissions follow the same principle.</p> <p>Jan 24, 2012 - Comment addressed - Cleared</p> | Yes |
| | 24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | Yes. The incremental reasoning should be elaborated upon in the full proposal, which should describe how HCW and e-waste would be managed in the absence | Yes |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
| | | of GEF funding, and how the GEF funding would allow it to be managed. | |
| | 25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided. | <p>Co-financing is indicative, type unknown, and will need to be confirmed. Non-UN co-financing is listed in Table C but is not described – more description of Swiss and Government and Private co-financing will be needed in full proposal. More importantly, we expect an increase in the contribution from Government and ask UNDP to explore this possibility with the GoE. A co-financing ratio around 1:2 would be more reasonable.</p> <p>Jan. 5, 2012_JP Overall cofinancing is brought up to 1:4, but co-financing type of 6 million is unknown. In addition, the 6 million co-financing identifies government ministries such as MoHP, MSEA, MoCIT as the potential sources, however, these ministries have already contributed 3.6 million of grant as national government. It is unclear why they are listed again under Private Sector column as potential sources of co-financing. B.5 should show clearly where the 6 million comes from to allow GEF to assess the substantiality of it.</p> <p>Jan 24, 2012 - Comment Cleared.</p> | Yes. |
| | 26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role? | Yes, UNDP providing \$100,000 in-kind. | Yes |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable? | | Yes |
| | 28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? | | Yes. Please also include monitoring of the costs of the various interventions so that the data is available to help analyse the costs of these types of projects. |
| Agency Responses | 29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from: | | |
| | • STAP? | | The STAP comments have been adequately addressed |
| | • Convention Secretariat? | | The BRS Secretariat has confirmed the eligibility and consistency with the National Implementation Plan. |
| | • Council comments? | | None Received |
| | • Other GEF Agencies? | | None Received |
| Secretariat Recommendation | | | |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage | 30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended? | <p>23 November 2010.</p> <p>Pending submission of a revised document addressing the points raised in this review in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - description of organizational and technical approaches to be used in both sectors and further elaboration of situation in absence of GEF funding. - other potential POPs releases besides UPOPs, and other chemicals eg mercury, which could be addressed in this project - Justify national chemicals management situation report and development of inventory guidance; - Justify Agency's CA on e-wastes management; - Need to increase Gov contribution; | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
| | | <p>June 20, 2011. The PIF has still not statifactorily addressed the issues raised and there is need for additional responses on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no indication of how technology will be chosen and if it will be technology transfer or investment with technical assistance etc. 2. It is not clear if new POPS will be looked at in the e-waste streams. 3. The e-waste components need to be separated into the part that will be eligible for funding under the POPS window and the part that can be funded from the SMC window. 4. The same applies to the funding for mercury from HCW and UPOPS from HCW. 5. Component 1 is a bad fit for the project since it covers a broader issue than the project is dealing with. It should be removed. 6. The project should be re-designed to address U-POPS in the healthcare and e-waste sectors, with additional components on mercury and e-waste management. 7. There should be an investment component focusing on the emission reduction technology and developing a sustainable mechanism for e-waste recycling tied into overall waste management. 8. It may be useful to look at the computer refurbishment center set up in Ethiopia as an example for developing | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|---|--|
| | | <p>sustainable e-waste management.</p> <p>9. The cofinancing being brought by the agency should also be in cash and the overall level of co-financing needs to be increased</p> <p>Oct. 20, 2011_ Revised PIF has addressed some of the above comments. Comment 7, 8, and 9 are not sufficiently addressed.</p> <p>Comment 7: The project includes activities to introduce BAT/BEP into waste processors in the country. Yet the development of a sustainable mechanism for e-waste recycling as part of overall waste management system is still weak in the current PIF. The existing activities under e-waste component is scattered in that it touches upon policy and regulation, rules for refurbishment, leaving many other aspects of the issue unmentioned, such as collection, dismantling, recovery of metal in e-waste end-of-life disposal. And how the project design takes into a holistic approach to address e-waste and waste management issue in general, replicability of results in other regions?</p> <p>Comment 8:The project should also take into account as much as possible existing or completed work . For instance, Egypt was a participating country of E-waste Africa Project by implemented by BCRC-Egypt.</p> | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
| | | <p>Comment 9:The requirement for a co-financing ratio of 1:4 or aboved has been explained to Agencies and recipient countries in several occasions. Agency is expected to adhere to this principal in all its PIFs submission.</p> <p>Based on the revised project design, the following comments need to be taken into account.</p> <p>Risks:</p> <p>1.Inadequate disassembly and recovery processes will result in harmful releases such as POPs and UPOPs, how the project takes into account potential contamination of water sources and raise mitigation measures. This shall be identified in PIF.</p> <p>Project design</p> <p>2.Activities on policy and regulatory framework have been split into different components (1.2.1/ 2.2.1 /3.2.1/3.2.3/4.2.1) due to the reason that these activities drawing on GEF resources from different pots (POPs, mercury, SCM). However, since it's probably dealing with the same government organization there needs to be an integrated approach for mainstreaming it into the national waste management policy.</p> <p>3.With the data that cable accounts for 2% e-waste, and circuit board 1.7%,it is unclear why three waste fractions of cables, integrated circuit board, and</p> | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | <p>plastics are the targeted waste fractions. Why not focusing on other significant e-waste sources like computers, mobile phones, or printers since Egypt is experiencing large increase in consuming information and communication technology products.</p> <p>Identification of stakeholders 4.As a suggestion, potential stakeholders for e-waste may include Egypt's National Cleaner Production Centers, Egyptian Electronic Recycling Co., Spear INK, Mobinil, CEDARE , and EMPA</p> <p>Please revise the PIF taking into account all of the comments so far and in the resubmission, indicate where the changes are.</p> <p>Jan. 5, 2012_JP Project design issues are resolved. Please adjust the PMC co-financing and address private sector co-financing issue.</p> <p>Jan 24, 2012 (AS)</p> <p>The pending issues for the project have been satisfactorily addressed. The PIF is being recommended for CEO clearance.</p> | |
| | 31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval. | | |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ | 32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG | | Yes |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|--|--|
| Approval | with clear information of commitment status of the PPG? | | |
| | 33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended? | | Yes |
| Review Date (s) | First review* | November 23, 2010 | October 17, 2014 |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | June 20, 2011 | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | October 20, 2011 | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | January 05, 2012 | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | January 24, 2012 | |

* **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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

| Review Criteria | Decision Points | Program Manager Comments |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| PPG Budget | 1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate? | Yes. The PPG will help refine the project objectives, outcomes and outputs as well as the work plan and budget of the project components. The PPG grant will finance discussions, meetings, assessments and assistance provided by local and international consultants, in order to improve baseline scenario mapping, cost-effectiveness and the global benefits of the project, secure co-financing for each of the project component and finalize the project's scoping and definition. |
| | 2. Is itemized budget justified? | Yes. |
| Secretariat Recommendation | 3. Is PPG approval being recommended? | Yes. |
| | 4. Other comments | |
| Review Date (s) | First review* | |
| | 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.