

Design & Appraisal Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Satisfactory
Decision:	Approve: The project is of sufficient quality to continue as planned. Any management actions must be addressed in a timely manner.
Portfolio/Project Number:	00143931
Portfolio/Project Title:	GEF VII Chemical Project on Mercury and POPs in Sri Lank
Portfolio/Project Date:	2023-08-01 / 2028-12-31

Strategic**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

1. Does the project specify how it will contribute to higher level change through linkage to the programme's Theory of Change?

- ☐ 3: The project is clearly linked to the programme's theory of change. It has an explicit change pathway that explains how the project will contribute to outcome level change and why the project's strategy will likely lead to this change. This analysis is backed by credible evidence of what works effectively in this context and includes assumptions and risks.
- ☒ **2: The project is clearly linked to the programme's theory of change. It has a change pathway that explains how the project will contribute to outcome-level change and why the project strategy will likely lead to this change.**
- ☐ 1: The project document may describe in generic terms how the project will contribute to development results, without an explicit link to the programme's theory of change.

Evidence:

A Theory of Change (P 25) has been outlined, with the overall strategy and change pathway towards achieving the identified outcomes and outputs. Attached is the final version of the project document, where the ToC is thoroughly explained.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_11Nov2022_15322_101 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_11Nov2022_15322_101.docx)	sampath.ranasinghe@undp.org	12/15/2022 12:32:00 PM

2. Is the project aligned with the UNDP Strategic Plan?

- ☐ 3: The project responds to at least one of the development settings as specified in the [Strategic Plan](#)¹ and adapts at least one [Signature Solution](#)². The project's RRF includes all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)
- ☒ **2: The project responds to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan⁴. The project's RRF includes at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)**
- ☐ 1: The project responds to a partner's identified need, but this need falls outside of the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

Evidence:

The project contributes and is linked to the New IRR F indicator (2023-2027) -

SP Output - 4.1 Natural resources protected and managed to enhance sustainable productivity and livelihoods

SP IRRF Indicator - Amount of chemicals reduced, disposed or avoided (metric tons)

Please refer page 81 of the attached Project Document for the project's RRF, which contains this indicator

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_11Nov2022_15322_102 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_11Nov2022_15322_102.docx)	sampath.ranasinghe@undp.org	12/15/2022 12:33:00 PM

3. Is the project linked to the programme outputs? (i.e., UNDAF Results Group Workplan/CPD, RPD or Strategic Plan IRRF for global projects/strategic interventions not part of a programme)

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Evidence:

The project is linked to the New CPD (2023 -2027) Outcome 2 (By 2027, people and communities in Sri Lanka, especially the vulnerable and marginalized, are more resilient to climate change and disaster risks, have enhanced water and food security, and equitably benefit from ambitious climate action and increasingly sustainable management and protection of the environment and natural resources) and the Strategic Plan/ IRRF

SP Output - 4.1 Natural resources protected and managed to enhance sustainable productivity and livelihoods

SP IRRF Indicator - Amount of chemicals reduced, disposed or avoided (metric tons)

PI see the Prodoc attached.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
---	-----------	-------------	-------------

No documents available.

Relevant

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

4. Do the project target groups leave furthest behind?

- ☐ 3: The target groups are clearly specified, prioritising discriminated, and marginalized groups left furthest behind, identified through a rigorous process based on evidence.
- ☒ 2: *The target groups are clearly specified, prioritizing groups left furthest behind.*
- ☐ 1: The target groups are not clearly specified.

Evidence:

The Project's main target groups are hospitals, local authorities, their staffs, patients, and farmers etc. a detailed description of all stakeholders, their roles, and contributions to the project and benefits from the project are provided in the stakeholder engagement mapping and plan (Annex 08). However, the project has prioritized engagement and benefits to sanitary workers, who come from low income background having no choice but to engage in high risk employment as waste workers. They are the most affected by improper handling and disposal of hazardous clinical waste. A specific Gender Action plan will be implemented to ensure that women sanitary workers are included in receiving the project benefits. The other marginalized groups that the project targets is poor subsistence farmers who overuse hazardous agro chemicals and often are the victims of non-communicable diseases including CKDU and cancers.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_11Nov2022_15322_104 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_11Nov2022_15322_104.docx)	sampath.ranasinghe@undp.org	12/15/2022 12:34:00 PM
2	PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_Annex8_StakeholderEngagementPlan_15322_104 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_Annex8_StakeholderEngagementPlan_15322_104.docx)	sampath.ranasinghe@undp.org	1/8/2023 5:12:00 PM

5. Have knowledge, good practices, and past lessons learned of UNDP and others informed the project design?

- ☐ 3: Knowledge and lessons learned backed by credible evidence from sources such as evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, and/or monitoring have been explicitly used, with appropriate referencing, to justify the approach used by the project.
- ☒ 2: *The project design mentions knowledge and lessons learned backed by evidence/sources but have not been used to justify the approach selected.*
- ☐ 1: There is little, or no mention of knowledge and lessons learned informing the project design. Any references made are anecdotal and not backed by evidence.

Evidence:

The project was developed based on the findings of an extensive baseline survey, which included capturing lessons from past initiatives, implemented by UNDP and other development partners alike. Please refer to the baseline section of the Prodoc from Section 1E starting from para 50 to 62 (pages 17-18).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	IP-HCWMRFF-22APR2021_15322_105 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/IP-HCWMRFF-22APR2021_15322_105.pdf)	sampath.ranasinghe@undp.org	12/15/2022 12:36:00 PM

6. Does UNDP have a clear advantage to engage in the role envisioned by the project vis-à-vis national / regional / global partners and other actors?

- ☐ 3: An analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area where the project intends to work, and credible evidence supports the proposed engagement of UNDP and partners through the project, including identification of potential funding partners. It is clear how results achieved by partners will complement the project's intended results and a communication strategy is in place to communicate results and raise visibility vis-à-vis key partners. Options for south-south and triangular cooperation have been considered, as appropriate. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *Some analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area where the project intends to work, and relatively limited evidence supports the proposed engagement of and division of labour between UNDP and partners through the project, with unclear funding and communications strategies or plans.*
- ☐ 1: No clear analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area that the project intends to work. There is risk that the project overlaps and/or does not coordinate with partners' interventions in this area. Options for south-south and triangular cooperation have not been considered, despite its potential relevance.

Evidence:

The project design covered a complete Stakeholder Engagement Plan that analyzed the role of each partner. Partners for this project include the national government, private sectors, and civil society organizations.
See Annex 8: Stakeholder Engagement Plan in P17 3 of Prodoc.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_11Nov2022_15322_106 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_11Nov2022_15322_106.docx)	sampath.ranasinghe@undp.org	12/15/2022 12:39:00 PM

Principled

Quality Rating: **Satisfactory**

7. Does the project apply a human rights-based approach?

- ☐ 3: The project is guided by human rights and incorporates the principles of accountability, meaningful participation, and non-discrimination in the project's strategy. The project upholds the relevant international and national laws and standards. Any potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were rigorously identified and assessed as relevant, with appropriate mitigation and management measures incorporated into project design and budget. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project is guided by human rights by prioritizing accountability, meaningful participation and non-discrimination. Potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were identified and assessed as relevant, and appropriate mitigation and management measures incorporated into the project design and budget. (both must be true)*
- ☐ 1: No evidence that the project is guided by human rights. Limited or no evidence that potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were considered.

Evidence:

The project has adhered to human rights principles, including conducted the SESP and identified the risk as moderate which is ESMF was also concluded.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PIMS6677-SriLankarevisedSESP29Nov2022- Revised15Dec_15322_107 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS6677-SriLankarevisedSESP29Nov2022-Revised15Dec_15322_107.docx)	sampanth.ranasinghe@undp.org	12/15/2022 12:42:00 PM
2	PIMS6677SRLPOPsandHCWM-ESMF_15322_107 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS6677SRLPOPsandHCWM-ESMF_15322_107.docx)	sampanth.ranasinghe@undp.org	12/15/2022 12:44:00 PM

8. Does the project use gender analysis in the project design?

- ☐ 3: A participatory gender analysis has been conducted and results from this gender analysis inform the development challenge, strategy and expected results sections of the project document. Outputs and indicators of the results framework include explicit references to gender equality, and specific indicators measure and monitor results to ensure women are fully benefitting from the project. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *A basic gender analysis has been carried out and results from this analysis are scattered (i.e., fragmented and not consistent) across the development challenge and strategy sections of the project document. The results framework may include some gender sensitive outputs and/or activities but gender inequalities are not consistently integrated across each output. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 1: The project design may or may not mention information and/or data on the differential impact of the project's development situation on gender relations, women and men, but the gender inequalities have not been clearly identified and reflected in the project document.

Evidence:

The project is a GEN 2 project, also a separate Gender Action plan has been conducted, including clear gender disaggregation has been mentioned for indicators in the RRF. Please refer Annex 10 (page 242) in the attached Prodoc.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_11Nov2022_15322_108 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_11Nov2022_15322_108.docx)	sampath.ranasinghe@undp.org	12/15/2022 12:47:00 PM

9. Did the project support the resilience and sustainability of societies and/or ecosystems?

- ☐ 3: Credible evidence that the project addresses sustainability and resilience dimensions of development challenges, which are integrated in the project strategy and design. The project reflects the interconnections between the social, economic and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. Relevant shocks, hazards and adverse social and environmental impacts have been identified and rigorously assessed with appropriate management and mitigation measures incorporated into project design and budget. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project design integrates sustainability and resilience dimensions of development challenges. Relevant shocks, hazards and adverse social and environmental impacts have been identified and assessed, and relevant management and mitigation measures incorporated into project design and budget. (both must be true)*
- ☐ 1: Sustainability and resilience dimensions and impacts were not adequately considered.

Evidence:

The project has concluded SESP and concluded the ESMF to mitigate steps to minimize risks, including update budgets. Please refer Prodoc and SESP. Please refer annexes 5 and 9 in the attached Prodoc.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_11Nov2022_15322_109 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_11Nov2022_15322_109.docx)	sampath.ranasinghe@undp.org	12/15/2022 12:48:00 PM
2	PIMS6677-SriLankarevisedSESP29Nov2022- Revised15Dec_15322_109 (<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS6677-SriLankarevisedSESP29Nov2022-
Revised15Dec_15322_109.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS6677-SriLankarevisedSESP29Nov2022- Revised15Dec_15322_109.docx)	sampath.ranasinghe@undp.org	12/15/2022 12:49:00 PM

10. Has the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) been conducted to identify potential social and environmental impacts and risks? The SESP is not required for projects in which UNDP is Administrative Agent only and/or projects comprised solely of reports, coordination of events, trainings, workshops, meetings, conferences and/or communication materials and information dissemination. [if yes, upload the completed checklist. If SESP is not required, provide the reason for the exemption in the evidence section.]

- ☒ Yes
☐ No
☐ SESP not required because project consists solely of (Select all exemption criteria that apply)
- ☐ 1: Preparation and dissemination of reports, documents and communication materials
 - ☐ 2: Organization of an event, workshop, training
 - ☐ 3: Strengthening capacities of partners to participate in international negotiations and conferences
 - ☐ 4: Partnership coordination (including UN coordination) and management of networks
 - ☐ 5: Global/regional projects with no country-level activities(e.g.activities such as knowledge management, inter-governmental processes)
 - ☐ 6: UNDP serves as Administrative Agent
 - ☐ 7: Development Effectiveness projects and Institutional Effectiveness projects

Evidence:

SESP is attached.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Risk Category	Risk Requirements	Document Status	Modified By	Modified On
1	PIMS 6677-SriLankarevised SESP 29Nov2022-Revised15 Dec_15322_110 (http://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFor mDocuments/PI MS6677-Sri Lanka revised SES P29Nov2022-Rev ised15Dec_15322_110.docx)	Substantial	Human Rights; Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment; Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management; Climate Change and Disaster Risks; Community Health, Safety and Security; Cultural Heritage; Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency; Sustainability and Resilience; Accountability; Labour and Working Conditions	Draft	sampath.ranasinghe@undp.org	12/15/2022 1:00:00 PM

Management & Monitoring

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

11. Does the project have a strong results framework?

- ☐ 3: The project's selection of outputs and activities are at an appropriate level. Outputs are accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure the key expected development changes, each with credible data sources and populated baselines and targets, including gender sensitive, target group focused, sex-disaggregated indicators where appropriate. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project's selection of outputs and activities are at an appropriate level. Outputs are accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators, but baselines, targets and data sources may not yet be fully specified. Some use of target group focused, sex-disaggregated indicators, as appropriate. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 1: The project's selection of outputs and activities are not at an appropriate level; outputs are not accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure the expected change and have not been populated with baselines and targets; data sources are not specified, and/or no gender sensitive, sex-disaggregation of indicators. (if any is true)

Evidence:

.The project has a well thought out Results Framework, that is in line with the project's theory of change and includes indicators to monitor key project objectives and outcomes. Please refer pages 81 - 85 of the Project Document for the Results Framework.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_11Nov2022_15322_111 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_11Nov2022_15322_111.docx)	sampanth.ranasinghe@undp.org	12/15/2022 1:01:00 PM

12. Is the project's governance mechanism clearly defined in the project document, including composition of the project board?

- ☐ 3: The project's governance mechanism is fully defined. Individuals have been specified for each position in the governance mechanism (especially all members of the project board.) Project Board members have agreed on their roles and responsibilities as specified in the terms of reference. The ToR of the project board has been attached to the project document. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project's governance mechanism is defined; specific institutions are noted as holding key governance roles, but individuals may not have been specified yet. The project document lists the most important responsibilities of the project board, project director/manager and quality assurance roles. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 1: The project's governance mechanism is loosely defined in the project document, only mentioning key roles that will need to be filled at a later date. No information on the responsibilities of key positions in the governance mechanism is provided.

Evidence:

Yes governance mechanism clearly stated in the pro doc under section VIII in page 101-107. This project will be executed as an 'Assisted NIM' following UNDP's National Implementation Modality (NIM) with the Ministry of Environment (MOE) as the Implementing Partner (IP). ToR of key staff included in the Prodoc.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_11Nov2022_15322_112 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_11Nov2022_15322_112.docx)	sampath.ranasinghe@undp.org	12/15/2022 1:02:00 PM

13. Have the project risks been identified with clear plans stated to manage and mitigate each risk?

- ☐ 3: Project risks related to the achievement of results are fully described in the project risk log, based on comprehensive analysis drawing on the programme's theory of change, Social and Environmental Standards and screening, situation analysis, capacity assessments and other analysis such as funding potential and reputational risk. Risks have been identified through a consultative process with key internal and external stakeholders, including consultation with the UNDP Security Office as required. Clear and complete plan in place to manage and mitigate each risk, including security risks, reflected in project budgeting and monitoring plans. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: *Project risks related to the achievement of results are identified in the initial project risk log based on a minimum level of analysis and consultation, with mitigation measures identified for each risk.*
- ☐ 1: Some risks may be identified in the initial project risk log, but no evidence of consultation or analysis and no clear risk mitigation measures identified. This option is also selected if risks are not clearly identified, no initial risk log is included with the project document and/or no security risk management process has taken place for the project.

Evidence:

A detailed Risk Log has been completed, based on a thorough risk analysis - refer Annex 6 on page 150 of the Prodoc.

In addition, a Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) has also been conducted.

SESP has categorized this project as a Substantial Risk. A series of Risk Mitigation/Avoidance Mechanisms have been proposed in line with the SES Policy. See section XII of the Prodoc.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_11Nov2022_15322_113 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_11Nov2022_15322_113.docx)	sampath.ranasinghe@undp.org	12/15/2022 1:04:00 PM

Efficient**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

14. Have specific measures for ensuring cost-efficient use of resources been explicitly mentioned as part of the project design? This can include, for example:

- i) Using the theory of change analysis to explore different options of achieving the maximum results with the resources available.
- ii) Using a portfolio management approach to improve cost effectiveness through synergies with other interventions.
- iii) Through joint operations (e.g., monitoring or procurement) with other partners.
- iv) Sharing resources or coordinating delivery with other projects.
- v) Using innovative approaches and technologies to reduce the cost of service delivery or other types of interventions.

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Evidence:

Yes. Cost efficiencies have been considered where possible, in the design of the project.

For example, the project has ensured the following:

- i) Leveraging private sector investments to achieve project results.
- ii) A single project management unit will be set up to manage the GEF VII chemical management Project and the low-carbon municipal solid waste management and resource recovery project funded by KEITI where multiple synergies have been identified.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SriLankaMSWMPProjectProposal_15thJanuary2023_Final_15322_114 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SriLankaMSWMPProjectProposal_15thJanuary2023_Final_15322_114.pdf)	sampath.ranasinghe@undp.org	1/16/2023 3:52:00 PM

15. Is the budget justified and supported with valid estimates?

- ☐ 3: The project's budget is at the activity level with funding sources, and is specified for the duration of the project period in a multi-year budget. Realistic resource mobilisation plans are in place to fill unfunded components. Costs are supported with valid estimates using benchmarks from similar projects or activities. Cost implications from inflation and foreign exchange exposure have been estimated and incorporated in the budget. Adequate costs for monitoring, evaluation, communications and security have been incorporated.
- ☒ 2: *The project's budget is at the activity level with funding sources, when possible, and is specified for the duration of the project in a multi-year budget, but no funding plan is in place. Costs are supported with valid estimates based on prevailing rates.*
- ☐ 1: The project's budget is not specified at the activity level, and/or may not be captured in a multi-year budget.

Evidence:

A detailed budget for the GEF trust fund is included in the project document. See P111 of Prodoc for details.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

16. Is the Country Office / Regional Hub / Global Project fully recovering the costs involved with project implementation?

- ☐ 3: The budget fully covers all project costs that are attributable to the project, including programme management and development effectiveness services related to strategic country programme planning, quality assurance, pipeline development, policy advocacy services, finance, procurement, human resources, administration, issuance of contracts, security, travel, assets, general services, information and communications based on full costing in accordance with prevailing UNDP policies (i.e., UPL, LPL.)
- ☒ **2: The budget covers significant project costs that are attributable to the project based on prevailing UNDP policies (i.e., UPL, LPL) as relevant.**
- ☐ 1: The budget does not adequately cover project costs that are attributable to the project, and UNDP is cross-subsidizing the project.

Evidence:

The funding comes from GEF. The project budget covers all major expenditures and expenditure categories anticipated as part of the project. Also, UNDP will be providing in-kind co-financing to cover some staff costing.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Effective**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

17. Have targeted groups been engaged in the design of the project?

- ☐ 3: Credible evidence that all targeted groups, prioritising discriminated and marginalized populations that will be involved in or affected by the project, have been actively engaged in the design of the project. The project has an explicit strategy to identify, engage and ensure the meaningful participation of target groups as stakeholders throughout the project, including through monitoring and decision-making (e.g., representation on the project board, inclusion in samples for evaluations, etc.)
- ☒ 2: *Some evidence that key targeted groups have been consulted in the design of the project.*
- ☐ 1: No evidence of engagement with targeted groups during project design.
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evidence:

Consultation with key targeted groups was completed during PPG. Please refer to Annex 8 of the Project document - the Stakeholder Engagement plan - for details

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_11Nov2022_15322_117 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_11Nov2022_15322_117.docx)	sampath.ranasinghe@undp.org	12/15/2022 1:06:00 PM

18. Does the project plan for adaptation and course correction if regular monitoring activities, evaluation, and lesson learned demonstrate there are better approaches to achieve the intended results and/or circumstances change during implementation?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Evidence:

This project will be regularly monitored, strictly following UNDP and GEF's policies on monitoring. The project results, corresponding indicators, and mid-term and end-of-project targets in the Project Results Framework will be monitored annually and evaluated periodically during project implementation.

The project, by design, has built in the necessary provisions to enable adaptive measures, to bring the project back on track. If through regular monitoring activities, there is a need for course corrections, the Project Board will be consulted to obtain approval for the recommended corrective actions. Upon receipt of approval from the GEF Secretariat, the necessary course correction activities will be implemented.

The budgeted Monitoring Plan included on page 86, details, the roles, responsibilities, and frequency of monitoring project results.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_28Dec20221_15322_118 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_28Dec20221_15322_118.docx)	sampath.ranasinghe@undp.org	1/16/2023 4:09:00 PM

19. The gender marker for all project outputs are scored at GEN2 or GEN3, indicating that gender has been fully mainstreamed into all project outputs at a minimum.

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Evidence:

It's a GEN2 project and a gender specialist was hired to make sure that gender mainstreaming is considered during project design. See attached gender analysis and action plan for details in Annex 10.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_11Nov2022_15322_119 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_11Nov2022_15322_119.docx)	sampath.ranasinghe@undp.org	12/15/2022 1:07:00 PM

Sustainability & National Ownership**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

20. Have national / regional / global partners led, or proactively engaged in, the design of the project?

- ☒ **3: National partners (or regional/global partners for regional and global projects) have full ownership of the project and led the process of the development of the project jointly with UNDP.**
- ☐ 2: The project has been developed by UNDP in close consultation with national / regional / global partners.
- ☐ 1: The project has been developed by UNDP with limited or no engagement with national partners.

Evidence:

The project was designed in very close partnership with key government stakeholders. The project will be implemented under a CO Support to NIM modality, and the Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Health, and Central Environment Authority will take full ownership of the project for implementation, with a supportive role played by UNDP. See Section VIII -governance and management arrangements in the Pro D oc.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_11Nov2022_15322_120 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS6677SriLankaPOPsPesticidesandHCWM_ProDoc_11Nov2022_15322_120.docx)	sampath.ranasinghe@undp.org	12/15/2022 2:40:00 PM

21. Are key institutions and systems identified, and is there a strategy for strengthening specific / comprehensive capacities based on capacity assessments conducted?

- ☐ 3: The project has a strategy for strengthening specific capacities of national institutions and/or actors based on a completed capacity assessment. This strategy includes an approach to regularly monitor national capacities using clear indicators and rigorous methods of data collection, and adjust the strategy to strengthen national capacities accordingly.
- ☒ 2: *A capacity assessment has been completed. There are plans to develop a strategy to strengthen specific capacities of national institutions and/or actors based on the results of the capacity assessment.*
- ☐ 1: Capacity assessments have not been carried out.
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evidence:

A PCAT and micro assessment have been conducted on the Ministry of Environment. The PCAT and micro assessment indicated a "moderate risk rating". There are plans to develop a strategy to strengthen specific capacities of national institutions and/or actors based on the results of the capacity assessment.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	GEF6677-MOEPCAT2022-12-10_15322_121 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/GEF6677-MOEPCAT2022-12-10_15322_121.xlsm)	sampath.ranasinghe@undp.org	12/15/2022 2:37:00 PM
2	HACT-MicroAssessment-MoE25-05-2021_15322_121 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/HACT-MicroAssessment-MoE25-05-2021_15322_121.pdf)	sampath.ranasinghe@undp.org	12/15/2022 2:39:00 PM

22. Is there is a clear strategy embedded in the project specifying how the project will use national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluations, etc.,) to the extent possible?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evidence:

According to the GEF requirements, there's a full set of regulations from both GEF and the national implementing partner. The Ministry of Environment (MOE), the Implementing Partner is responsible for executing the project, including the procurement of goods and services, and human resources, with select Responsible Parties supporting implementation. The Ministry of Environment also has a clear policy document concerning the management of international funds. Thus this project will make sure to follow both.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

23. Is there a clear transition arrangement / phase-out plan developed with key stakeholders in order to sustain or scale up results (including resource mobilisation and communications strategy)?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Evidence:

A sustainability and replication strategy is built into the project design. Accordingly, the project has an objective of promoting best practices through strengthening institutional capacities, which enforce regulations on the management of POPs, Mercury and other chemicals of concern, deploying environmentally sound management strategies and systems for mercury-containing wastes in the Healthcare sector including phase-out the use of mercury-added products, piloting management strategies for recycling and reduction of UPOP emission and treatment of infectious waste aligning the immediate COVID-19 response to long-term health care waste management, strengthening of information and data management systems that inform monitoring and reporting of chemicals waste management.

Thus, strengthening institutional capacities, coordination and information management systems will help the government to minimize the illegal import of banned chemicals under the Stockholm and Minamata conventions and the project will assist the government to put in place a plan to continually update the information management system and build capacities of relevant stakeholders. The project will demonstrate PPP for the final disposal of healthcare waste management to convince the government and the private sector to invest in such facilities and also develop a financial framework to support replication. Further, the green procurement standards and innovative financing scheme to support local facilities in Sri Lanka to expedite and scale up the replacement of mercury-containing devices and products in line with the baseline National Policies set by the MoH, to ensure long-term sustainability. The demonstration medical facilities will also capture and share awareness and training materials and guidance documents for long-term, post-GEF-funded sustainability.

Accordingly, the ProDoc describes how important project results will be sustained, replicated or even scaled up, where possible.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

QA Summary/LPAC Comments

This project contributes to UNSDCF OUTCOME 3/UNDP OUTCOME 2. This project directly supports national priorities in healthcare waste management, including Mercury and POPs in the agriculture sector and is in line with international conventions like Minamata and Stockholm. Also, the results and benefits generated by the Project will contribute to Sustainable Development Goals 3 (Good Health and Well-being), 9 (Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure) and 12 (Responsible Consumption and Production). Strong Healthcare Waste Management (HCWM) has a direct impact on providing safe working conditions for women (Goal 5 Gender Equality and Goal 8 Decent Work and Economic Growth).

The Project will collect experiences and lessons learned from relevant GEF projects implemented (e.g., GEF project IDs 10349, 4611 and 1802) as well as international best practices in the area to roll out relevant Knowledge Management Plans and improve the replication of successful experiences. Specifically, the project will identify potentially replicable or adaptable strategies, approaches, and methodologies that have worked well internationally, which would include BAT/BEP, business models, standards and guidelines knowledge management products.

During the project formulation phase, in-depth stakeholder consultations were carried out to develop project outcomes, outputs, activities and institutional arrangements for the project. Accordingly, the Project will work with different partners from both the public and private sector to achieve the project results. The stakeholders, identified in the stakeholder engagement plan, will continue being engaged during project implementation. Environmental and social safeguards have been assessed and measures have been outlined to address and minimize risks. To guarantee that the project activities are both gender-responsive and sensitive, a gender analysis was carried out, and a gender action plan was subsequently prepared. A grievance redress process for the project will be developed based on the currently in existence locally acceptable and UNDP methods to give a forum for expressing any issues specific to the project and have a transparent system to resolve such grievances.