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**Context, background and findings**

The Midterm Review (MTR) of the Project was conducted by an independent consultant, Mr. Peder Bisbjerg between October-18 and March-19. Upon submission of the draft MTR report, comments from project partners, teams and UNDP-GEF were received and satisfactorily incorporated into the final MTR report as reported in the audit trail annexed to the final MTR report.

Presented in the Ratings and Achievements summary table of the final MTR report, the project progress is rated in different criteria as:

* Satisfactory in Progress Towards Results;
* Satisfactory in Project Implementation & Adaptive Management;
* Likely for Sustainability

Final MTR report is finalized with fourteen (14) recommendations but only four (4) recommendations (recommendation number A1, A2 and B1, B2) target the regional component, implemented by UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub. The management response for the regional component is prepared and addresses the key evaluation recommendations. National components will separately prepare management responses concerning the respective national component to be followed up by UNDP Country Offices.

**Recommendations and management response**

|  |
| --- |
| **Midterm Review recommendation 1 (Rec A.1.)**The placement of sterilised waste on a dumpsite or landfill, without any change of physical form is clearly a concern to all project countries. To fully utilise the autoclaves, it is clear that the sterilised waste must be shredded or otherwise altered prior to landfilling. The Regional Project Team is already aware of this and shredders are included in the new *Catalogue of HCWM Equipment*, so that the countries will receive shredder during the second project phase. For areas where there are several autoclaving facilities within one city, it should be examined whether one shredder could be installed at either the landfill or a central location and handle all the sterilized waste.  |
| **Management response:** Recommendation is relevant based on project’s findings therefore the regional project team has already included shredders in the updated catalogue of HCWM equipment. BoQ of 2nd round of central procurement of HCWM equipment was prepared to include 7 shredders for three project countries (Ghana, Madagascar and Zambia). Tanzania opted for local procurement of compacters/balers on same purpose to alter the physical appearance of the treated waste.  |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame [month, year to month, year]** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking[[2]](#footnote-2)** |
| **Comments** | **Status[[3]](#footnote-3)** |
| 1. Finalization of procurement and installations of shredders (in Ghana, Madagascar and Zambia) and compacters/balers (in Tanzania) | April 2019 – August 2019 | Regional Project Management Unit |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Midterm Review recommendation 2 (Rec A.2.)**There are clearly issues with the availability of a local service technicians from TTM to provide maintenance and repair services for the autoclaves. During the MTR visits, this was an issue in Ghana, Madagascar and Tanzania. It is essential that this issue is resolved with the TTM main office. |
| **Management response**: Recommendation is accepted. The regional project team has already communicated with the contractor, TTM on this issue and also organized three separate calls (virtual meetings) together with representatives of TTM and national teams of four countries to discuss on issues related to operationalization and maintenance of the autoclave equipment. Specifically, on this recommendation, there has been an agreed plan of communication and action (with TTM and national teams) in cases of non-responsiveness of the local agent to any service request. Project’s additional response to the MTR recommendation, would be that regional project team can also prepare a SOP document 1) to clarify roles and responsibilities of contractor, local agent and requestors for the provision of maintenance service; and 2) to clarify communication line among different stakeholders – TTM, its local agents and national stakeholders - in cases of non-responsiveness to maintenance requests in the countries. |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame [month, year to month, year]** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 1. Preparation and dissemination of SOP for maintenance service requests and related communication/action plan in case of non-responsiveness by the local service providers. | April 2019 – May 2019 | Regional Project Management Unit |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Midterm Review recommendation 3 (Rec B.1.)**The Project Document states that “an additional 12 rural health posts are to be supported during the second phase of the project.” It is strongly recommended that the project focusses on larger hospitals in the second phase. Rural health posts may be able to properly segregate and handle their infectious waste, but the quantities of waste they generate is small and the costs of bringing this waste to an autoclave facility are prohibitive. |
| **Management response**: Recommendation is well accepted and in line with the decisions taken in the last regional project meeting (Dec-18 in Ghana). Therefore, as agreed with national partners, the project has only included only 6 large hospitals as pilot hospitals of second phase; 3 hospitals in Ghana, 2 hospitals in Madagascar and 1 hospital in Tanzania. |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame [month, year to month, year]** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 1. Selection of larger and central hospitals during in the second phase | April 2019-April 2019 | Regional Project Management Unit | Agreed with national partners, in the second phase of the project, only 6 large hospitals were selected as pilot facilities; 3 hospitals in Ghana, 2 hospitals in Madagascar and 1 hospital in Tanzania. | Completed |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Midterm Review recommendation 4. (Rec B.2.)**The Project Document recommends to “Increase composting activities, which will significantly reduce the volume of the waste that needs to be transported to the landfill/dump site. Organic waste makes up the majority of HCF waste. By developing composting activities on the premises, HCFs could reduce waste collection rates charged by the municipal service providers, while generating some additional income through the sale of compost.” This advice should be disregarded. While it is environmentally sound guidance to collect and treat organic waste, this activity, like other forms of waste treatment, costs money and it is very unlikely that the compost can be sold. Therefore, the Regional Project Team should only encourage the on-site composting of garden waste (not food waste) for use within the hospitals’ green areas. |
| **Management response**: Recommendation is discussed and agreed by all project stakeholders during the last regional project meeting (Dec-18 in Ghana) and in line with the recommendations of regional expert team. Therefore, composting activities indicated in the Project Document will not be implemented in the second phase of the project. Instead, the project will continue to encourage bio-digestion activities and possibly expand the bio-digestion activities both in Tanzania and Madagascar. |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame [month, year to month, year]** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 1. Removal of composting activities and inclusion of bio-digestion activities in the annual workplan. | April 2019-April 2019 | Regional Project Management Unit | Support to compost activities are removed and bio-digestion activities are already included in the annual work plan. | Completed |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. This template is in alignment with the [Management Response Template](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/documents/templates/Independent-Evaluation-Management-response.doc) for UNDP project-level evaluations in the Evaluation Resource Centre. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. If the MTR is uploaded to the ERC, the status of implementation is tracked electronically in the Evaluation Resource Centre database (ERC). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Status of Implementation: Completed, Partially Completed, Pending. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)