**Review of implementation of healthcare waste management investments**

October 2024

**Objectives:**

The objective is to assess and verify the implementation of Global Fund (GF) approved healthcare waste management investments, including identifying critical gaps and recommending actions to ensure effective healthcare waste management. This includes visit of sites to verify implementation and reporting of accurate results for indicator: *Number of waste management treatment sites equipped and functional that were supported by Global Fund investments*.

The review focuses on verifying the progress and adequacy of the implementation of GF funded investments in health care waste management and infrastructure. For an assessment of the country’s waste management system and practices overall, please refer to the [ToR *‘Assessment of Health Care Waste Management’*](https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/11965/lfa_health-care-waste-management-assessment_tor_en.docx) and the related [assessment tool](https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/11964/lfa_health-care-waste-management-assessment_tool_en.xlsx).

**Scope of Review:**

***[detailed scope to be agreed with the Country Team prior to commencing the review]*:**

If the performance framework includes a Work Plan Tracking Measure (WPTM) that reflects a high investment in the areas of healthcare waste management which is perceived to be high risk, consider including its verification in the spot check.

The scope of work includes review of available documentation, interaction with national partners and site visits, aiming to assess:

1. Waste Investments, including:
   1. Readiness: in-country progress in terms of Budget and Planning, Institutional and Organizational Capacity, National Planning and Baseline Data, Regulatory Framework, Guidance, Training and Competence
   2. Implementation of healthcare waste management investments
   3. Effectiveness of Waste Storage, Collection and Transport, and Waste Treatment and Disposal
2. Waste infrastructure investments, including:
   1. Whether implementers carried out the required studies and site assessments
   2. Procurement processes
   3. Construction, Installation and Commissioning
   4. Post-construction: whether the infrastructure is operating as intended, including adequacy of maintenance, spare parts, personnel etc.
3. Site visits to assess reporting system and to verify reporting of results for indicator:*Number of waste management treatment sites equipped and functional that were supported by Global Fund investments*.

Please consider the following definitions:

*Equipped* – An incinerator, autoclave or other alternative form of treatment has been installed and commissioned

*Functional* – The waste treatment equipment is understood to be processing healthcare waste on a planned basis and is operated in accordance with manufacturer guidelines

Site selection should include those that report on the above indicator and will be country/investment specific. The LFA and Global Fund Country Team should agree on the number of sites to be visited depending on total number of sites in the country.

**Tasks:**

1. As part of the Scope of Review, please answer the questions in the *Review Tool* to assess the portfolio’s implementation progress.

1. In case of reporting against the indicator *Number of waste management treatment sites equipped and functional that were supported by Global Fund investments,* please describe the reporting system put in place to report results and verify accurate reporting.

Furthermore, the below table contains questions for the verification of data reporting related to indicator: *Number of waste management treatment sites equipped and functional that were supported by Global Fund investments.* The questions in the table are to guide and assist the LFA in gathering the relevant information related to the verification of the indicator. Please note that the below is not an exhaustive list of questions the LFA should address in the review of the indicator.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Purpose | Question | Response and comments |
| Confirm that appropriate data reporting mechanism has been established to correctly report against this indicator | Has an adequate reporting system been put in place to report against this indicator? Briefly describe it and highlighted any issues/risks, as relevant. |  |
| What is the total number of sites reported at national level? |  |
| What is the total number of sites visited by the LFA that reported against this indicator? |  |
| Are source documents at the site available to verify reporting? |  |
| Is there evidence of appropriate equipment and functionality when reporting against this indicator? |  |
| Confirm if site is equipped | * Is the installed waste treatment equipment as specified in the requisition/order? * Is there a shipment note? * Is there a delivery receipt? * Is there an installation record (ideally from the supplier)? * Is there a record that the equipment was successfully commissioned (ideally from the supplier)? * Are there any as-built drawings? |  |
| Confirm if site is functional | * Is the equipment operational and actively processing waste? * Is the equipment operating without major unplanned downtime? * Is there an operating manual? * Are there waste processing records (i.e. including inbound and outbound weights)? |  |

**Deliverable(s):**

The report should address each of the points listed under the scope of review/list of tasks in the Implementation Assurance Tool, as per the Global Fund request, and supplemented by other relevant information. It should include without limitation:

1. A detailed description and analysis of issues/risks identified. The LFA should comment on the context and root causes of the issues identified, providing background information as necessary and prioritise the list of issues in an executive summary according to their significance.
2. The LFA should review the budget for the elements in the Implementation Assurance Tool to identify any gaps in the budget that could pose a risk to full commissioning of waste management solutions and equipment.
3. Detailed description of reporting system put in place to report against the selected indicator, highlighting critical issues/risks that need to be addressed. Please list the issues/risks and recommended actions in order of priority.
4. Based on the sites visited, the LFA should comment on the reliability of the data reported against the verified indicator.
5. Recommendations for addressing issues identified. Recommendations should be:

* Detailed – with all the relevant information included
* Specific and contextualised
* Time-bound
* Prioritized based on the level of risk
* Identifying the main entity responsible for implementation

**Required background reading**:

* Relevant Global Fund grant documents and PR program updates, national waste management plans, road maps and strategies, Waste Management Technical Working Group documents related to in-country capacities and solutions.
* The PR’s healthcare waste plans and monitoring reports of treatment facilities and equipment.
* The relevant [Global Fund’s guidance documents on Waste Management](https://www.theglobalfund.org/en/covid-19/response-mechanism/health-care-waste-management/).

**Service Delivery**:

This review will be executed by the designated LFA PSMexpert (or equivalent designate who ideally has healthcare waste management expertise) accountable for the technical content of this report. S/he can be supported by other LFA team members in the planning and during the verification. The LoE for this task, including report writing, depends on which elements of the ToR and the number and location of service delivery sites included in the review, as agreed between the Global Fund country team and the LFA.

If the review identifies clear evidence of fraud, the LFA should use the Global Fund Communication Protocol to inform the Global Fund Secretariat and the OIG to allow evidence collection and other issues relevant to a possible criminal investigation.