

Phasing out mercury measuring devices in healthcare

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10716

Countries

Global (Burkina Faso, India, Montenegro, Uganda, Albania)

Project Name

Phasing out mercury measuring devices in healthcare

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

12/10/2021

Review completed by PM

5/4/2022

Program Manager

Anil Sookdeo

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

Project Type

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes, some minor changes have been made which are well explained and in line with the objectives of the project.

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description

of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Please provide the co-financing letters.

Agency Response

11 Feb 2022

Missing co-financing letters provided in resubmission.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Provided

Agency Response

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, there is an increase in the expected GEB's from the PIF and information on the total tons of medical devices to be managed by the project has been provided in sub-indicator 9.6.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, Mercury in medical devices is to be phased out in accordance with the requirements of the Minamata Convention.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Provided.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, all related projects have been identified and alignment with the UNDP-implemented project in China: GEF 10349 ? Demonstration of production phase-out of mercury-containing medical thermometers and sphygmomanometers and promoting the application of mercury-free alternatives in medical facilities in China has been done. The institutional arrangements have also been fully described with a note that the executing agency WHO will also be involved in the execution of the UNDP project thereby ensuring alignment of the work in both projects which have a shared goal of phasing out the production and use of mercury containing medical devices.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response
Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response
Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, however please provide the co-financing letters.

Agency Response
11 Feb 2022

Missing co-financing letters provided in resubmission.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request The results framework is clear.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1. On Project Information: the duration does not match the expected start/end date ? please amend so the time between these will be 60 months.
2. Focal Area outcomes in Table A are missed ? please amend.
3. The budget is not possible to read as it uses a different format ? as it is, one cannot assess the reasonability of each budget line charged to the different sources (project?s components ? M&E ? PMC).. Please request the agency to use a template that can be reviewed by the secretariat (like the one provided in the guidelines) ? then we will provide comments as appropriate.
4. On the Utilization of PPG: please note that this section requires ?detailed funding amount of the PPG activities ?? -; It is explained that ?costs associated with the work of ? a Project Executing Entity? - WHO is the executing agency and seems that there is a subcontract with WHO, please clarify.
5. The M&E budget table (in section 9) is missing the total.
6. On the PMC proportionality: There is no proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5.0%, for a co-financing of \$122,199,426 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$6,109,971 instead of \$4,142,250 (which is 3.3%). As the costs associated with the project management must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion
7. Core Indicators :
 - (i) GEF Core Indicator 9 target in core indicator table is 29.2. This seems not to be exactly aligned with Results Framework target. In addition, the agency should explicitly mention the GEF Core Indicators in the Results Framework in Annex A.
 - (ii) GEF Core Indicator 11 (Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment) target - please include CEO Endorsement level targets in the Results Framework, aligned with those targets found in Core Indicator Table. GEF Core Indicators should be explicitly mentioned in the Results Framework in Annex A.

(iii) In addition, in respect to CI 11, the agency provided some explanation for calculation of core indicator 11 target. The number seems too high. Can the agency confirm in the explanation that these 3.6 million people are direct beneficiaries?

8. Co-financing:

(i) Gov't of India: change 'Recurrent expenditures' to 'Investment mobilized'.

(ii) Gov't of Uganda: change 'Public investment' to 'In-kind'.

(iii) Describe how any 'Investment Mobilized' was identified: add info about the Gov't India's co-financing info.

9. Environmental and Social Safeguards: We note that the project overall ESS risk is classified as low, and UNEP attached Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF). The SRIF, however, does not include the safeguard screening review by the safeguard team as UNEP's usual practice. Please clarify whether the safeguard team reviewed the ESS screening and risk mitigation plan at the CEO Endorsement stage and changes of overall ESS risk classification from moderate to low.

May 4th, 2022 - Project to be returned to the Agency because while some comments provided on March 10th, other comments were not:

1. One co-financing comment has not been addressed and there is no response provided.

India: Ministry of Health and Social Welfare \$106.05M Investment Mobilized.

o No further info about this co-financing has been provided except the info provided in the ministry co-financing letter stating 'As per a recent report shared by WHO, India has spent approximately USD 106.05 million on non-mercury thermometers and sphygmomanometers in the recent past as a part of its commitment under Minamata Convention.'

o Based on this info (in the absence of further info about the co-financing), if the ministry wishes to report this amount as co-financing, please do so as 'in-kind' and 'recurrent expenditures'. (Note: these categories may not appear to be the right descriptions, but given the lack of detailed financing info, if the ministry wishes to report the amount as co-financing, please report the amount as 'in-kind')

2. Project Expected Implementation Start Date has now past:

3. Budget table: administrative support cannot be covered by GEF funds. Please remove it and cover it with co-financing resources.

May 11, 2022 - Comments addressed.

Agency Response

7 April 2022

1. The project implementation dates have now been amended to 1 Apr 22 - 31 Mar 27
2. Focal area outcome in Table A added
3. The budget format has been completely revised and is attached
4. PPG activities conducted have been included
5. Totals have been added to the M&E budget.
6. The co-financing budget has been revised. PMC co-finance allocation is now USD 6,016,275, which represents 5 % of the co-finance subtotal.
7. Core Indicators:
 - (i) 28.3 tonnes has been changed to 29.2 tonnes in the Results Framework. GEF indicators have been added in parenthesis as well as in the indicator column at Project Objective level.
 - (ii) Indicator 11 has been added to the Project Objective level in Results Framework.
 - (iii) Indicator 11 has been reduced to 1.8 m. The justification in CEO endorsement document has been updated in sections E and 1a.6.
8. Co-financing:
 - (i) GOI co-financing has been changed to "investment mobilized" in table C and Appendix 5.
 - (ii) GOU co-financing has been changed to "in-kind" in table C and Appendix 5. GMP and WHO contributions have also been changed to "in-kind".
 - (iii) The following text has been added to the CEO endorsement document: "India's investment mobilised represents the total amount of Hg-free devices to be procured for use at public healthcare facilities within the timeframe of the project. The value was calculated as part of India medical devices study (Appendix 12e) and reflects full adoption of Hg-free devices."
9. The approved SRIF is attached. The overall ESS risk is classified as low.

9 May 2022

1. Co-financing contribution from the government of India has been revised to recurrent expenditures.
2. Project expected implementation start date has been revised.
3. Budget table has been revised and administrative support has been removed. A Project Assistant post has been added and charged against PMCs as this is an eligible PMC and the post will assist the Project Manager in execution activities.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Council Comments have been fully addressed

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request STAP comments have been addressed

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Provided

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Provided

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please provide the co-financing letters.

March 11, 2022 - Please see PPO comments.

May 4, 2022 - Please address remaining PPO comments.

May 11, 2022 - PPO comments addressed and project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/17/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/11/2022	

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)	5/4/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/11/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations