

# Phasing out mercury measuring devices in healthcare

Review PIF 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**

9/28/2020

**Review completed by PM**

10/23/2020

**Program Manager**

Anil Sookdeo

**Focal Area**

Chemicals and Waste

**Project Type**

FSP

## **PIF**

### **Part I – Project Information**

#### **Focal area elements**

**1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, the project seeks to phase out the use of mercury in medical devices.

Agency Response

**Indicative project/program description summary**

**2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes

Agency Response

**Co-financing**

**3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes

Agency Response

**GEF Resource Availability**

**4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes

Agency Response

**The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

**The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

**Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

**Project Preparation Grant**

**5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion The PPG request is within the allowable cap.

Agency Response

**Core indicators**

**6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The core indicator for mercury is clear. Please include in 9.6 the estimate tons of material contaminated with mercury. Please clarify if there are benefits to core indicator 10 and if so please provide an estimate.

October 22, 2020 - comment addressed.

Agency Response

**21.10.2020**

The following text has been added to the core indicators justification and the GEB section: “Sub-indicator 9.6 estimates include the total mass of equipment containing mercury. To calculate this value, we estimate the weight of a single thermometer as 15 grams and the weight of a single sphygmomanometer as 500 grams. Applying the same assumptions as above, this results in a total 98,358 kg Hg-contaminated material avoided.”

Benefits for core indicator 10 will be estimated during PPG

**Project/Program taxonomy**

**7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes.

Agency Response

**Part II – Project Justification**

**1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

**2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, however in the description please also identify how the China project (10349) contributes to the global baseline.

October 22, 2020 - Comment addressed.

## Agency Response

**21.10.2020**

The following text has been added to the associated baseline projects section: “In addition, one other project is currently in the PPG having had the concept approved on 20 November 2019 (GEF 10349). The project ‘Demonstration of phase-out of mercury-containing medical thermometers and sphygmomanometers and promoting the application of mercury-free alternatives in medical facilities in China’ will be executed over 60 months and supported with USD 16 million in GEF resources. The project structure of 10349 is analogous to that proposed here, having included outputs related to improved procurement, support for manufacturers, and the responsible management of mercury-contaminated wastes. This shared approach will facilitate knowledge sharing across projects as lessons learned could be immediately applicable. China is the world’s largest manufacturer of mercury-added medical devices followed by India. The outcomes of each of these projects could therefore influence each other as markets potentially shift in response to project activities. In this way, the existence of 10349 should form a key consideration of the project baseline.”

**3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

**4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

**5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

**6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The core indicator for mercury is clear. Please include in 9.6 the estimate tons of material contaminated with mercury. Please clarify if there are benefits to core indicator 10 and if so please provide an estimate.

October 22, 2020 - Comment addressed.

Agency Response

**21.10.2020**

The following text has been added to the core indicators justification and the GEB section: "Sub-indicator 9.6 estimates include the total mass of equipment containing mercury. To calculate this value, we estimate the weight of a single thermometer as 15 grams and the weight of a single sphygmomanometer as 500 grams. Applying the same assumptions as above, this results in a total 98,358 kg Hg-contaminated material avoided."

Benefits for core indicator 10 will be estimated during PPG

**7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, however the statement in paragraph 'f' in the project is misleading particularly " This lack of projects may represent a gap in the portfolio as the GEF is the primary funding mechanism for the implementation of the Minamata Convention."

October 22, 2020 - Comment addressed.

Agency Response

**21.10.2020**



Agreed. This text has been removed throughout.

**Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

**Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The proposal indicates this will be done at PPG stage.

Agency Response

**Stakeholders**

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response  
**Private Sector Engagement**

**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
Yes

Agency Response  
**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please provide additional information on the impacts on climate to the project and Covid-19 as well as the current situation in Armenia.

October 22, 2020 - Comment addressed.

Agency Response

**21.10.2020**

Regarding the current situation in Armenia, due to the conflict outbreak at the time of submission, the country has opted not to participate in the project. Instead, Albania, which has a comparable amount of mercury inputs in medical devices, has now been included instead.

With regard to COVID-19, in addition to the two risks previously identified (i.e. increased exposure and limited mobility) the following two risks have been included: availability of healthcare staff and increased thermometer price owing to COVID-19-induced demand.

With regard to climate, in addition to the two risks previously identified (i.e. increased waste and increased volatility) a third risk has been included. This third risk relates to increased infectious disease incidence attributable to climate change and subsequent increases in thermometer procurement. Increased demand could increase price and therefore encourage the continued use of Hg-added devices based on their lower sticker price. Conversely, increased international support (i.e. aid) coupled with demand could offer an opportunity to encourage more responsible procurement. The project will conduct a more thorough evaluation of these risks and opportunities during the PPG.

#### **Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please clarify if the Project Execution Unit to be established in WHO will be staffed by new personnel or with existing WHO staff.

October 22, 2020 - comment addressed.

Agency Response

**21.10.2020**

WHO will hire consultants (non-staff) for the PEU. WHO staff time on the project will be contributed as co-financing.'

**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

## Knowledge Management

**Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?**

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, however please clarify if the KM will include work being conducted by the China project (10349) and if so how will these projects both contribute to global knowledge and best practices in this sector.

October 22, 2020 - Comment addressed.

### Agency Response

**21.10.2020**

The following text has been added beginning in the KM section: “With regard to the UNDP-executed GEF ID 10349 project, China has requested that WHO participate in its execution. The activities of 10349 include increasing stakeholders’ awareness and knowledge about the phase-out of mercury-added medical devices and about mercury-free medical facilities, through websites, use of media, and other means. WHO will cooperate with 10349 in sharing and disseminating knowledge about the replacement of mercury thermometers and sphygmomanometers in healthcare through the WHO project website and other means, such as through publications of case studies and newsletters.

WHO will further cooperate with 10349 to ensure incorporation of international best practice and experience in developing national legislation, regulatory frameworks, and capacity-building programs developed to support the phase-out of mercury-added thermometers and sphygmomanometers in healthcare.

As part of cooperation with 10349, WHO will promote the use of new WHO guidance “WHO guidance for climate resilient and environmentally sustainable healthcare facilities.” This guidance aims to enhance the capacity of healthcare facilities to protect and improve the health of their target communities in an unstable and changing climate; and to empower healthcare facilities to be environmentally sustainable, by optimizing the use of resources and minimizing the release of waste into the environment. The guidance includes targeted interventions to support countries in meeting their obligations under the Minamata Convention regarding mercury-containing devices and products used in healthcare facilities. The guidance document is targeted at healthcare facility managers in particular, and the health workforce in general, and attempts to cover healthcare facilities of all sizes.”

**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please clarify on Covid-19, climate risks and the current political situation in Armenia.

October 22, 2020 -Environmental and Social Safeguards: UNEP attached the Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF) describing the overall ESS risk of the project as low. However, there seems to be some inconsistencies in the ratings. Please ask UNEP to confirm the rating as we also find in SRIF reports that ESS risks have been identified as medium (e.g. social risk have been identified as medium) . In addition, it does not seem like the Safeguard Review Summary has attached or that the SRIF has been reviewed by UNEP safeguard team, please clarify further.

October 29, 2020 - Comment addressed.

#### Agency Response

**21.10.2020**

Regarding the current situation in Armenia, due to the conflict outbreak at the time of submission, the country has opted not to participate in the project. Instead, Albania, which has a comparable amount of mercury inputs in medical devices, has now been included instead.

With regard to COVID-19, in addition to the two risks previously identified (i.e. increased exposure and limited mobility) the following two risks have been included: availability of healthcare staff and increased thermometer price owing to COVID-19 induced demand.

With regard to climate, in addition to the two risks previously identified (i.e. increased waste and increased volatility) a third risk has been included. This third risk relates to increased infectious disease incidence attributable to climate change and subsequent increases in thermometer procurement. Increased demand could increase price and therefore encourage the continued use of Hg-added devices based on their lower sticker price. Conversely, increased international support (i.e. aid) coupled with demand could offer an opportunity to encourage more responsible procurement. The project will conduct a more thorough evaluation of these risks and opportunities during the PPG.

**29 October 2020:**

Signed SRIF has been uploaded and risk increased to M (Medium/Moderate)

**Part III – Country Endorsements**

**Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

**Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects**

**Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please provide a response to the review.

October 22, 2020 - Please address the comment on the safeguards.

October 29, 2020 - All comments addressed. The project is recommend for technical clearance.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>10/5/2020</b>	<b>10/21/2020</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/22/2020</b>	<b>10/29/2020</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**PIF Review**

**Agency Response**

**Additional Review (as necessary)**

**Additional Review (as necessary)**

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

**Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**

The Minamata Convention on Mercury entered into force on 16 August 2017. The Convention covers a range of issues associated with mercury production, use, waste and disposal, providing a list of uses in which the manufacture, import and export are restricted, and applicable phase-out dates or reduction targets. The manufacture import and export of sphygmomanometers and thermometers have a specified phase-out date of 2020. Parties may request exemptions. India, which is included in the project, has requested such an exemption for the manufacture of Hg-added sphygmomanometers and thermometers among other devices until 2025.

Mercury-added measuring devices have formed an essential component of medicine for centuries. The first mercury-added thermometer was developed in Germany in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century (by Fahrenheit); sphygmomanometers came about 170 years later in Austria. Owing largely to environmental and human health concerns, high-income countries began to phase-out the manufacture and use of these devices beginning in the early 2000s.

This project proposes to phase out the manufacture of mercury containing medical devices in India and introduce new devices in Burkina Faso, Montenegro, Uganda, Albania as well as India.