

Environmentally sound management of PCBs, Mercury and other toxic chemicals in Peru

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10419

Countries

Peru

Project Name

Environmentally sound management of PCBs, Mercury and other toxic chemicals in Peru

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

12/8/2021

Review completed by PM

4/29/2022

Program Manager

Evelyn Swain

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

Project Type

FSP

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, the project design is appropriate and consistent with the PIF.

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 NA

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 Co-financing has increased since PIF stage. It includes significant investment mobilized and funding from the private sector.

Agency Response
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 Yes, the PPG utilization is included in Annex C. About one third of the funds have been committed.

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 The core indicator targets remain consistent with the PIF.

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, there is sufficient elaboration.

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

Yes, the baseline scenario has been elaborated.

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, the alternative scenario is well described, including clarity on the expected outcomes and components.

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, this project is aligned with the CW strategy and

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, this is well elaborated.

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, the GEBs are elaborated.

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, innovation, sustainability and scale up are addressed.

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

Yes maps and geo-reference are included.

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

NA

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, information on stakeholder engagement is provided. Including private sector engagement.

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

The gender analysis is attached, but please include an overview of the gender analysis in the portal main document. Currently there is no information in this section.

ES, 4/3/22: Gender information has been added to the portal. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Answer 8/3/22: GEF CEO Endorsement Portal Item #3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment updated with text from UNDP Project Document.

During the PPG phase a gender analysis was conducted, and a gender action plan was developed for addressing gender equality in project outcomes. The Annex 11 'Gender Analysis and Action Plan' includes the detail of this work but it can be highlighted that main objective of this plan is to mainstream the gender approach in the life cycle of the project contributing to a sustainable and inclusive development in the population that inhabit the areas and that work in the intervention sectors of the project. Likewise, the specific objectives are:

- 1. Raise awareness on the concepts of gender approach to achieve sustainable and inclusive development in the management and elimination of PCBS, mercury and toxic chemicals.*
- 2. Promote actions that protect the health of men and women, taking into account the differentiated exposure to PCBs, mercury and other toxic chemicals in the project.*

3. Improve spaces for participation and empowerment of women as agents of change for the management and elimination of PCBS, mercury and toxic chemicals.

4. Generate information disaggregated by sex that will serve as a basis to strengthen the project's monitoring, communication, and evaluation mechanisms on the management and elimination of PCBS, mercury, and toxic chemicals.

As a result of the implementation of the gender action plan, it is expected to improve working conditions, health and information disaggregated by sex in the sectors and areas of priority intervention throughout the life cycle of the project, thus contributing to the strengthening of the processes of governance and sustainable and inclusive development in the management and proper disposal of PCBS, mercury and toxic chemicals.

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, private sector engagement and co-financing is included.

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, risks including pandemic risks have been addressed.

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, the institutional arrangements are elaborated.

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, the project is aligned with the NIP and MIA and other enabling activities. It is also coordinating with other relevant projects.

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

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

The response to comments needs some work.

ES, 4/3/22: The response to comments have been addressed. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Answer 8/3/22: More details been provided both for Council and STAP comments. Comments have been re-pasted on the GEF portal and attached into the file folder both in excel and word formats.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

PPO Comments received on April 8

1. On Project Information: given the 4 circulation please request the agency to correct the expected implementation start for a more realistic date.

UNDP Answer April 8: modified to a later date.

2. Core Indicators: The agency indicated 10 million direct beneficiaries. Please request agency to provide some explanations/justification for this core indicator 11.

UNDP Answer: clarification inserted:

For the estimation of Project Beneficiaries, the following was considered:

a) For Outputs B1 and B3, the beneficiaries of these activities can be grouped and would be the agricultural producers (which develop family farming) of the 9 regions where the pilots will be developed = 1.4 million people.

b) For Output B2: beneficiaries of this activity would be people who assist to the Big Market in Lima (buyers) = 9 million people.

c) For Output C1: beneficiaries of this activity would be people living nearby and/or working in industries or sensitive sites where electrical equipment contaminated with PCBs are located. = 100,000 people.

d) For Output C2: beneficiaries of this activity would be people who work in DIRESAs/GERESAs and in SENASAs who are exposed to stockpiles. = 16,300

e) For Output D1 and D2: the beneficiaries of these activities can be grouped and would be attendees to health establishments-EESS and people who work in hospitals who are exposed to mercury and UPOPs emissions = 38,000 people.

Aprox 10.5 million people.

3. Excepting in a diagram, nowhere in section 6 ? Coordination it is clearly specified that the Ministry of Environment will be the executing Agency (?Implementing Partner? in UNDP language) ? please ask the agency to include the Ministry of Environment somewhere in the first part of section 6, in which the responsibilities of the executing agency are described.

UNDP Answer April 8: Inserted.

4. On the Budget: The project budget totals are not possible to read. It looks like there is space for the agency to make the columns larger so please use this space so that the budget is easier to read. It also looks like some other lines have been squeezed and it's not possible to review the table. Only once we get a readable table in Portal, we'll be in a position to compare it with the other budget tables, then we can provide comments on the budget as appropriate [hint: please ask the agency to present the costs associated with the execution of the project (staff) with enough details, item per item ? as we see the current version, they are bundle with several other positions]

UNDP Answer April 8: GEF budget table modified. Positions are not bundled: each consultant is associated with a specific component / outcome. For additional details, please see UNDP budget and its budget notes as each budget line is directly linked to an output from the PRF.

5. The PPG utilization table has been included twice and does not include any details on how the funding has been used for. Please request the agency to provide details of the PPG activities as requested.

UNDP Answer April 8: ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) up to CEO Endorsement request submission table has been re-pasted on the GEF Portal.

The final outputs of the GEF PPG are:

1. UNDP-GEF Project Document (ProDoc).
2. Mandatory annexes to the ProDoc listed in the Annotated UNDP-GEF Project Document Template.
3. GEF CEO Endorsement Request and all mandatory annexes; and
4. Validation Workshop report.

Activities performed during a UNDP PPG phase are:

Component A: Preparatory Technical Studies & Reviews

The following technical studies and reviews will be conducted.

a. Desktop and field-based studies and data collection

This research should produce the background information required to prepare the ProDoc (including its Annexes) and CEO Endorsement Request, including but not limited to:

- ? Development challenge and strategy (including threats, problems and barrier assessment);
- ? Review of national policy and legislative frameworks;
- ? Problem and solution trees, assumptions and risks, developed in consultation with project stakeholders, for a robust Theory of Change, Results Framework and solid M&E plan;
- ? Review of relevant past and ongoing projects for lessons, including project evaluations; and
- ? Any other analyses required to address all comments on the PIF received from GEF Secretariat, GEF Council members and STAP

b. Gender Analysis

A gender analysis will be prepared to fully consider the different needs, roles, benefits, impacts, risks, differential access to and control over resources of women and men (including considerations of intersecting categories of identity such as age, social status, ethnicity, marital status, etc.) and to identify appropriate measures to address these and promote gender equality and women's empowerment. See guidance available [here](#).

c. Social and Environmental Standards: Screening and Assessments

The social and environmental safeguards pre-screening (pre-SESP) prepared during the PIF design phase has initially determined the overall risk categorization of this project as Moderate and highlighted potential safeguard risks to be further assessed during the PPG phase.

An Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) will be prepared, to ensure that the required assessments are carried out during the first phase of project implementation. The ESMF and ProDoc must clearly state that none of the associated project activities will commence until: the assessment(s) have been completed; the

required management plan(s) have been prepared; and the plan(s) have been disclosed and approved by the Project Board.

The required targeted assessment(s) of the risks related to Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management, Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions, Indigenous Peoples and Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency will be undertaken. The assessment will identify ways to avoid negative environmental and social impacts where possible and if risk avoidance is not possible, then mitigation and management measures must be identified.

d. Identification of project sites

Based on the above reviews, and through consultation with stakeholders, the targeted project demonstration sites will be identified and detailed, ensuring that geo-referencing is clearly presented for all targeted project areas and surrounding landscapes. This should include providing geographic coordinates, maps and shapefiles for inclusion in the ProDoc.

e. Financial planning, co-financing and investment mobilized

Co-financing and investment mobilized ? as defined in the GEF Policy and Guidelines on co-financing - will be confirmed, and additional sources identified through a series of consultations with partners to ensure a coherent and sustainable financing package for the project, including post-GEF grant phase to the extent possible. The GEF is seeking high co-financing/investment mobilized to GEF grant ratios with a preference for grants, loans and other public investments over in-kind co-financing. The GEF also expects the Government to significantly support the costs associated with project execution (i.e. PMC).

f. Stakeholder analysis

Building on the initial identification of stakeholders in the PIF, an appropriately-scaled analysis of project stakeholders will be undertaken. This stakeholder analysis will provide the foundation for development of the project's Stakeholder Engagement Plan and will facilitate prioritization of engagement activities with particular stakeholder groups and individuals. See the UNDP SES Guidance Note on Stakeholder Engagement.

g. Appraise and formulate the most appropriate project implementation and execution modality

The design of the project will comply with the UNDP's Program and Operations Policy and Procedures (POPP), Financial Regulations, and Programme and Project Management and Quality Standards, and UNDP-GEF guidance (which will be provided by the RTA). A full assessment of the most appropriate project implementation and management arrangements will be carried out in full consultation with the RTA, UNDP Country Office, Resident Representative (or their Deputy), the relevant government coordinating agency, and the GEF OFF.

UNDP should not have a role in project execution as project execution is the primary responsibility of the selected Implementing Partner (see UNDP-GEF Guidance Note for further information). Therefore, an assessment and the selection of the most appropriate Implementing Partner and/or third parties (Responsible Parties) with full capacity to execute the project must be carried out.

Project management arrangements need to be discussed and agreed early in the PPG phase. During the first two months of the PPG phase:

- ? For all potential Implementing Partners, carry out capacity assessments to assess their capacity to implement the project and assess all related risks. This must include HACT and PCAT assessments.
- ? Discuss the level of co-financing the Government and Implementing Partner are able to commit to this project. As per GEF Policy, the GEF is seeking high co-financing to GEF grant ratios and expects the Government to significantly support the costs associated with project execution (i.e. PMC) for this project.
- ? Based on these assessments, select and confirm the Implementing Partner for the project in consultations with all relevant stakeholders. The selected Implementing Partner must express willingness to serve as the Implementing Partner for the Project and the concerned government must agree to use the selected Implementing Partner for the Project. (Please see UNDP's Policy on Selecting Implementing Partners).
- ? If the Implementing Partner does not have full capacity to execute the project, and execution support is likely to be needed, discuss with the UNDP Resident Representative whether the choice of Implementing Partner is the correct choice. If not, select another Implementing Partner, if possible. If that is not an option, explore alternative options for the provision of execution support via Responsible Parties (following UNDP Policy on Selecting Responsible Parties). Discuss with the

Implementing Partner the role of the responsible parties in project execution, and the execution support these parties could provide.

- ? Consult with the RTA on the latest guidance regarding UNDP providing support services to the Implementing Partner. If the costs for UNDP to provide support services is to be charged to the GEF project budget, the UNDP support services must be approved by the GEF Secretariat before CEO endorsement.

h. Other required studies

As detailed in the individual consultant TOR, and as further specified in the PPG work plan, and subsequent direction from the PPG Team Leader during the course of the PPG period.

Component B: Formulation of the UNDP-GEF Project Document, CEO Endorsement

Request, and

Mandatory and Project Specific Annexes

Based on the technical studies and reviews undertaken under **Component A**, the UNDP-GEF Project Document will be developed (following the annotated UNDP-GEF Project Document), and the GEF CEO Endorsement Request will be prepared. See additional guidance notes below.

The GEF PPG Team Leader will be responsible for the consolidation and finalization of all required materials.

- a. Stakeholder Engagement Plan:
- b. Gender Action Plan and Budget
- c. Social and Environmental Standards: Screening and Management Measures
- d. GEF and LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators
- e. Completion of the required official endorsement letters

Mandatory Annexes

In addition to the documents listed above, the following Annexes should be prepared by the GEF PPG team:

- ? Project map and Geospatial Coordinates of project sites
- ? Multi Year Work Plan
- ? Monitoring Plan
- ? UNDP Risk Register
- ? Overview of Technical Consultancies
- ? GEF 7 Taxonomy
- ? Initial Project Team Procurement Plan and TORs for key Project Team staff

Upon a request from the UNDP Regional Technical Adviser during the PPG implementation, the PPG team may be required to prepare additional annexes.

f. Project Management Arrangements

Based on the stakeholder analysis and consultations undertaken in **Component A** above, agreement(s) on project management and governance arrangements?including roles, responsibilities and accountabilities of lead and partner Agencies?will be secured early in the project development phase and will be fully detailed in the ProDoc.

Component C: Validation Workshop and Report

A validation workshop will be held with relevant stakeholders to present, discuss and validate the project activities, and the final draft of the UNDP-GEF project document if possible. A validation workshop report will be prepared for projects with an overall safeguards risk rating of moderate or high.

[illegible]

UNDP -GEF cleara nce proces ses																	
GEF Secret ariat submis sion deadli ne																	
<i>GEF Secreta riat review (indica tive)</i>																	

PPO Comments received on April 25

1. On project duration: now with expected start date changed but not expected closing date, the duration is 56 months but not 60 any longer ? please ask the Agency to amend:

UNDP Response April 25: amended.

4. Budget: with the formatting addressed, now we can provide comments. Project Manager is being charged to components and PMC. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. Requesting the costs associated with the execution of the project to be covered by the PMC is reasonable ? by so doing, asking the proponents to utilize both portions allocated to PMC (GEF portion and co-financing portion) is also reasonable. As the co-financing portion allocated to PMC is 1.6 million, and considering that the grants portion of co-financing is nearly 6 million, there is room to cover the costs of the Project Manager from co-financing.

UNDP Response April 25: The Project Coordinator's tasks are expected to include technical assistance for other components of the project (see PRODOC Annex 5 - Overview of Project Staff and Technical Consultancies for additional details.

The project coordinator's salary is expected to be partially covered by the GEF Grant (only USD\$39,000 / yr). The remaining portion for the Project Coordinator's salary will be covered through Co-financing). See PRODOC Table 10 for additional details.

5. PPG: not addressed ? the table still hasn't provided enough details on expenditure categories ? please ask the agency to provide ?the detailed funding amount of the PPG activities? as requested

UNDP Response April 25: Below is the PPG budget and Budget notes.

GEF Outcome/Atlas Activity	Responsible Party	Fund ID	Donor Name	Atlas Budgetary Account Code	ATLAS Budget Description	2020	Budget Notes
Project preparation grant to finalize the UNDP-GEF project document for project <i>Environmentally sound management of PCBs, Mercury and other toxic chemicals in Peru</i>	UNDP	62000	GEF TRUSTEE	71200	International Consultants	42,000.00	A
				71300	Local Consultants	28,000.00	B
				71400	Contractual Services - Individ	45,000.00	C
				71600	Travel	14,000.00	D
				75700	Training, Workshops and Confer	5,000.00	E
				74100	Professional Services	10,000.00	F
				74200	Translation costs	4,000.00	G
				74500	Miscellaneous Expenses	2,000.00	H
					PROJECT TOTAL	150,000.00	

Budget Note	Items	Total estimated person weeks	Budget	Budget Note
A	71200 - International Consultants	18	42,000.00	International Experts to provide overall guidance on project preparation to National Consultants engaged by the project and preparation of the UNDP-GEF Project Document, the GEF CEO Endorsement, the SESP, the GEF Tracking Tools).
B	71200 - International Consultants	60	28,000.00	National Experts to provide overall guidance on project preparation to National Consultant engaged by the project.
C	71400 - Contractual Services - Individ	50	45,000.00	Oversight and coordination of the PPG process throughout its entire duration and be responsible for the overall coordination of processes and consultations needed for project development and the preparation of the UNDP-GEF Project Document and the GEF CEO Endorsement Form, in direct collaboration with the international coordinator and national/international consultants.
D	71600 - Travel		14,000.00	Travel costs related to travel for fieldwork and exchange of experiences
E	75700 - Training, Workshops and Confer		5,000.00	Includes the organization of the two Workshops (PPG Inception Workshop and Project Document Validation Workshop), training of national experts on establishing the project's baseline as well as four working meetings with national stakeholders.
F	74100 ? Professional Services		10,000.00	For the development of the Partner Capacity Assessment and Due Diligence for Co-Financing letters from the Private Sector
G	74200 - Audio Visual&Print Prod Costs		4,000.00	Includes the translation relevant documents (PRODOC, SES?) from English to Spanish to facilitate consultation and validation process
H	74500 - Miscellaneous Expenses		2,000.00	Coffee breaks, PPE for COVID protection during fieldwork.

ES, 4/28/22: PPO has the following comments:

Project to be returned to the Agency because most of the comments were addressed excepting one that is easy to fix (see below):

5. On status of PPG: not addressed. Still there is no detailed information on the activities that were funded through the PPG. Please request the agency to provide details on how the \$150,000 budgeted was spent and committed (please do so specifying the expenditures that are financed such as consultants, workshops, etc. instead of per outputs such as stakeholder engagement plan, preparation of ProDoc, etc.) We need to assess whether the expenditures are eligible per Guidelines (note: we saw the details in the review sheet ? please ask the Agency to include them in Portal ? but also please ask them to specify what entails ?Contractual Services - Individ? ; ?Professional Services? and ?Miscellaneous Expenses?)

Please add this information into the portal.

UNDP Response April 28: detail added into the portal. Information on initial budgeting and expenditures have been added and all follow GEF and UNDP Guidelines. Please note that ?BUDGET NOTES? include details on Account description and nature of the tasks that have been agreed upon with the EA upon initiation of the PPG.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The US comment does not have a response. Please include a response to the US comments. Also the responses to the other Council Comments are very brief, an elaboration would be useful.

ES, 4/3/22: The response to council comments have been addressed. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Answer 8/3/22: the US?s comment has been addressed.

UNDP notes with appreciation the US? comment regarding the pressure the COVID-19 pandemic is having on the ASGM sector. Although this project does not address issues related to ASGM, it?s important to note that the Ministry of Environment of Peru, along with UNDP, are implementing a planetGOLD child project. The Per? planetGOLD project has developed cutting- COVID-19 protocols for ASGM. These protocols are documented on the planetGOLD website (<https://www.planetgold.org/peru>) and have been shared and used across all the GEF?s planetGOLD projects. UNDP is convinced that through coordination with all relevant stakeholders in Peru, the planetGOLD project will achieve Hg reduction targets and improve access to finance for miners.

US Comments received on May 31st, 2022

We would like to know more about the plans to engage with indigenous populations. The PIF does not include an Indigenous Peoples Plan and we'd like to better understand those efforts. We would also recommend engagement with the Center for Amazonian Scientific Innovation (CINCIA).

The project thanks the recommendation to work with the Center for Amazonian Scientific Innovation (CINCIA). It will reach out to CINCIA as soon as implementation begins.

As per the stakeholder engagement plan developed during the PPG phase, Indigenous People will be engaged through different consultations meetings where they will be properly informed of project implementation status, lessons learned, best practices and successful experiences throughout the project.

Furthermore, the Social and Environmental Safeguards (SES) Screening process and the proposed Management Plan for the project considers Indigenous Peoples involvement. The project will work within the national framework where the Ministry of Environment is committed to safeguarding the rights of Indigenous Peoples in Peru. The project considers encouraging the development of Free Prior Informed Consent whenever it is needed based on the project activities.

Accountability and transparency will be also promoted through providing meaningful means for local communities and affected populations to raise concerns and/or grievances including a redress process for local communities when activities may adversely impact them.

Finally, UNDP's Accountability Mechanism, which includes the Social and Environmental Compliance Review (SECU) and Stakeholder Response Mechanism (SRM) will also serve as an additional layer of grievance redress and empower stakeholders to push for accountability.

We would also like to better understand how this project aims to address private sector accountability for chemical waste management. We see this project as having relevance across many sectors, including mining, agriculture, electrical, and medical fields which both can make this project more impactful and more challenging to implement.

The project will promote accountability of the private sector by:

- i) Supporting their participation in the development of national strategies for chemical management and disposal (these include PCBs, Pesticides POPs and HHP, and mercury from the health sector).
- ii) Enhancing coordination between government authorities and the private sector.
- iii) Involving them in field works (pilot sites) for building national capacity and promoting the scaling of its results.
- iv) Involvement of various stakeholders including private sector (suppliers, buyers), workers, and civil society attending the market for determination of POPs/HHP pesticides residues in food.
- v) Stakeholder Engagement activities are also foreseen during project execution for the private sector (including health, agriculture, and power sector.)

In addition, through Component A, the project's strategy seeks to enhance coordination, compliance and enforcement of the private sector through institutional strengthening by supporting the creation of an Information exchange platform among competent authorities in LCM of chemicals; the design of a National Hazardous Chemicals Management Strategy as well as the creation of the PCB management system where Electrical and Industrial sector will be linked to service suppliers embracing involved in PCB management and elimination chain.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

It is very difficult to read the STAP comment and responses in the portal, the document seems to be pasted poorly. Please try to correct the formatting.

ES, 4/3/22: The response to STAP comments is now clear. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Answer 8/3/22: Comments have been re-pasted on the GEF portal and attached into the file folder both in excel and word formats.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Approximately 2/3 of the PPG has been utilized.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

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

NA

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 NA

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 NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Not at this time. Some issues remain.

ES, 4/3/22: CEO endorsement is recommended by the PM.

ES, 4/8/22: PPO has the following comments

Project to be returned to the Agency due to:

1. On Project Information: given the 4 circulation please request the agency to correct the expected implementation start for a more realistic date.
2. Core Indicators: The agency indicated 10 million direct beneficiaries. Please request agency to provide some explanations/justification for this core indicator 11.
3. Excepting in a diagram, nowhere in section 6 ? Coordination it is clearly specified that the Ministry of Environment will be the executing Agency (?Implementing Partner? in UNDP language) ? please ask the agency to include the Ministry of Environment somewhere in the first part of section 6, in which the responsibilities of the executing agency are described.
4. On the Budget: The project budget totals are not possible to read. It looks like there is space for the agency to make the columns larger so please use this space so that the budget is easier to read. It also looks like some other lines have been squeezed and it's not possible to review the table. Only once we get a readable table in Portal, we'll be in a position to compare it with the other budget tables, then we can provide comments on the budget as appropriate [hint: please ask the agency to present the costs associated with the execution of the project (staff) with enough details, item per item ? as we see the current version, they are bundle with several other positions]
5. The PPG utilization table has been included twice and does not include any details on how the funding has been used for. Please request the agency to provide details of the PPG activities as requested.

ES, 4/25/22: PPO has further comments:

Project to be returned to the Agency because while some of the comments provided on April 7th were addressed, others were not:

1. On project duration: now with expected start date changed but not expected closing date, the duration is 56 months but not 60 any longer ? please ask the Agency to amend:

4. Budget: with the formatting addressed, now we can provide comments. Project Manager is being charged to components and PMC. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. Requesting the costs associated with the execution of the project to be covered by the PMC is reasonable ? by so doing, asking the proponents to utilize both portions allocated to PMC (GEF portion and co-financing portion) is also reasonable. As the co-financing portion allocated to PMC is 1.6 million, and considering that the grants portion of co-financing is nearly 6 million, there is room to cover the costs of the Project Manager from co-financing.

5. PPG: not addressed ? the table still hasn't provided enough details on expenditure categories ? please ask the agency to provide ?the detailed funding amount of the PPG activities? as requested

ES, 4/28/22: PPO has the following comments:

Project to be returned to the Agency because most of the comments were addressed excepting one that is easy to fix (see below):

5. On status of PPG: not addressed. Still there is no detailed information on the activities that were funded through the PPG. Please request the agency to provide details on how the \$150,000 budgeted was spent and committed (please do so specifying the expenditures that are financed such as consultants, workshops, etc. instead of per outputs such as stakeholder engagement plan, preparation of ProDoc, etc.) We need to assess whether the expenditures are eligible per Guidelines (note: we saw the details in the review sheet ? please ask the Agency to include them in Portal ? but also please ask them to specify what entails ?Contractual Services - Individ? ; ?Professional Services? and ?Miscellaneous Expenses?)

Please add this information into the portal.

ES, 4/29/22: PPO's comments have been addressed. CEO Endorsement is recommended

ES, 4/29/22: Please address Council comments.

ES, 6/2/22: Council comments have been addressed. CEO Endorsement is recommended.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	3/7/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/3/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/8/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/28/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/29/2022	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

This project will support the Stockholm Convention and Minamata Convention to minimize risk to Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCBs), Mercury and other toxic chemicals exposure of human beings and environment through environmentally sound management in Peru. The project takes an innovative approach to addressing POPs pesticides by piloting pesticide prevention on the main Lima market of greengrocers. The project will also support COVID-19 recovering by applying best practice for hazardous and infectious medical waste. This project will also apply learning from UNDP's projects what addressed the Ebola outbreak. The project will result in a number of global environmental benefits, including 700 MT of POPs and mercury and 10 gTEQ POPs emissions.