

## Environmentally sound management of hazardous wastes containing POPs and Mercury

### Basic Information

**GEF ID**

10721

**Countries**

Panama

**Project Title**

Environmentally sound management of hazardous wastes containing POPs and Mercury

**GEF Agency(ies)**

UNDP

**Agency ID**

UNDP: 6527

**GEF Focal Area(s)**

Chemicals and Waste

**Program Manager**

Evelyn Swain

# PIF

## Part I – Project Informatic

### 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 is aligned with the GEF7 CW strategy.

#### 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

Component C on PCBs does not include information on how the project will help the country meet the 2025/ 2028 phaseout requirements under the Stockholm Convention.

ES, 10/26/20: Information provided on the phaseout requirements. Comment cleared.

For the component on ESP foam. Does the foam in Panama also contain an ODS blowing agent? It so will think project result is ODS benefits?

ES, 10/26/20: ESP foam in Panama does not contain an ODS blowing agent. Comment cleared.

ES, 10/26/20: ESP foam in Panama generally does not contain ODS. Comment cleared.

For component D please check the spelling of the acronym. Both HBCD and HCBD are used.

ES, 10/26/20: acronym fixed. Comment cleared.

For Component 3 on health care waste, please indicate if this project will respond to the ongoing COVID-19 crisis.

ES, 10/26/20: Information on how this project responds to the COVID-19 crisis has been included. Comment cleared.

## Agency Response

Component C on PCBs does not include information on how the project will help the country meet the 2025/ 2028 phaseout requirements under the Stockholm Convention.

### UNDP's response:

The improved coordination, legal framework, strengthened enforcement and information exchange that will result of the implementation of the Component A, plus the activities that will be conducted under Outputs C1 and C2 of this project will assist Panama with the planning of the management and with the disposal of remaining stocks of PCB contaminated equipment in the country; this approach would put Panama well on track to comply with its obligations under the Stockholm Convention on PCBs for the years 2025 and 2028. The country would not require additional assistance from the GEF for PCB management and disposal in the future.

During the PPG phase additional inquiries will be conducted to identify PCB-containing equipment and to cover zones that may not be included in previous inventories.

For the component on ESP foam. Does the foam in Panama also contain an ODS blowing agent? It so will think project result is ODS benefits?

**UNDP's response:** No, ESP foam used in Panama does not contain ODS blowing agent. XPS foams, which can use ODS blowing agent, are scarcely used in Panama and projects impact on ODS benefits would be minimal. Panama ban the use of HCFC in the production of XPS foam.

For component D please check the spelling of the acronym. Both HBCD and HCBD are used.

**UNDP's response:** Done, acronym corrected, now HBCD is used in all document.

For Component 3 on health care waste, please indicate if this project will respond to the ongoing COVID-19 crisis.

**UNDP's response:** Yes, the project will respond to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, the following text has been included to the PIF.

### COVID-19 Responsiveness

1. This project will support the GEF's COVID-19 response and mitigation of Future Pandemics through the promotion of activities that minimize human health risks while reducing pollution. Specifically, through Component 2, the project will assist Panama on improving the

management of hospital's waste disposal where a programme to decrease the incidence of waste burning will be developed, and also through Component 3, where the project will support the country on the establishment of Best Practices for the management of Healthcare Waste management, including COVID-19 pathological wastes. Through the Project's Pilots, demand and supply channels of Healthcare facilities will be strengthened, fostering the decisionmakers' capability to understand the challenges of waste management and its implications for human health and the environment. Components 2 and 3 will incorporate COVID-19 and healthcare waste management considerations into all activities developed throughout the implementation of the project. These activities assess opportunities where the Project's initiatives and Pilots can help reduce the risk of emerging infectious diseases such as COVID-19.

2. In this regard, it is worth mentioning that Panama, through Law No. 139, published on April 2, 2020, declared a national health emergency that is still currently in force. The current context led to the issuance of differentiated protocols on solid waste management, reason why the execution of the activities proposed in Components 2 and 3 of this project is of great interest regarding the improvement of the management of hospital waste and its contribution to the best response to the COVID-19 context.

3. Furthermore, the project will also benefit from UNDP's extensive experience with Pandemic responses. In the past, UNDP has been key in the management of the Ebola pandemic, helping countries to promote and adopt actions that assure sustainable mechanisms to avoid future outbreaks.

#6. Please provide information on how the indicator for mercury was developed, the amount may be low.

**UNDP's response:** Target was increase after review with national authorities (increased from 100 kg to 350 kg). The following text was included in the PIF:

*Based on the results of the last official mercury inventory in Panama (2013), the liberation of mercury related to the use of mercury containing products in the medical sector is estimated to be 2,044.49 kg/year. Within the scope of the project, the reduction of 205 kg Hg for health products is estimated. In addition, health facilities at the national level also present the use of other general mercury products such as thermostats, mercury lamps, batteries and other laboratory products. It was estimated that the liberation of mercury from these type of products from the health sector included in this project is at least 150 kg. Therefore, a total reduction of about 350 kg of Hg is expected during the project period. Further analysis of potential additional contributions will be conducted during the PPG phase.*

## 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, the co-financing is adequate and include private sector investment which is expected in this type of project.

**Agency Response**

1. CAH: 28/10/2020 Please find answers below to PPO's comments.

There is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC – it should be around 5% as it is the GEF contribution. Hence, for a co-financing of \$18,750,000, the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$937,500 instead of \$250,000. Please ask the Agency to amend.

**UNDP's response:** Co-financing has been distributed to reflect the contribution to PMC.

Project Objective: Prevent, Reduce and Eliminate the presence and emission of POPs and Mercury in Panama to protect public health and the environment in compliance with the Stockholm and Minamata Conventions.						
Project Components	Component Type	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
					GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
1. Strengthening legal and institutional capacities for sound management of POPs and Mercury.	Technical Assistance	A) Legal and institutional capacities for sound management of POPs and Mercury strengthened.	A1) Legal and regulatory framework for sound management and elimination of POPs and Mercury strengthened and enforcement enhanced.  A2) Institutional coordination for sound management of POPs and Mercury strengthened (including national training programme)		300,000	\$ 800,000

			ning programme)			
2. Prevention and reduction of POPs emission.	Investment	<p>B) Unintentional POPs emission from waste burning and incineration reduced (6 gT EQ/yr)</p> <p>C) Sound elimination of PCB contaminated equipment/material achieved (200 ton)</p>	<p>B1) Programme to decrease incidence of waste burning of dump sites/landfills and of hospital's waste disposal in Panama developed and implemented.</p> <p>B2) Pilot projects (2) for PCCD/Fs reduction emission through BAT/BEP implementation in a dump site combined with plastics waste minimization in touristic area.</p> <p>C1) PCB contaminated equipment elimination plan established based on full national inventory.</p> <p>C2) Two hundred (200) t of PCB equipment and waste from sensitive sites eliminated.</p> <p>D1) Programme for reduction of use of Expanded Polystyrene (with prevention as basic</p>		1,180,000	\$ 8,050,000

		<p>D) Use of HBCD containing materials minimized (300 t) and elimination of HBCD containing waste achieved (30 t)</p>	<p>in prevention as basic concept) as building material for reduction of HBCD developed.</p> <p>D2) Pilots (2) of final disposal of 30 t of EP S waste with HBCD in production and construction enterprises tested.</p>		
3. Prevention and Minimization of Mercury Emissions.	Investment	<p>E) Mercury emissions in the Health Sector prevented and reduced through the implementation of good practices and</p> <p>improved management of mercury containing products and wastes (350 kg)</p>	<p>E1) Pilot projects (5) for replacement of mercury containing equipment/products and establishment of a management and temporary storage system of mercury waste, in large hospitals and small priority health centres.</p> <p>E2) Pilot projects (2) in hospitals for reduction of emission of mercury through prevention and application of BAT/BEP for management and disposal of waste</p>	\$ 870,000	\$ 8,550,000

			waste.			
4. Monitoring, Evaluation and Dissemination of Project Results and Awareness-Raising and Training	Technical Assistance	F) Project results monitored, evaluated and disclosed.	F1) M&E and adaptive management applied in response to the needs and results of the mid-term assessment.  F2) Lessons learned and best practices extracted and disseminated at the national, regional and global level.		\$ 250,000	\$ 650,000
Subtotal					2,600,000	18,050,000
Project Management Cost (PMC)					130,000	950,000
<b>Total Project Cost</b>					<b>2,730,000</b>	<b>19,000,000</b>

2. Co-financing (comment provided by Minna):

- Please describe the definition/ approach used to differentiate between "investment mobilized" and "recurrent expenditures".

**UNDP's response:** The amounts listed under Investment mobilized are indicative figures based on preliminary discussions with the co-financiers. The final amounts will be confirmed during the PPG phase. Investment mobilized refers to additional investment that the private sector companies would have to do as a result of the project and can therefore not be considered recurrent expenditures. Recurrent expenditures have been listed under the Government in-kind contributions. Whereas the project will receive real and tangible support from the Ministry of Health, the human resources (as well as other resources) will be part of the annual budget that is being allocated to the

Ministry.

- Co-financing from the GoP has been identified as "in-kind" and "investment mobilized". However, where co-financing truly meets the definition of "in-kind", it should typically be classified as "recurrent expenditures" rather than "investment mobilized". Please revise.

**UNDP's response:** Adjustment made to "Recurrent expenditures". All co-financing of the Ministry of Health was consolidated under one line.

- Please complete the entry for Construction companies (this can be revised at later stage).

**UNDP's response:** Revised to Grant.

## 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 Yes.

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 Yes.

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**

Please provide information on how the indicator for mercury was developed, the amount may be low.

ES, 10/26/20: The mercury target was increased from 100 to 350 kg. Comment cleared

Indicator 11 needs to be filled out.

ES, 10/26/20: Indicator 11 has been updated. Comment cleared.

**Agency Response**

· #6. Please provide information on how the indicator for mercury was developed, the amount may be low.

**UNDP's response:** Target was increase after review with national authorities (increased from 100 kg to 350 kg). The following text was included in the PIF:

*Based on the results of the last official mercury inventory in Panama (2013), the liberation of mercury related to the use of mercury containing products in the medical sector is estimated to be 2,044.49 kg/year. Within the scope of the project, the reduction of 205 kg Hg for health products is estimated. In addition, health facilities at the national level also present the use of other general mercury products such as thermostats, mercury lamps, batteries and other laboratory products. It was estimated that the liberation of mercury from these type of products from the health sector included in this project is at least 150 kg. Therefore, a total reduction of about 350 kg of Hg is expected during the project period. Further analysis of potential additional contributions will be conducted during the PPG phase.*

Indicator 11 needs to be filled out.

**UNDP's response:** Indicator 11 was calculated; this text was included in the PIF:

11. Number of **direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender** as co-benefit of GEF investment.

Based on the number of health care facilities in Panama, their classification (based on complexity of services provided), the government authorities (such as MINSA, MiAmbiente, Customs Authority, National Waste Authority, Senafront, etc.), private counterparts (such as the power distribution and construction companies, hotels, Colon Free Trade Zone, Panama Canal) and Civil society organizations that will be involved in the implementation of the project, it is estimated that The project will directly impact 1,684 persons through its different components (585 male and 1,099 Female). Indirectly, the project will impact 2,798,262 (1,399,131 male and 1,399,131 female) users of the health care network around the country. During the PPG phase further analysis will be conducted to estimate the impact of the project.

## **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**

**Agency Response**

#### **art 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, the problem and root causes are well described.

**Agency Response**

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

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, the baseline is clear and well developed.

### Agency Response

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

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please see comments above on table B.

Also, please include information on how the components will respond to the COVID-19 crisis. The GEF has provided a document on COVID for reference.

ES, 10/26/20: Information on the COVID-19 situation, risks, and opportunities has been provided. Comment cleared.

### Agency Response

· #3. Please see comments above on table B.

Also, please include information on how the components will respond to the COVID-19 crisis. The GEF has provided a document on COVID for reference.

**UNDP's response:** Please see text included above about COVID-19 Responsiveness.

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes, the project is well aligned with the CW strategy.

**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, the incremental cost reasoning is well described.

**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**

More information is needed on the mercury benefits.

ES, 10/26/20: Mercury targets have been increased. Comment cleared.

**Agency Response**

· #6. More information is needed on the mercury benefits.

**UNDP's response:** Additional information on the potential of replicability of the project activities related to reduction of mercury was included.

Changes in Output E1:

It is expected that the finding of the pilot projects could be replicated in the 908 health care facilities that conform the government health care network.

Changes in Output E2: Increased reduction target from 100 kg to 350 kg.

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes, innovation and sustainability is addressed.

**Agency Response**

## **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 project will take place in Panama and the exact locations will be determined during PPG.

**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, stakeholder engagement is well provided, including CSO, local groups, and private sector.

**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**

Gender is included and a full gender analysis will be developed during PPG.

**Agency Response**

CAH: 28/10/2020 Please find answer to PPO's comment below.

3. Gender (comment provided by Gabriella): whereas recognizing the context and nature of this project (mainly a technical assistance project), it seems that UNDP should have been able, at this stage, to provide some preliminary information on important gender dimensions. While the PIF clearly indicate that a gender analysis will be carried out during PPG, please ask UNDP to provide some additional information on gender related to the project components

**UNDP's response:** Panama, like many countries in Latin America, needs more gender and sex disaggregated information related to the level and frequency of exposure to toxic chemicals and their impacts on human health, as well as on developing indicators to measure hazardous chemical's impacts on women and men. Data gathering in the labor market and health sector is especially important because gender-determined occupational roles have a direct impact on the exposure to chemicals. Specific policies to focus on gender and hazards of this and other polluting substances need to be produced.

Component 1 foresees the deployment of a collaborative approach to policy making that is sustained and continuously improves, integrating gender related issues across the implementation of the proposed activities.

Components 2 and 3 for POPs and Hg phaseout and management activities will benefit from other initiatives in the region to perform an in-depth review of existing Guidelines for update and expansion, adding an operational guide for maintenance practices based on Best Available Techniques/Best Environmental Practices (BAT/BEP), participating all relevant market stakeholders involved in the relevant elimination chains. The guidelines and pilot projects will include gender equity considerations indicating how the development of this activity considers different roles for women and men in the workplace, for instance, at the health care facilities.

Component 4 will provide gender-sensitive knowledge management and implement an outreach communication strategy that will allow the dissemination of BAP/BEP for the development of a national-level platform to create awareness for compliance. This strategy will also publish success stories and will provide recommendations for other potential actors. It will also include a gender approach for communication, education, training and capacity building workshops aimed at the FSP team, participating entities, key stakeholders and beneficiaries, related to risk management of hazardous waste.

Finally, a Gender Analysis and Action Plan will be prepared during the PPG phase. This plan will focus on three objectives as part of the project: 1) Capacity building for gender mainstreaming, 2) Women empowerment; 3) Information gathering regarding gender and hazardous wastes by conducting a national survey. The proposed actions to support these objectives will be undertaken to address the identified gender risk and leverage it for multiple benefits. Opportunities for improving the lives of women will be identified in the Gender Analysis and prepared at the PPG stage.

## **Private Sector Engagement**

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

## Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, there is significant private sector engagement.

## 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

COVID risks should be elaborated along the lines of the information document provided by the GEF.

On climate change the following key questions on STAP's guidance will be considered during review. Please be sure that the proposal responds adequately.

- i. Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?
- ii. How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately?
- iii. Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate change and its impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?
- iv. What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?

ES, 10/26/20: Information on the COVID-19 situation, risks, and opportunities has been provided. Information on Climate risks has also been provided. Comments cleared.

## Agency Response

### Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

- COVID risks should be elaborated along the lines of the information document provided by the GEF.

**UNDP's response:** COVID-19 risks and mitigation measures were updated. This text was included (highlighted in yellow):

Risk	Mitigation Measure
Absence of (exchange of) data (reliable), confidential data	Inter-agency coordination and implementation of an information system should mitigate this risk, as well as direct participation and cooperation by the private sector.
Weak inter-agency coordination / Conflict of competencies	The competencies between the various institutions will be improved with the integral waste management bill (in discussion) as well as the establishment of the Inter-Agency Commission on Chemical Substances.
Lack of technical capacity / Human Resources / Inspection and Law enforcement	The project includes strengthening of technical capacity in the public sector. The trainings envisaged in this project for the public sector will mitigate this risk.
Impact on source of income of recyclers present in landfill ("pepenadores")	The social and economic component of integral waste management should include a solution for the population currently living off the income from the recovery of recyclable materials. Professionalizing the recycling activity can improve their living, health and economic conditions.
Lack of cooperation from the Private Sector to eliminate or apply alternatives due to increased costs or due to financial constraints resulting by COVID-19 pandemic.	Close cooperation with the private sector minimizes this risk. The private sector is aware of the (high) costs of hazardous waste management and the need to reduce and eliminate the generation of hazardous waste, especially containing or generating POPs and mercury. The project will facilitate communication channels between the government and the private sector, so private sector can express their concerns and needs while getting information of stimulus packages or financial aids that may be available for them.
COVID-19 pandemic threat	1. To avoid change of priorities of central government due COVID-

	<p>... COVID-19 pandemic impact ...</p> <p>... COVID-19 pandemic impact ...</p> <p>19, which could include lack of availability of human and financial resources, the project will have close cooperation with stakeholders to highlight the links of the project with the governmental policies to deal with the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p>2. Develop innovative virtual and remote methods for working and implementation.</p> <p>3. Since the World has not yet found a vaccine for this virus, for the implementation of those activities that require social gathering, the Project will assume COVID-19 as a public health crisis, implementing the solutions for which are social distancing, careful sanitation, widespread testing, access to safety equipment, and immediate competent medical care, if needed. During the preparation of terms of reference, conditions will be included to request that service provider take into consideration the COVID-19 pandemic in their implementation plans.</p>
--	---

On climate change the following key questions on STAP's guidance will be considered during review. Please be sure that the proposal responds adequately.

i. Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?

**UNDP's response:** Yes, sensitivity to climate change to the project was considered and impacts were not identified. The project will have a positive impact to climate change thanks to the reduction of emissions that will be achieved.

ii. How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately?

**UNDP's response:** Objectives and outputs won't be affected by climate risks. They were considered during the preparation of the SESP and were considered low.

iii. Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate change and its impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?

**UNDP's response:** Yes, sensitivity to climate change to the project was considered and impacts were not identified

iv. What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?

**UNDP's response:** Component 1 of the project aims to strength national capabilities to collect and exchange information, coordination between institutions and enforcement of current and future legislation. So it is considered that the project will have a positive impact on preparing the country to address climate risk and enhance its resilience to climate impacts.

## 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

This project needs to includes coordination and KM links to other UNDP implemented projects on health care waste management, particularly those responding to COVID-19 and Ebola.

This project should also include coordination and KM links to other GEF funded PCB projects.

ES, 10/26/20: Coordination has been strengthened. Comment cleared.

### Agency Response

Coordination

· This project needs to includes coordination and KM links to other UNDP implemented projects on health care waste management, particularly those responding to COVID-19 and Ebola.

**UNDP's response:** The project will be in contact with other UNDP projects on HCWM, obtaining access to UNDP's network of experts.

This project should also include coordination and KM links to other GEF funded PCB projects.

**UNDP's response:** Additional information included in the document.

Text included highlighted in yellow.

This Project will be implemented under the National Implementation Modality (NIM) in accordance with UNDP's rules and regulation. The Ministry of Health – MINSA will be the National Executing Agency and will be responsible for the implementation of the project in Panama. UNDP will play the standard role as a GEF Implementation Agency and will provide clear implementation support to the Government of Panama. The Monitoring and Evaluation Coordination will follow standard UNDP-GEF policies as standard practice in all UNDP projects that are being financed by the GEF.

The National Project Director is a staff member of the MINSA and s/he will have overall responsibility of the project implementation. The Project Coordinator will be hired with Project Funds and will oversee the day to day management of the project. He/She will report directly to the National Project Director. The National Project Director will at least annually report to the Project Steering Committee which is composed of the Government of Panama and UNDP.

The project will be coordinated within MINSA by the Sub-directorate of Environmental Health, and implemented in close cooperation with Ministry of Environment, Municipalities where pilot projects will be developed and other institutions related to the subject. The Inter-Agency Commission on Chemical Substances to be established will be a key element in coordinating the implementation of this project with the various institutions.

The project will interact with other PCB and POPs projects in LAC, especially those implemented by UNDP, to exchange experiences, lesson learned and good practices to ensure a smooth and impactful implementation of all activities. The project will benefit particularly from the experiences and expert network that UNDP gained during the implementation of projects on health care waste management during the Ebola epidemic in Africa and the COVID-19 response network.

## **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, this project is consistent with the NIP and MIA.

### 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

Please see the comment under Coordination which also addresses KM.

ES, 10/26/20: Coordination and KM has been strengthened. Comment cleared.

### Agency Response

· Please see the comment under Coordination which also addresses KM.

**UNDP’s response:** The following text was included:

*The project will have the opportunity to learn from previous and ongoing initiatives from other countries in the region implemented by UNDP; those projects will share their good practices, approaches, results of the activities, examples and expert’s network created by the different projects.*

*The specific Knowledge Management Strategy will be developed during the PPG phase.*

## **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**

Yes, ESS is addressed.

**Agency Response**

## **art 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

Agency Response

EFSEC 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

Not at this time. Some issues need to be clarified.

ES, 10/28/20: PPO has the following comments which need to be addressed:

PIF to be returned to the Agency due to:

1- There is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC – it should be around 5% as it is the GEF contribution. Hence, for a co-financing of \$18,750,000, the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$937,500 instead of \$250,000.

Please ask the Agency to amend.

2- Co-financing:

- Please describe the definition/ approach used to differentiate between "investment mobilized" and "recurrent expenditures".

- Co-financing from the GoP has been identified as "in-kind" and "investment mobilized". However, where co-financing truly meets the definition of "in-kind", it should typically be classified as "recurrent expenditures" rather than "investment mobilized". Please revise.

- Please complete the entry for Construction companies (this can be revised at later stage).

3- Gender: whereas recognizing the context and nature of this project (mainly a technical assistance project), it seems that UNDP should have been able, at this stage, to provide some preliminary information on important gender dimensions. While the PIF clearly indicate that a gender analysis will be carried out during PPG, please ask UNDP to provide some additional information on gender related to the project components

ES, 11/1/2020: The following PPO comment needs to be addressed:

PIF to be returned to the Agency due to:

3- Gender: There is an elaboration in the review comment sheet on PPO comment on gender. This information is, however, not visible/included in the actual PIF in Portal. Please ask the Agency to amend in Portal.

ES, 10/28/20: PPO's comment has been addressed. PIF is recommended 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

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/8/2020	10/23/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/28/2020	10/28/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/2/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/2/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

## **Brief Reasoning for Recommendations to CEO for EIR Approval**

This project aims to prevent, reduce and eliminate the presence and emission of POPs and Mercury in Panama to protect public health and the environment in compliance with the Stockholm and Minamata Conventions. It will strengthening legal and institutional capacities for sound management of POPs and Mercury. The project will take an integrated approach and will address UPOPs by decrease incidence of waste burning of dump sites/landfills and proper handling of hospital waste, combined with plastics waste minimization in touristic areas. The project will also eliminate PCB equipment and waste from sensitive sites and reduce the use of Expanded Polysterene building material for reduction of HBCD. This project will result in several global environmental benefits, including reduction of 202 MT of POPs and mercury, 530 MT of POPs and mercury containing materials, 6 gTEQ of UPOPs, and climate benefits of 6,765 MT CO2 equivalent.