

Strengthening the national capacity for the management of POPs in Costa Rica

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11015

Countries

Costa Rica

Project Name

Strengthening the national capacity for the management of POPs in Costa Rica

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

6/23/2023

Review completed by PM

10/19/2023

Program Manager

Evelyn Swain

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

Project Type

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, the project is well aligned.

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.

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 Yes. There is more co-financing that was estimated at PIF and it includes significant support 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, PPG is reported in Annex C.

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 Core indicators remain the same as at CEO Endorsement.

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 it is well elaborated.

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 is well developed.

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 and includes a TOC.

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

The focal area is well aligned, but the plastics components of this project should also coordinate with the Costa Rica child project of the Plastics IP that is also implemented by UNDP.

ES, 9/12/23: Please confirm that this project will coordinate with the plastics IP.

ES, 9/26/23: It was clarified that the projects will coordinate. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Answer 9/14/23

Costa Rica has recently been selected for the GEF IP "Circular solutions to plastic pollution in Costa Rica" which aims for policy coherence, access to finance, innovation with the establishment of new return and deposit schemes and capacity building of participating stakeholders to achieve systemic change in food and beverage industry. Specifically, the project will reduce the amount of plastic that the food and beverage industry put on the market and incentivize them to implement circular solutions to plastic packaging.

Although the IP was not confirmed when designing the PRODOC of the "Strengthening the national capacity for the management of POPs in Costa Rica" Project, during its implementation the project will definitely contain articulation points mainly on the activities

directed to strengthen plastic management systems (Output C1 and C2) where plastic that the food and beverage industry put on the market can be found.

In addition, it is relevant to highlight that the PRODOC design of the IP in Costa Rica will include the synergies and articulations with this GEF/UNDP Project.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, 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 elaborated.

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.

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, stakeholder engagement report was included.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, gender action plan was developed during PPG.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, there is a description of private sector engagement and there is also contributions from the private sector to co-financing.

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 are elaborated.

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, this implementation arrangements are described. At PIF stage there was an approval on an exceptional basis for UNDP to support a small amount executing functions.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Benefits

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Response to Council and STAP comments are missing. Please provide detailed responses.

ES 9/12/23: Please see comment below about STAP comments.

Agency Response

UNDP Answer: Responses included on ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS

UNDP Answer 9/14/23:

Updated file has been uploaded and table has been removed. Portal updated.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please find below PPO review comment for FSP ID11015- Costa Rica:

1. Core indicators:

? Please consider including the core indicator 6 and the target in the results framework (annex A).

? The target for core indicators 10 and 11 are not consistent with the results framework. Please revise accordingly.

2. Co-financing:

? The letter of support of for ?Fonds Fran?ais pour l'Environnement Mondial? is indicating UNDP as the source of cofinancier. Please revise ?Fonds Fran?ais pour l'Environnement Mondial? to UNDP and ?Donor Agency? to ?GEF Agency?.

? Please consider including an English translation of letter of support from ESPH, ICE.

3. Geographic location data:

? In Annex D on Project Map and Coordinates, please consider inserting the geographic location of the site directly under the dedicated data entry field in the portal.

4. KM: The project document includes a set of knowledge management and communications activities, especially as part of Component 4, including knowledge and communications products to share key messages and experiences and disseminate lessons learned as well as training, workshops, lessons learned

case study reports, and a knowledge and information exchange (KIE) platform at national level, The project document includes references to a communication plan and the project's results framework lists targeted KM and communications deliverables. A budget for KM&L activities have been provided in the KM section. However, a timeline for the implementation of key KM and communications activities has not been provided.

The agency is requested to provide implementation timelines for key KM and communications activities.

5. Gender: Please reflect in Component 4, E2) M&E reporting on the Gender Action Plan.

6. Operations:

b. Please provide more details on expenditure categories of the PPG spending report:

c. Budget table: Project Coordinator is charged to both project components and PMC, please consider to charge to PMC and proportionately between GEF financing and co-financing.

ES, 10/4/23: PPO has the following comments

The cancellation deadline for this project is on December 23, 2023. This project must be circulated as it is implemented by UNDP. Most of the comments provided on July 28th were addressed, but other were not:

(i) Comment 6a is not addressed, UNDP is not yet listed as co-executing partner in the Information section of the Portal entry. I can't find GPU Manager's of the dual role in either the review comment section or in the review sheet.

(ii) Comment 6b on PPG expenditure report is addressed.

(iii) Comment 6c on Project Coordinator charged to component and PMC is not adjusted, instead UNDP responded as following:

(iv) Knowledge Management: in the Prodoc I was unable to find Annex 4 Multiyear Workplan that is supposed to contain ?implementation timelines for key KM and communications activities?. In the Prodoc, there is section IX. Total Budget and Work Plan. But this section only provides annual budgets for KM related consultants and contractual services (as part of Component 4) and no timelines are included for key KM and communications activities. The agency is requested to provide the timelines for the implementation of key KM and communications activities. This can be a small itemized table that can be added to

the KM section. Or the agency can share Annex 4 - if it already includes this information.

ES, 10/16/23: Still comment 6a is not addressed because UNDP is not included as executing partner in the Project Information section ? note that in section ?Institutional Arrangements? in the CEO Endorsement request in Portal.

Agency Response

1. Core indicators:

? Please consider including the core indicator 6 and the target in the resultsframework (annex A).

UNDP Answer: Thanks. Core Indicator 6 was included in the PRF (Annex A)

? The target for core indicators 10 and 11 are not consistent with the resultsframework. Please revise accordingly.

UNDP Answer: For Core Indicator 11: Number of beneficiaries were updated accordingly in the CEO ER.

For Core Indicator 10. Please refer to methodologies for calculation.

Both CEO ER and results framework indicates the following methodology:

Core Indicator 10: Reduction, avoidance of emissions of POPs to air from point and non-point sources (grams of toxic equivalent gTEQ)

This Core Indicator is measured for 5 years of project implementation and 2 years after project implementation.

The UPOPs calculation is done applying the Stockholm Toolkit^[1].

In the case of biomass burning: Group 6 ? Category a ? Class 1 and 3.

The project will gradually address 10% of the annual UPOPs emissions of the selected crops.

This means avoiding 9gTEQ (accrued) during 5 years of project implementation, reaching 17gTEQ (accrued) after 2 years of project completion.

In the case of plastics: Group 6 ? Category a ? Class 1 and 3.

The project will gradually address 40% of the annual UPOPs emissions due to mismanagement of plastics in prioritized sectors..

This means avoiding 9gTEQ (accrued) during 5 years of project implementation, reaching 17gTEQ (accrued) after 2 years of project completion.

TOTAL: 18 gTEQ during 5 years of project implementation, reaching 34 gTEQ (accrued) after 2 years of project completion.

The Results framework shows 18gTEQ which is the target during project lifetime. CEO GEBs table shows total benefit 34gTEQ (5 years of project + 2 years after project completion)

2. Co-financing:

? The letter of support of for ?Fonds Fran?ais pour l'Environnement Mondial? is indicating UNDP as the source of cofinancier. Please revise ?Fonds Fran?ais pour l'Environnement Mondial? to UNDP and ?Donor Agency? to ?GEF Agency?

UNDP Answer: Adjusted.

? Please consider including an English translation of letter of support from ESPH,ICE.

UNDP Answer: included.

3. Geographic location data:

? In Annex D on Project Map and Coordinates, please consider inserting the geographic location of the site directly under the dedicated data entry field in the portal.

UNDP Answer: Location Name, Latitude, Longitude, Geo Name ID, & Activity Description inserted in the GEO location section of the GEF portal.

4. KM: The project document includes a set of knowledge management and communications activities, especially as part of Component 4, including knowledge and communications products to share key messages and experiences and disseminate lessons learned as well as training, workshops, lessons learned case study reports, and a knowledge and information exchange (KIE) platform at national level. The project document includes references to a communication plan and the project's results framework lists targeted KM and communications deliverables. A budget for KM&L activities have been provided in the KM section. However, a timeline for the implementation of key KM and communications activities has not been provided.

The agency is requested to provide implementation timelines for key KM and communications activities.

UNDP Answer: The timeline of project activities is located in PRODOC Annex 4: Multiyear Workplan.

5. Gender: Please reflect in Component 4, E2) M&E reporting on the Gender Action Plan.

UNDP Answer: The monitoring of the Gender Action was already mentioned within monitoring activities in Output E2 (item iii of activities listed under E2).



6. Operations:

b. Please provide more details on expenditure categories of the PPG spending report:

UNDP Answer: additional details included.

c. Budget table: Project Coordinator is charged to both project components and PMC, please consider to charge to PMC and proportionately between GEF financing and co-financing.

UNDP Answer: As indicated on PRODOC Annex 7 on technical consultancies, the Project coordinator is expected to support technical and administrative components.

[1]

<http://www.pops.int/Implementation/UnintentionalPOPs/ToolkitforUPOPs/ToolkitMethodology/tabid/196/Default.aspx>

UNDP responses to comments received on 10/4/23

The cancellation deadline for this project is on December 23, 2023. This project must be circulated as it is implemented by UNDP. Most of the comments provided on July 28th were addressed, but other were not:

(i) Comment 6a is not addressed, UNDP is not yet listed as co-executing partner in the Information section of the Portal entry. I can't find GPU Manager's of the dual role in either the review comment section or in the review sheet.

UNDP Answer: This project is designed and approved with an implementation modality of "UNDP support to NIM". The scope of UNDP services is detailed in the Letter of agreement (LOA). The background of the LOA and scope of services are summarized under question "is the institutional arrangement of project implementation fully described". Under this modality, UNDP is responsible and accountable for the provision of services, upon the request of the IP, ensuring the quality and timeliness of these services. For this project, the government retains full programmatic control, accountability, and ownership of project activities. The PRODOC describes this structure of the Project Board as well. With this arrangement, UNDP cannot be listed as Executing partner.

(ii) Comment 6b on PPG expenditure report is addressed.

UNDP Answer: noted

(iii) Comment 6c on Project Coordinator charged to component and PMC is not adjusted, instead UNDP responded as following:

UNDP Answer: UNDP Answer: Project Coordinator costs is charged project components and PMC as the individual is expected to perform both technical and coordination activities (See description on UNDP PRODOC Annex 7 - Technical Consultancies for a detailed list of activities). In addition, it's important to note that the figures indicated on the budget represents the maximum figure to be costed out of the project. It is expected that part of the Project Coordinator's expenses are covered by MINAE's Co-financing.

(iv) Knowledge Management: in the Prodoc I was unable to find Annex 4 Multiyear Workplan that is supposed to contain ?implementation timelines for key KM and communications activities?. In the Prodoc, there is section IX. Total Budget and Work Plan. But this section only provides annual budgets for KM related consultants and contractual services (as part of Component 4) and no timelines are included for key KM and communications activities. The agency is requested to provide the timelines for the implementation of key KM and communications activities. This can be a small itemized table that can be added to the KM section. Or the agency can share Annex 4 - if it already includes this information.

UNDP Answer: Annex 4: Multi-year Work Plan was uploaded into the Roadmap section of the GEF Portal on 6/22/2023.

Please see below a copy of the table with the relevant workplan for component 4 which includes KM. Hope this clarifies the requirement.

Components	Outcomes	Outputs	Activities	Year 1				Year 2				Year 3	
				Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2
COMPONENT 4. Lessons learned identified, monitored, and assessed	OUTCOME E. Awareness-raised, lessons learned, and knowledge managed	<u>Output E1. Awareness raising approaches and plans developed and implemented.</u>	a) Case Study Reports developed										
			b) Communication Strategy			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
			c) Implement the Stakeholder Engagement Plan	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
			d) Implement the Gender Action Plan	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
		<u>Output E2. M&E and adaptive management in response to necessities and results from the MTR and final findings with lessons learned applied.</u>	a) Project's Inception Workshop	x									
			b) Monitoring	x		x		x		x		x	
			c) Holding Project Steering Meetings.		x		x		x		x		x
			d) Carrying out ?Mid-Term Review? (MTR)										
			e) Carrying out Terminal Evaluation (TE)										
		<u>Output E3. Knowledge management system for best practices and communication platform at national level established.</u>	Permanent knowledge and information exchange (KIE) platform implemented					x	x	x	x	x	x

ES, 10/16/23: Still comment 6a is not addressed because UNDP is not included as executing partner in the Project Information section ? note that in section ?Institutional Arrangements? in the CEO Endorsement request in Portal.

UNDP Answer: 10/18/23: According to its policies, UNDP can indeed only select one Implementing Partner. According to the UNDP Financial Regulations, the implementing partner is ?the entity to which the Administrator has entrusted the implementation of UNDP assistance specified in a signed document along with the assumption of full responsibility and accountability for the effective use of UNDP resources and the delivery of outputs, as set forth in such document?. So, by signing the Project document, the IP agrees to manage the project and achieve the defined results. As this is a NIM project, the only implementing partner will be the national partner, not UNDP.

However, it's important to note that there is a request from the Government for UNDP to provide execution support services. Therefore, this project is designed and approved with an implementation modality of "UNDP support to NIM". The scope of UNDP services is detailed in the Letter of agreement (LOA) - see uploaded document "PIMS_6496_GEFID_11015_POPs COSTA RICA_GEF_LOA". The background of the LOA and scope of services are summarized under question "is the institutional arrangement of project implementation fully described". Under this modality, UNDP is responsible and accountable for the provision of services, upon the request of the IP, ensuring the quality and timeliness of these services. For this project, the government retains full programmatic control, accountability, and ownership of project activities. The PRODOC describes this structure of the Project Board as well. With this arrangement, UNDP cannot be listed as Executing partner.

ES, 10/16/23: Still comment 6a is not addressed because UNDP is not included as executing partner in the Project Information section ? note that in section ?Institutional Arrangements? in the CEO Endorsement request in Portal.

UNDP Answer: 10/24/23: We cannot add a new executing partner on the Project information section: At CEO Endorsement request Stage, the portal is blocked and doesn't allow us to add additional Executing partners.

Countries Costa Rica,	Agency(ies) UNDP,
Executing Partner ⓘ <input type="text" value="Ministry of Energy and Environment (MINAE)"/>	Executing Partner Type <input type="text" value="Government"/>
GEF Focal Area Chemicals and Waste	Duration 60 <small>In Months</small>

In addition; CEO Endorsement Section 6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination, indicates that UNDP will provide support MINAE's execution, as requested by the GEF OFP.

UNDP project support: The Implementing Partner and GEF OFP have requested UNDP to provide support services in the amount of USD\$ 58,000 for the full duration of the project, and the GEF has agreed for UNDP Costa Rica Operations team to provide such execution support services and for the cost of these services to be charged to the project budget. The execution support services ? whether financed from the project budget or other sources - have been set out in detail and agreed between UNDP Country Office and the Implementing Partner in a Letter of Agreement (LOA). This LOA is attached to this Project Document.

To ensure the strict independence required by the GEF and in accordance with the UNDP Internal Control Framework, these execution services will be delivered independent from the GEF-specific oversight and quality assurance services.

Section 3: Segregation of duties and firewalls vis-?-vis UNDP representation on the project board:

As noted in the [Minimum Fiduciary Standards for GEF Partner Agencies](#), in cases where a GEF Partner Agency (i.e. UNDP) carries out both implementation oversight and execution of a project, the GEF Partner Agency (i.e. UNDP) must separate its project implementation oversight and execution duties, and describe in the relevant project document a: 1) Satisfactory institutional arrangement for the separation of implementation oversight and executing functions in different departments of the GEF Partner Agency; and 2) Clear lines of responsibility, reporting and accountability within the GEF Partner Agency between the project implementation oversight and execution functions.

In this case, UNDP's implementation oversight role in the project ? as represented in the project board and via the project assurance function ? is performed by the UNDP Resident

Representative Costa Rica (on Project Board), and the UNDP Costa Rica Environmental Focal Point (project assurance). UNDP's execution role in the project (as requested by the implementing partner and approved by the GEF) is performed by UNDP Costa Rica Operations, and other staff in the Operations unit, who will report to the Deputy Resident Representative.

UNDP Answer: 10/31/23

UNDP has been inserted as an Executing Partner in a single line separated by comma. Please note that, although two Executing Partners will be inserted on the Project Information site of the portal, only one type (Government) for both will remain.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Response to council comments are missing. Council comments can be found in the following document on the GEF website:

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/2022-08/GEF_C.62_Compilation_council_comments.pdf

Please provide detailed responses.

ES, 9/12/23: Council comments have been addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP Answer: Responses included on ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Responses to STAP comments are needed. Please provide detailed responses.

ES, 9/12/23: Please respond to the STAP comments from the STAP reviewer. The table of what STAP looks for can be removed.

ES, 9/26/23: STAP Comments have been addressed. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Answer 9/14/23:

Updated file has been uploaded and table has been removed. Portal updated.

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 Provided.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Provided.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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, 9/12/23: Not at this time. There is a question on coordinating with the plastics IP and STAP comments remaining.

ES, 10/4/23: Not at this time. Some issues remain.

ES, 10/11/23: Not at this time. One issue remains.

ES, 10/23/23: Not at this time. One issue remains.

ES, 11/3/23: CEO Endorsement is recommended.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	7/20/2023	

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/12/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/26/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/4/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/16/2023	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

This project aims to reduce emissions and releases of toxic chemicals, minimize exposure of humans to unintentionally produced POPs (UPOPs) in strategic sectors including plastics, and advance the Stockholm Convention in Costa Rica. The project will strengthen institutional capacities, and the policy and regulatory framework to address POPs-containing chemicals, products and waste, including plastics. It will demonstrate through 3 pilot projects for the reduction of UPOP emissions from uncontrolled and/or open burning of biomass (sugarcane, pineapple, and rice), agrochemicals, and other waste. The project will also improve plastics management in POPs generating sectors such as agriculture and end of life vehicles. This project will result in several global environmental benefits, including addressing 30 tons of POPs containing martialals, 1 ton of PCBs, and 34 gTEQ UPOPs.