

# **Environmentally Sound Management of POPs, Mercury and other Hazardous Chemicals in Argentina**

*GEF Secretariat Review for Full Sized Project*

## **Basic Information**

**GEF ID**  
10094

**Countries**  
Argentina

**Project Title**  
Environmentally Sound Management of POPs, Mercury and other Hazardous Chemicals in Argentina

**GEF Agency(ies)**  
UNDP

**Agency ID**  
UNDP: 6281

**GEF Focal Area(s)**  
Chemicals and Waste

**Program Manager**  
Evelyn Swain

## **Part I – Project Information**

### **Focal area elements**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
Yes, this project is aligned with the Chemicals and Waste Strategy for GEF-7.

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

1. Core indicators on HHP, Mercury, containers containing POPS are missing for Indicator 9

ES, 11/17/18: HHP will be added to core indicator 9, but it doesn't show up in the portal yet. Please add it under POPs and make a note in the text then at the CEO Endorsement there will be a space for HHP.

ES, 11/19/18: HHP was added under Aldin and will be changed at CEO Endorsement. - Comment cleared

2. Core indicator 11 needs to be filled out

ES, 11/17/18: Please provide an estimate at PIF stage which can be adjusted after PPG.

ES, 11/19/18: Core indicator added. -comment cleared

3. Rio Markers need to be filled out

ES, 11/17/18: Comment cleared.

4. The NIP for Minamata Convention are not mandatory please adjust accordingly

ES, 11/19/18: Comment cleared

5. Please clearly indicate in the project description how the 2025/2028 PCB targets will be met.

ES, 11/17/18: The question is if this project will meet the phaseout targets with the PCBs that will be addressed?

ES, 11/19/18: Comment cleared

6. The section on scale up needs improvement. What mechanisms, financial and otherwise will be explored, developed etc to ensure the objectives are sustained?

ES, 11/17/18: Comment cleared

7. The Taxonomy needs to add Highly Hazardous Pesticides

ES, 11/17/18: Comment cleared

8. In output C2 please clarify that type of mining

ES, 11/17/18: Please clarify what type of gold mining. i.e. large scale or ASGM

11/19/18: Comment cleared

ES, 11/20/18

- There are no Rio Markers. This project does not describe any climate co-benefits, and the Rio Markers for CCM and CCA should be "0".

ES, 11/20/18: Rio Markers have been fixed. Comment cleared

Agency Response

1) Core indicators on HHP, Mercury, containers containing POPS are missing for Indicator 9

<b>Indicator 9 Reduction, disposal/destruction, phase out, elimination and avoidance of chemicals of global concern and their waste in the environment and in processes, materials and products (metric tons of toxic chemicals reduced)</b>			
Expected at PIF (Metric Tons)	Expected at CEO Endorsement (Metric Tons)	Achieved at MTR (Metric Tons)	Achieved at TE (Metric Tons)
<b>Indicator 9.1 Solid and liquid Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and POPs containing materials and products removed or disposed (metric tons/POPs type)</b>			
Expected at PIF (Metric Tons)	Expected at CEO Endorsement (Metric Tons)	Achieved at MTR (Metric Tons)	Achieved at TE (Metric Tons)
5,000 PCB contaminated material	TBD	TBD	TBD
100 Tons of POPs/Non-POPs / Highly hazardous pesticides *	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Indicator 9.2 Quantity of mercury reduced (metric tons)</b>			
Expected at PIF (Metric Tons)	Expected at CEO Endorsement (Metric Tons)	Achieved at MTR (Metric Tons)	Achieved at TE (Metric Tons)
350 MT (Gold mine) 20 MT pilots (mercury contaminated waste)	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Indicator 9.3 Hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFC) Reduced/Phased out (metric tons)</b>			
Expected at PIF (Metric Tons)	Expected at CEO Endorsement (Metric Tons)	Achieved at MTR (Metric Tons)	Achieved at TE (Metric Tons)

	Tons)		
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Indicator 9.4 Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste</b>	<b>Indicator 9.4 Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste</b>	<b>Indicator 9.4 Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste</b>	<b>Indicator 9.4 Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste</b>
Expected at PIF (Number)	Expected at CEO Endorsement (Number)	Achieved at MTR (Number)	Achieved at TE (Number)
1	0	0	1
<b>Indicator 9.5 Number of low-chemical/non-chemical systems implemented, particularly in food production, manufacturing and cities</b>			
Expected at PIF (Number)	Expected at CEO Endorsement (Number)	Achieved at MTR (Number)	Achieved at TE (Number)

\* Please note that Core indicator for HHP is currently missing from the GEF Portal. It will be added at accordingly at a next stage.

b) Core indicator 11 needs to be filled out

UNDP was the first UN agency to define the competencies needed to advance gender equality, and has been a leading agency within the UN system in this area. Since 1996, UNDP has sought to advance gender equality through its programmes and has developed internal gender capacities and coordinated with partners to mobilize expertise and resources.

Understanding the relationship between gender and sound chemicals management is important for the overall effectiveness of any project on chemicals and wastes. Women and men are impacted differently by chemicals and through different routes. They have different experiences of dealing with sources of exposure, and different priorities, responsibilities and needs relating to the reduction of toxic chemicals and wastes. In many developing countries, women and men also often have different levels of access to participation, decision-making, information, education or justice, and face different constraints in their efforts to improve their environment and living conditions. They can also play different roles in making decisions about pollution prevention, waste management, identification of sources of chemical exposure, and building a safer environment for communities.

Given the knowledge and experience with gender dimensions, the Project's stage is considered at a very early stage to define a number of Female and Male beneficiaries that will be benefited from the Project. Experience shows that a lack of gender analysis at the project design stage results in a low level of women participating and involved during project implementation. Another lesson that has been learned is that considering gender issues at the design stage could have helped to overcome certain cultural, social and religious norms and influences in some countries. Therefore, a strong gender analysis at the PPG Phase will provide the necessary beneficiary disaggregated information that will allow for a strong follow-up of the indicators and measurement of the positive outcomes of the project.

<b>Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment</b>				
	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female	4,400	TBD at PPG		
Male	3,600	TBD at PPG		
Total	8,000	TBD at PPG		

c) Rio Markers need to be filled out

The Rio Markers targeting of the proposed project is as follows:

- Biodiversity: Not targeted as 0% of the budget is allocated toward this theme.
- Desertification: Not targeted as 0% of the budget is allocated toward this theme.
- Climate change mitigation (i.e. reductions in or absorption of greenhouse gas emissions): Not targeted as 0% of the budget is allocated toward this theme.
- Climate change adaptation (including climate risk mitigation and vulnerability reduction): Not targeted as 0% of the budget is allocated toward this theme.

It is important to note that even though the Rio Markers are not the main targets of the Proposed project, some of its possible results may have positive indirect impacts in the markers. An example of indirect impact is the improvement on biodiversity as conservation activities can be improved with limited exposure to toxic chemicals.

d) The NIP for Minamata Convention are not mandatory please adjust accordingly

The development of a Minamata NIP is not mandatory; however, Argentina wishes to establish a plan with clear and measurable outcomes that continues a strategic approach to Mercury-related issues.

Output B4) Minamata Implementation Plan for Mercury-related activities. Technical support for the development and execution of an Implementation Plan considering the relevant activities and needs identified under the MIA. These include: evaluation, design and promotion of feasible alternatives for replacement of mercury-added products (such as thermometers, batteries and lamps); controlling and reducing emissions of mercury in point sources (such as cement factories, coal power plants and coal industrial boilers, smelting and calcination processes used in the production of non-ferrous metals); implementation of measures to decrease the use of dental amalgams and improve its storage, use, collection, treatment and disposal; impact on transition measures (such as design of policies and programs to promote knowledge, development of best environmental practices and viable alternative technologies with focus on private sector and other stakeholder's involvement); and design and assessment of economic instruments to encourage compliance of international commitments assumed.

e) Please clearly indicate in the project description how the 2025/2028 PCB targets will be met.

The suggested activities in the project will support annual eliminations of up to 2,000 MT of PCB contaminated materials in close collaboration with the national and local governments and the efforts of the private sector. Consequently, this project will assist Argentina to comply with the 2025 and 2028 PCB targets of the Stockholm Convention. The Government of Argentina will not request additional funding to phase out PCBs once this project is completed.

f) The section on scale up needs improvement. What mechanisms, financial and otherwise will be explored, developed etc to ensure the objectives are sustained?

The innovation of this project is based on the integrated approach for different waste materials containing POPs, mercury and other hazardous chemicals in various economic sectors. This will be the first time a coordinate effort will be conducted at this scale in Argentina on hazardous waste management and disposal. It is expected to generate increased awareness among stakeholders about their obligations on POPs/UPOPs/Mercury management and will identify cost effective options for them.

Sustainability of the project beyond its completion will be mainly ensured in the institutional side by the strengthening of the capacity of already existing institutions, supported by policies and regulations that will be further improved and expanded upon with the project's support, such as the establishment of a coordination mechanism of Government with private sector to impulse investments in the hazardous waste management sector by establishing incentives for the private sector and by enhancing dialogue and collaboration between producers, importers and users of hazardous chemicals and waste and those who treat those types of wastes (as stated in Paragraph 29) and the establishment of the hazardous chemical substances management strategy and PRTR mechanism (paragraph 32), as well as the Minamata Implementation Plan for Mercury-related activities (paragraph 35) which will help to sustain project's objectives. Sustainability will be further ensured by supporting key elements such as improved enforcement capacity and the establishment of a monitoring mechanism that will facilitate the information gathering on management and disposal activities in the country.

The potential for scale up is based on the following. First, the four pilot projects outputs will serve as the basis for replication in other cases in the country, supported by the feasibility study developed. Secondly, pilot projects are done with the private sector in order to improve the chance of long-term sustainability. In addition, regarding PCBs, as stated in paragraph 46, there are at least 5 provinces that lack of this kind of services and PCBs destruction has not been reported. Furthermore, results obtained can be replicated in other countries in the region, while large potential also exists for replication in other regions in the world of this kind of integrated POPs approach.

g) The Taxonomy needs to add Highly Hazardous Pesticides

Attached.

h) In output C2 please clarify that type of mining

Agency Response

Large Scale Gold mining

## **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

ES, 11/20/18: The co-financing table includes US\$100,000 in co-financing from public hospitals that is classified as "in-kind" and "investment mobilized". Where co-financing truly meets the definition of "in-kind", it should typically be classified as "recurrent expenditures" rather than "investment mobilized".

ES, 11/20/18: co-financing has been fixed. Comment cleared  
Agency Response

## **GEF Resource Availability**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

### **The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

### **The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

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

- Core indicators on HHP, Mercury, containers containing POPS are missing for Indicator 9
- Core indicator 11 needs to be filled out
- Core indicator 3 should be filled out if possible

- Rio Markers need to be filled out

ES, 11/17/18: See comments above

ES, 11/19/18: Comments cleared

Agency Response

- a) Core indicators on HHP, Mercury, containers containing POPs are missing for Indicator 9

<b>Indicator 9 Reduction, disposal/destruction, phase out, elimination and avoidance of chemicals of global concern and their waste in the environment and in processes, materials and products (metric tons of toxic chemicals reduced)</b>			
Expected at PIF (Metric Tons)	Expected at CEO Endorsement (Metric Tons)	Achieved at MTR (Metric Tons)	Achieved at TE (Metric Tons)
POPs / Obsolete Pesticides	100		
<b>Indicator 9.1 Solid and liquid Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and POPs containing materials and products removed or disposed (metric tons/POPs type)</b>			
Expected at PIF (Metric Tons)	Expected at CEO Endorsement (Metric Tons)	Achieved at MTR (Metric Tons)	Achieved at TE (Metric Tons)
5000 PCB contaminated material	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Indicator 9.2 Quantity of mercury reduced (metric tons)</b>			
Expected at PIF (Metric Tons)	Expected at CEO Endorsement (Metric Tons)	Achieved at MTR (Metric Tons)	Achieved at TE (Metric Tons)
350 MT (Gold mine) 20 MT pilots (mercury contaminated waste)	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Indicator 9.3 Hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFC) Reduced/Phased out (metric tons)</b>			
Expected at PIF (Metric Tons)	Expected at CEO Endorsement (Metric Tons)	Achieved at MTR (Metric Tons)	Achieved at TE (Metric Tons)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Indicator 9.4 Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste</b>			
Expected at PIF (Number)	Expected at CEO Endorsement (Number)	Achieved at MTR (Number)	Achieved at TE (Number)
1	0	0	1
<b>Indicator 9.5 Number of low-chemical/non-chemical systems implemented, particularly in food production, manufacturing and cities</b>			
Expected at PIF (Number)	Expected at CEO Endorsement (Number)	Achieved at MTR (Number)	Achieved at TE (Number)

b) Core indicator 11 needs to be filled out

UNDP was the first UN agency to define the competencies needed to advance gender equality, and has been a leading agency within the UN system in this area. Since 1996, UNDP has sought to advance gender equality through its programmes and has developed internal gender capacities and coordinated with partners to mobilize expertise and resources.

Understanding the relationship between gender and sound chemicals management is important for the overall effectiveness of any project on chemicals and wastes. Women and men are impacted differently by chemicals and through different routes. They have different experiences of dealing with sources of exposure, and different priorities, responsibilities and needs relating to the reduction of toxic chemicals and wastes. In many developing countries, women and men also often have different levels of access to participation, decision-making, information, education or justice, and face different constraints in their efforts to improve their environment and living conditions. They can also play different roles in making decisions about pollution prevention, waste management, identification of sources of chemical exposure, and building a safer environment for communities.

Given the knowledge and experience with gender dimensions, the Project's stage is considered at a very early stage to define a number of Female and Male beneficiaries that will be benefited from the Project. Experience shows that a lack of gender analysis at the project design stage results in a low level of women participating and involved during project implementation. Another lesson that has been learned is that considering gender issues at the design stage could have helped to overcome certain cultural, social and religious norms and influences in some countries. Therefore, a strong gender analysis at the PPG Phase will provide the necessary beneficiary disaggregated information that will allow for a strong follow-up of the indicators and measurement of the positive outcomes of the project.

<b>Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment</b>				
	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female	0	TBD at PPG		
Male	0	TBD at PPG		
Total	0	TBD at PPG		

c) Rio Markers need to be filled out

The Rio Markers targeting of the proposed project is as follows:

- Biodiversity: Not targeted as 0% of the budget is allocated toward this theme.
- Desertification: Not targeted as 0% of the budget is allocated toward this theme.
- Climate change mitigation (i.e. reductions in or absorption of greenhouse gas emissions): Not targeted as 0% of the budget is allocated toward this theme.

- Climate change adaptation (including climate risk mitigation and vulnerability reduction):  
Not targeted as 0% of the budget is allocated toward this theme.

d) Core indicators on HHP, Mercury, containers containing POPs are missing for Indicator 9

<b>b) Indicator 9 Reduction, disposal/destruction, phase out, elimination and avoidance of chemicals of global concern and their waste in the environment and in processes, materials and products (metric tons of toxic chemicals reduced)</b>			
Expected at PIF (Metric Tons)	Expected at CEO Endorsement (Metric Tons)	Achieved at MTR (Metric Tons)	Achieved at TE (Metric Tons)
<b>Indicator 9.1 Solid and liquid Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and POPs containing materials and products removed or disposed (metric tons/POPs type)</b>			
Expected at PIF (Metric Tons)	Expected at CEO Endorsement (Metric Tons)	Achieved at MTR (Metric Tons)	Achieved at TE (Metric Tons)
5,000 PCB contaminated material	TBD	TBD	TBD
100 Tons of POPs/Non-POPs / Highly hazardous pesticides *	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Indicator 9.2 Quantity of mercury reduced (metric tons)</b>			
Expected at PIF (Metric Tons)	Expected at CEO Endorsement (Metric Tons)	Achieved at MTR (Metric Tons)	Achieved at TE (Metric Tons)
350 MT (Gold mine) 20 MT pilots (mercury contaminated waste)	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Indicator 9.3 Hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFC) Reduced/Phased out (metric tons)</b>			
Expected at PIF (Metric Tons)	Expected at CEO Endorsement (Metric Tons)	Achieved at MTR (Metric Tons)	Achieved at TE (Metric Tons)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Indicator 9.4 Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste</b>	<b>Indicator 9.4 Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste</b>	<b>Indicator 9.4 Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste</b>	<b>Indicator 9.4 Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste</b>
Expected at PIF (Number)	Expected at CEO Endorsement (Number)	Achieved at MTR (Number)	Achieved at TE (Number)
1	0	0	1

**Indicator 9.5 Number of low-chemical/non-chemical systems implemented, particularly in food production, manufacturing and cities**

Expected at PIF (Number)	Expected at CEO Endorsement (Number)	Achieved at MTR (Number)	Achieved at TE (Number)
-----------------------------	---	-----------------------------	----------------------------

\* Please note that Core indicator for HHP is currently missing from the GEF Portal. It will be added at accordingly at a next stage.

c) Core indicator 11 needs to be filled out

UNDP was the first UN agency to define the competencies needed to advance gender equality, and has been a leading agency within the UN system in this area. Since 1996, UNDP has sought to advance gender equality through its programmes and has developed internal gender capacities and coordinated with partners to mobilize expertise and resources.

Understanding the relationship between gender and sound chemicals management is important for the overall effectiveness of any project on chemicals and wastes. Women and men are impacted differently by chemicals and through different routes. They have different experiences of dealing with sources of exposure, and different priorities, responsibilities and needs relating to the reduction of toxic chemicals and wastes. In many developing countries, women and men also often have different levels of access to participation, decision-making, information, education or justice, and face different constraints in their efforts to improve their environment and living conditions. They can also play different roles in making decisions about pollution prevention, waste management, identification of sources of chemical exposure, and building a safer environment for communities.

Given the knowledge and experience with gender dimensions, the Project's stage is considered at a very early stage to define a number of Female and Male beneficiaries that will be benefited from the Project. Experience shows that a lack of gender analysis at the project design stage results in a low level of women participating and involved during project implementation. Another lesson that has been learned is that considering gender issues at the design stage could have helped to overcome certain cultural, social and religious norms and influences in some countries. Therefore, a strong gender analysis at the PPG Phase will provide the necessary beneficiary disaggregated information that will allow for a strong follow-up of the indicators and measurement of the positive outcomes of the project.

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

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female	4,400	TBD at PPG		
Male	3,600	TBD at PPG		
Total	8,000	TBD at PPG		

d) Core indicator 3 should be filled out if possible

Indicator 3 Area of land restored cannot be filled out as it is not an activity foreseen under this project.

e) Rio Markers need to be filled out

The Rio Markers targeting of the proposed project is as follows:

- Biodiversity: Not targeted as 0% of the budget is allocated toward this theme.
- Desertification: Not targeted as 0% of the budget is allocated toward this theme.
- Climate change mitigation (i.e. reductions in or absorption of greenhouse gas emissions): Not targeted as 0% of the budget is allocated toward this theme.
- Climate change adaptation (including climate risk mitigation and vulnerability reduction): Not targeted as 0% of the budget is allocated toward this theme.

It is important to note that even though the Rio Markers are not the main targets of the Proposed project, some of its possible results may have positive indirect impacts in the markers. An example of indirect impact is the improvement on biodiversity as conservation activities can be improved with limited exposure to toxic chemicals.

## **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

The Taxonomy needs to add Highly Hazardous Pesticides

ES, 11/17/18: Comment cleared

Agency Response

Attached.

## **Part II – Project Justification**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The project needs to include information on how it will meet the 2025/2028 PCB targets.

ES, 11/17/18: See comment above.

ES, 11/19/18: Comment cleared

Agency Response

The suggested activities in the project will support annual eliminations of up to 2,000 MT of PCB contaminated materials in close collaboration with the national and local governments and the efforts of the private sector. Consequently, this project will assist Argentina to comply with the 2025 and 2028 PCB targets of the Stockholm Convention. The Government of Argentina will not request additional funding to phase out PCBs once this project is completed.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The GEF WEE Initiative in LAC is mentioned with a project allocation for Argentina that exceeds the overall GEF project amount.

ES, 11/17/18: Comment cleared

ES, 11/19/18: Comment cleared

Agency Response

Correction:

GEF funded regional programme for Strengthening National Initiatives and Improving Regional Cooperation for the Environmentally Sound Management of POPs in Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) in Latin American Countries (9,500,000 US\$). The allocation for Argentina in the project's budget is US \$795,000 with an estimated duration of 60 months.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEBs in the core indicators need to be corrected.

ES, 11/19/18: Comment cleared

Agency Response

<b>Indicator 9 Reduction, disposal/destruction, phase out, elimination and avoidance of chemicals of global concern and their waste in the environment and in processes, materials and products (metric tons of toxic chemicals reduced)</b>			
Expected at PIF (Metric Tons)	Expected at CEO Endorsement (Metric Tons)	Achieved at MTR (Metric Tons)	Achieved at TE (Metric Tons)
<b>Indicator 9.1 Solid and liquid Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and POPs containing materials and products removed or disposed (metric tons/POPs type)</b>			
Expected at PIF (Metric Tons)	Expected at CEO Endorsement (Metric Tons)	Achieved at MTR (Metric Tons)	Achieved at TE (Metric Tons)
5,000 PCB contaminated material	TBD	TBD	TBD
100 Tons of POPs/Non-POPs / Highly hazardous pesticides *	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Indicator 9.2 Quantity of mercury reduced (metric tons)</b>			
Expected at PIF (Metric Tons)	Expected at CEO Endorsement (Metric Tons)	Achieved at MTR (Metric Tons)	Achieved at TE (Metric Tons)
350 MT (Gold mine) 20 MT pilots (mercury contaminated waste)	TBD	TBD	TBD

<b>Indicator 9.3 Hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFC) Reduced/Phased out (metric tons)</b>			
Expected at PIF (Metric Tons)	Expected at CEO Endorsement (Metric Tons)	Achieved at MTR (Metric Tons)	Achieved at TE (Metric Tons)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Indicator 9.4 Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste</b>			
Expected at PIF (Number)	Expected at CEO Endorsement (Number)	Achieved at MTR (Number)	Achieved at TE (Number)
1	0	0	1
<b>Indicator 9.5 Number of low-chemical/non-chemical systems implemented, particularly in food production, manufacturing and cities</b>			
Expected at PIF (Number)	Expected at CEO Endorsement (Number)	Achieved at MTR (Number)	Achieved at TE (Number)

\* Please note that Core indicator for HHP is currently missing from the GEF Portal. It will be added at accordingly at a next stage.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This section needs to be elaborated.

ES, 11/17/18: Comment cleared

Agency Response

The innovation of this project is based on the integrated approach for different waste materials containing POPs, mercury and other hazardous chemicals in various economic sectors. This will be the first time a coordinate effort will be conducted at this scale in Argentina on hazardous waste management and disposal. It is expected to generate increased awareness among stakeholders about their obligations on POPs/UPOPs/Mercury management and will identify cost effective options for them.

Sustainability of the project beyond its completion will be mainly ensured in the institutional side by the strengthening of the capacity of already existing institutions, supported by policies and regulations that will be further improved and expanded upon with the project's support, such as the establishment of a coordination mechanism of Government with private sector to impulse investments in the hazardous waste management sector by establishing incentives for the private sector and by enhancing dialogue and collaboration between producers, importers and users of hazardous chemicals and waste and those who treat those types of wastes (as stated in Paragraph

29) and the establishment of the hazardous chemical substances management strategy and PRTR mechanism (paragraph 32), as well as the Minamata Implementation Plan for Mercury-related activities (paragraph 35) which will help to sustain project's objectives. Sustainability will be further ensured by supporting key elements such as improved enforcement capacity and the establishment of a monitoring mechanism that will facilitate the information gathering on management and disposal activities in the country.

The potential for scale up is based on the following. First, the four pilot projects outputs will serve as the basis for replication in other cases in the country, supported by the feasibility study developed. Secondly, pilot projects are done with the private sector in order to improve the chance of long-term sustainability. In addition, regarding PCBs, as stated in paragraph 46, there are at least 5 provinces that lack of this kind of services and PCBs destruction has not been reported. Furthermore, results obtained can be replicated in other countries in the region, while large potential also exists for replication in other regions in the world of this kind of integrated POPs approach.

## **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  
Yes.

Agency Response

## **Stakeholders**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
Yes.

Agency Response

## **Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
Yes.

Agency Response

## **Private Sector Engagement**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
Yes.

Agency Response

## **Risks**

**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  
Yes.

Agency Response

## **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  
Yes.

Agency Response

## **Consistency with National Priorities**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

## **Knowledge Management**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

## **Part III – Country Endorsements**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The CEO Endorsement letter is not attached. Please send it before this project can be reviewed.

ES, 11/1/2018. Yes the letter has been provided.

ES, 11/20/18

Comments on the OFP LoE:

- The Agency fee for both together –the GEF Financing and the PPG— goes above the endorsed amount for 75 cents (instead of \$867,374, the endorsed amount is 867,373.75). I am sorry, one would say that it is only 25 cents, but the approved amount cannot be ever higher than the endorsed amount. As the project has to be returned anyway, please ask the Agency to round the Agency fee to one dollar less perhaps in the Agency fee section.
- ES, 11/20/18: The numbers have been fixed. Comments cleared

Agency Response

## **GEFSEC DECISION**

## **RECOMMENDATION**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
Not at this time. Three comments remain.

### **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

### **Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>	
First Review	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>