

Development of Minamata Convention Initial Assessment (MIA) for Sultanate of Oman

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10811

Countries

Oman

Project Name

Development of Minamata Convention Initial Assessment (MIA) for Sultanate of Oman

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

4/9/2021

Review completed by PM

5/3/2021

Program Manager

Yuki Shiga

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

Project Type

EA

Expedited Enabling Activity req (CEO)

Part 1: Project Information

Focal area elements

Is the enabling activity aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. This is an enabling activity for the Minamata Convention.

Agency Response

The comments by the Secretariat were included in the recommendation section (far end of this sheet) which does not allocate any editable box for GEF Agency to provide response. The GEF Agency is therefore responding to the those comments at this box.

Agency response (April 21 2021) to comments in the recommendation:

Regarding the supporting document:

The irrelevant supporting document was uploaded by mistake by UNDP. It has been removed.

Regarding executing arrangement

Project ownership lies solely with Oman's Environment Authority. The GEF Agency was explicitly requested by the Environment Authority to explore arrangements to recruit/manage international consultants on its behalf. This is mainly in an administrative context given certain limitations that the Environment Authority foresaw that may limit its capacity to recruit, onboard, and administer international consultant.

The GEF OFP endorsement letter already states and requests UNEP ROWA's administrative support. No PMC will be incurred by ROWA.

Regarding ESS

UNEP requires ESS clearance for all projects, irrespective of nature. The ESS identifies no risks associated with this project in conformity with this comment as the EA focuses primarily on desk studies and report preparation.

The ESS (called SRIF) is now uploaded to the portal as a stand-alone document.

Project description summary

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

Co-financing

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 No co-financing is required for this EA.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

**Are they within the resources available from:
The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes. It is within the recommended budget of \$500k.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Is the financing presented adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Part 2: Enabling Activity Justification

Background and Context.

Are the achievements of previously implemented enabling activities cited since the country(ies) became a party to the Convention?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request This is the first Minamata Convention Initial Assessment.

Agency Response

Goals, Objectives, and Activities.

Is the project framework sufficiently described?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

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.

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

2021.06.29: Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed.

2021.05.26:

Please provide additional information on gender, drawing on existing national relevant gender disaggregated data/information, including any potential barriers to women's participation or other relevant gender issues specific to project objective and activities, and the project plans to mainstreaming gender in implementation.

Agency Response

14 June 2021

Comment addressed in the main project document as highlighted in green. Changes made to the portal text as highlighted in green.

Monitoring and Evaluation.

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Cost Effectiveness.

Is the project cost effective?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Cost Ranges

If there was a deviation in the cost range, was this explained?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Part III. Endorsement/Approval by OFP

Country endorsement

Has the project been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Response to Comments

Are all the comments adequately responded to? (only as applicable)

GEF Secretariat Comment

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

STAP Comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO Endorsement/approval recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2021.06.29: This EA is recommended for technical clearance.

2021.04.29: Not yet.

- Please provide clarification to, or delete an attached supporting document, which does not seem to have relevance to the submitted PIF: '10067 Cancellation Nigeria 2BUR duplication in GEF portal _UNDP ID 6239'.

- Please provide clarification on whether UNEP ROWA is one of the Executing Agencies of this proposed project or not. If UNEP ROWA is one of the Executing Agencies, the letter of support signed by the GEF OFP is required, as the implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate per policy and guideline. The GEFSEC will analyze any requests for dual role playing by an agency at the time of CEO endorsement and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an 'exceptional' basis. We strongly encourage the agency to look at third party options as a preferred way forward.

- Also, this EA(s) does not seem to lend itself to ESS, as this EA(s) focuses primarily on desk studies and report preparation. If so, please submit an email state the non-applicability of the ESS to this EA(s).

<https://www.thegef.org/documents/environmental-and-social-safeguard-standards>

Please refer to the review items and resubmit for consideration.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	4/20/2021	4/28/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/26/2021	6/14/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/29/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations