

Development of Minamata Initial Assessment in The Bahamas

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10585

Countries

Bahamas

Project Name

Development of Minamata Initial Assessment in The Bahamas

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

4/1/2020

Review completed by PM

4/30/2020

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

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

Agency Response

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes. It is within the recommended budget of \$200k.

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

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04.29.2020: Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed.

Allocation towards M&E component seems to be relatively higher, in terms of ratio to the total requested finance.

Recommended action: Please reconsider the allocation or provide sufficient justification to the above.

Agency Response

UNEP 20/04/2020

Budget for M&E has been reduced as per consultation with GEFSEC.

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion This is the first Minamata Convention Initial Assessment.

Agency Response

Goals, Objectives, and Activities.

Is the project framework sufficiently described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

2020.05.20: Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed.

2020.05.11:

The LoE stipulates that the executing partners are BCRC Caribbean and the BEST Commission (Ministry of Environment). This should be reflected in Portal by including BEST in “Other Executing Partner” (this field accepts more than one Institution). The Partner Type field only accepts one option: if BEST is the Lead Agency, the Executing Partner Type selected must be “Government”.

Agency Response

15/05/2020

Both Agencies are now mentioned in the portal.

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation.

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes.

Agency Response

Cost Effectiveness.

Is the project cost effective?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes.

Agency Response

Cost Ranges

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

2020.05.20: Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed. OFP endorsement letter is updated.

2020.05.11:

There are two issues that need to be addressed: (i) the LoE is not dated; and (ii) the FA in the LoE should be corrected to Chemicals & Waste. Please provide additional information /clarification on these points from the OFP. The most straightforward manner is through an email from the OFP. Please upload this once received.

Agency Response

2020.05.15

New LoE (The Bahamas Endorsment – signed) has been uploaded with the date and correct focal area.

Response to Comments

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

GEF Secretariat Comment

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

STAP Comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO Endorsement/approval recommended?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

2020.05.20: This EA is recommended for technical clearance.

2020.05.11:

Not yet. Please refer to the review item(s) (sections 'Goals, Objectives, and Activities' and 'Country endorsement') and resubmit for consideration (please highlight the update).

Review Dates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

This enabling activity will assist the country in conducting mercury inventories, understand the sectoral consumption of mercury and mercury containing products. The Bahamas acceded to the Minamata Convention on 12 February 2020 and meets the eligibility criteria for access to and utilization of financial resources. This is the first project implemented in The Bahamas aimed at facilitating the implementation of the Minamata Convention. The project is a country-driven initiative in conformity with the Minamata Initial Assessment overall strategies, policies and guidance approved by the Conference of the Parties in its first session.

This activity will also strengthen the capacity of the country to understand issues related to the implementation of the Minamata Convention.