



Accelerate Minamata Convention compliance through improved understanding and control of mercury trade in Latin America

Basic Information

GEF ID

11047

Countries

Regional (Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Honduras, Mexico, Peru)

Project Title

Accelerate Minamata Convention compliance through improved understanding and control of mercury trade in Latin America

GEF Agency(ies)

UNEP

Agency ID

GEF Focal Area(s)

Chemicals and Waste

Program Manager

Evelyn Swain

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes, all countries have ratified the Minamata Convention.

Yes, the general project information table is correctly populated.

Agency's Comments

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

The project summary needs to be strengthened. Please clearly and concisely describe the issue and how this project will address it. Also clearly describe the results including the GEBs that the project will generate.

For this and all sections please provide information within the word limit.

ES, 10/20/22: The summary has been strengthened and is now clear and concise. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

17 October 2022

Project summary and all sections revised in content and within word limit.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

The project objective is clear.

Please clarify if the project will include some sort of enforcement mechanism? No information is provided on how the regulations and procedures to track mercury will be enforced. How will customs and boarder control agents be included in the project?

Also, will there be some kind of tracing function built in to the project? For example will mercury source monitoring be used though isotope tracing with IAEA or another lab, or is a tracing system like block chain an option to determine legal vs illegal mercury?

ES, 10/20/22: This will be looked at during PPG. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

17 October 2022

Enforcement mechanisms will be further discussed and developed during the PPG phase and to be included in final CEO endorsement.

Please note that currently there are no proven mercury tracing technologies available on the market, but potential methods to conduct mercury source tracing will be explored during PPG phase with no guarantee that this aspect will be included during CEO endorsement.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

M&E and KM is clear but gender should be clarified further in the components.

ES, 10/20/22: Gender will be further assessed during PPG. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

17 October 2022

Gender cannot be determined during project design stage, however, a balance among men and women participating in the decision making process in all target countries will be incorporated. A more detailed analysis and action plan on gender mainstreaming will be carried out during the PPG phase.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?**b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?****c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?****Secretariat's Comments**

From PPO: On the PMC Proportionality: there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 4.98%, for a co-financing of \$7,043,273 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$350,755 instead of \$50,000 (which is 0.7%). As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please ask the Agency to amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion. A more definitive estimation of PMC will be presented and adjusted at CEO Endorsement stage.

ES, 10/20/22: PMC has been adjusted. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

17 October 2022

PMC co-financing has been adjusted and to be further defined during the PPG phase.

4 Project Outline**A. Project Rationale****4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS**

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

Please note that the page limit on the project rationale is 3-5 pages. The information provided exceeds these limits. Please provide complete but concise information in each section.

The situation and barriers have been identified.

ES, 10/20/22: Adjustments were made. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

17 October 2022

Sections have been revised and within the page limit.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

- a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?
- b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?
- c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?
- d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments A list of stakeholders is included but the project justification could be strengthened in section A.

Agency's Comments

17 October 2022

Project justification has been strengthened.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

- a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?
- b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

Theory of change and outputs are provided.

Please provide how this LAC regional project fits in with the global trade of mercury.

ES, 10/20/22: Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

17 October 2022

An explanation on how this LAC regional project fits in with global trade of mercury has been added.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

- a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?**
- b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).**
- c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area**
- d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?**

Secretariat's Comments

Project coordination is missing. Please provide.

ES, 10/20/22: Explanation on project coordination has been added. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

17 October 2022

Explanation on project coordination has been added.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

The project aims to reduce 176 tons of mercury.

Beneficiaries under Indicator 11 are missing, but will be provided at the time of CEO Endorsement.

Agency's Comments

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments NA**Agency's Comments****5.6 RISKS**

- a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?
- b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?
- c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments Yes, risks are provided.

Agency's Comments**5.7 Qualitative assessment**

- a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?
- b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?
- c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments This is an important project supporting Article 3 of the Minamata Convention and national priorities. It has the potential to be transformative and durable, and may serve as a model for replication in other regions.

potential to be transformative and durable, and may serve as a model for replication in other regions.

Agency's Comments

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

8.3 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?

Secretariat's Comments

The co-financing for this project is low and all in-kind recurrent expenditures. There is also no financing from the provide sector. Is there a way that co-financing can be strengthened?

ES, 10/22/22: Co-financing will be strengthened during PPG stage. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

17 October 2022

Most of the target countries have recently undergone administrative changes in the Ministries therefore it was difficult to obtain higher co-financing amounts. However, co-financing will be confirmed and reinforced in the PPG phase, along with additional outreach to private sector stakeholders. This is a regulatory project, involvement of the private sector is not direct but will be pursued during PPG.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country's(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

No, there are only 3 letters of endorsement from Ecuador, Honduras, and Mexico. The rest of the countries are missing endorsement letters.

From PPO: While already mentioned by the PM, being this a key policy requirement we need to highlight it to double check at the resubmission: the LoEs from Bolivia, Colombia and Peru are missed.

ES, 10/20/22: Endorsement letters have been submitted. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

17 October 2022

The remaining 3 endorsement letters have been uploaded.

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

Only 3 have been uploaded.

ES, 10/20/22: Endorsement letters have been submitted. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

17 October 2022

The remaining 3 endorsement letters have been uploaded.

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

Only 3 have.

ES, 10/20/22: Endorsement letters have been submitted. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

17 October 2022

The remaining 3 endorsement letters have been uploaded.

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments Not applicable.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) 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 to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

Not at this time.

ES, 10/20/22: PIF and PPG are recommended for technical clearance.

Agency's Comments

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/13/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/20/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		