

Advanced Minamata Assessment in Thailand

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10983

Countries

Thailand

Project Name

Advanced Minamata Assessment in Thailand

Agencies

UNIDO

Date received by PM

4/13/2022

Review completed by PM

6/8/2022

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

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 Yes.

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
04.19.2022:
Please see comment in 'Deviation' section.

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
04.19.2022:
Please see comment in 'Deviation' section.

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

04.19.2022:

Please see comment in 'Deviation' section.

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

05.11.2022:

Cleared.

04.19.2022:

Presuming this is MIA (Minamata Initial Assessment) EA; please elaborate on why this project is referred as 'Advanced Minamata Assessment' (with 'Advanced' without 'Initial') or 'Advanced Minamata Initial Assessment' (with 'Advanced') in some places including the title.

Agency Response The project is referred to as advanced because a preliminary national inventory of emissions and releases of mercury and mercury compounds was developed using the UNEP Toolkit in 2013, in order to identify potential sources for controlling mercury emissions and releases. The preliminary inventory mostly used estimated data due to lack of primary data and some activity rates in the calculation might not actually reflect the real mercury situation in Thailand. Thus, the preliminary inventory needs to be further updated and improved as well as externally validated. This Advanced Minamata Assessment proposed will also provide more information to enable policy and strategic decisions to be made, and will assist Thailand to identify priority sectors and activities within the country, and to efficiently and effectively implement the key obligations of the Minamata Convention. This background information is contained in Part II Section A. The 2 terms used interchangeably have been corrected to reflect what is contained in the title and endorsement letter. Thus, the word initial has been deleted.

.

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

05.11.2022:

Cleared.

04.19.2022:

This EA does not seem to include any information about the project's overall ESS risk.

Please provide ESS screening information of the project, or if the project is exception of ESS policy, please provide information about exception.

Agency Response The ESS document was submitted with the proposal as a separate attachment.

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.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation.

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06.09.2022:

Cleared.

06.08.2022:

Please reflect the changes (table) also in Portal.

05.24.2022:

On the budget: GEF resources can't be used to cover unspecified Miscellaneous expenses (\$14,000). Please provide some level of detail regarding what these costs will cover. In addition, please provide a budget table that similar to that provided in Guidelines (please see below), so it is possible to assess the reasonability of the budget

lines (activities / expenditures) charged to the different sources (enabling activity components, M&E and PMC).

Appendix A: Indicative Project Budget Template

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)									Total (USD eq.)	Responsible Entity (Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)		
		Component 1		Component 2		Component 3		Sub-Total	M & E	P M C				
		Outcome 1.1	Outcome 1.2	Outcome 2.1	Outcome 2.2	Outcome 3.1	Outcome 3.2							
Works	...													
	...													
Goods	Equipment 1											e.g. Ministry Environment		
	Equipment 2													
	...													
Vehicles						xxx			xx x					
Grants/ Sub-grants	...													
Revolving funds/ Seed funds / Equity	...													
Sub-contract to executing partner/ entity														
Contractual Services – Individual	...													
Contractual														

Agency Response

9-June-22

The updated budget table has also been introduced within the EA document in Annex A.

An updated budget table with detailed costing of eligible miscellaneous expenses has been uploaded with the title MIA_THA_budget_final_7Jun22.docx

Cost Effectiveness.

Is the project cost effective?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

04.19.2022:

Please see comment in 'Deviation' section.

Agency Response

Cost Ranges

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05.13.2022:

Cleared.

05.11.2022:

Please include this explanation in the section 'F. EXPLAIN THE DEVIATIONS FROM TYPICAL COST RANGES'

04.19.2022:

Requested resources seem to be over the recommended budget of \$200k.

Please provide clear justification or re-consider the budget.

Agency Response

UNIDO response (13.05.2022)

Thank you. The requested explanation has been entered under section F in the Portal.

Thailand is the 2nd largest economy in South-East Asia. It has a complex demography, with 76 provinces and a substantial sectoral and industrial diversity. Industry contributes 43.9 percent of GDP and there are over 3 million SMEs. The country would need much more resources than the recommended budget of 200k to do a proper analysis of mercury use in all sectors across all provinces.

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

06.09.2022:

This EA is recommended for technical clearance.

06.08.2022 /05.24.2022 /05.11.2022 /04.19.2022:

Not yet. Please refer to the review items and resubmit for consideration (please highlight the changes).

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	4/19/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/11/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/13/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/24/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/8/2022	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations