

Minamata initial assessment and national action plan on the artisanal and small-scale gold mining sector in Nicaragua

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10148

Countries

Nicaragua

Project Name

Minamata initial assessment and national action plan on the artisanal and small-scale gold mining sector in Nicaragua

Agenices

UNIDO

Date received by PM

4/15/2019

Review completed by PM

7/16/2019

Program Manager

Evelyn Swain

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.

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.

ES, 7/10/19: Please confirm if the level 2 mercury toolkit will be used for the inventory

The MIA is missing from the "Types of Report" section at the top of the portal before section A. Please add this.

Agency Response 11 July 2019: It has been specified in Section A that the level 2 will be used for the mercury inventory. The Minamata Initial Assessment has been added under the section 'Types of Report'.

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 EAs however some is provided by the implementing agency.

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.

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 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion These are the first EAs under the Minamata Convention.

Agency Response

Goals, Objectives, and Activities.

Is the project framework sufficiently described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes, this will generate a MIA and NAP.

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes the projects includes stakeholder engagement.

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 Gender issues will be addressed through the project.

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, this is cost effective for an EA.

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 Yes.

Agency Response

Response to Comments

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

GEF Secretariat Comment

Agency Response

18 April 2019: Rio markers were included.

24 May 2019: The submission date, expected implementation start date, expected completion date, expected report submission to convention were included at the time of the submission, but surprisingly seems to have disappear from the platform. Nevertheless, the above mentioned dates has been included again for resubmission. Regarding the execution of the project by UNIDO and according to the GEF Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy, the OFP Endorsement Letter specifically mentions the official request from the government for UNIDO to be the implementing and executing agency; the specific roles and responsibilities of all partners and a sound justification for the execution activities are detailed in Section B of the project. Furthermore this is additionally reflected in the project budget table (Annex A).

09 August 2019: In 2018, the Government of Nicaragua requested UNIDO to provide execution support in this project due to the existence of gaps in the administrative and technical capacity of the institutions identified to deliver the outputs. Nevertheless, the bulk of the execution will be carried out by national executing entities while UNIDO will only undertake certain execution functions to provide assistance when needed. Both the project management arrangements (Annex B) and the budget (Annex A) describe the execution settings for the project.

05 November 2019: After discussions with the national counterparts, it has been agreed to incorporate UNITAR as the main executing entity for both the MIA and the NAP in order to perform the technical tasks and the complementary coordination role that were initially requested to be performed by the implementing agency.

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

Not at this time. Rio Markers are missing.

5/1: Not at this time. The EA is returned to the Agency by PPO due to: In Type of Reports Section the following information is missing • Submission Date • Expected Implementation Start Date • Expected Completion Date • Expected Report Submission to Convention The Project Execution Arrangements Annex uploaded in the Portal shows UNIDO as the Executing Partner. This intent of UNIDO to perform the executing functions needs to follow the process included in the Guidelines for the Project and Program Cycle, which must include an explicit request signed by the GEF Country OFP indicating the specific roles and responsibilities of all partners, including any execution activities provided by a GEF Agency. The request should provide a sound justification for the execution activities that the GEF Agency may perform for GEFSEC assessment.

7/10/19: Not at this time. Please confirm if the level 2 mercury toolkit will be used for the inventory. Also, the MIA is missing from the "Types of Report" section at the top of the portal before section A. Please add this.

7/11/19: Not at this time. Although the OFP has provided a letter requesting execution from the implementing agency adequate justification has not been provided. In general execution of this type of enabling activities should be government driven so adequate justification for this request is needed.

9/11/19: Please see the comment above and provide a detailed justification in the portal document and review sheet.

1/8/20: The execution arrangements have been changed and UNIDO will not self execute this project. CEO Endorsement is recommended.

Review Dates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

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

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

This project will help the country to develop Minamata Initial Assessment and a National Action Plan to reduce the use and emissions of mercury in the artisanal and small-scale gold mining (ASGM) and processing sector. ASGM is the largest emitter of mercury globally and is included as a priority under the Minamata Convention.

Article 7 of the Convention requires National Action Plans for countries with ASGM sectors and this project will directly respond to that convention obligation.