



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	<b>9240</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>China</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Capacity Strengthening For Implementation Of Minamata Convention On Mercury</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>World Bank</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>151281 (World Bank)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Chemicals and Waste</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CW-2 Program 4;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$8,000,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$8,000,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$16,000,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>October 01, 2015</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Anil Sookdeo</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Jiang Ru</b>

<b>PIF Review</b>			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	Yes, this project will assist China in defining it's long term strategy to implement the Minamata Convention	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes, China is a signatory to the Minamata Convention.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and	The project is meant to assist China elaborate on the sectors in which mercury is used and emitted in order for China to plan its interventions to	

<sup>1</sup> For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	innovation?	comply with the Minamata Convention. China is the largest consumer and emitter of mercury and its action on reducing mercury use and emission will significantly advance the achievement of the goals of the Minamata Convention.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Yes	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Yes	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?		
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	The Program Manager recommends CEO PIF clearance.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	August 11, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.