



## GEF-6 GEF Secretariat Review For Enabling Activity Proposal

GEF ID:	9641		
Country/Region:	Eritrea		
Project Title:	Development of Minamata Initial Assessment and National Action Plan for Artisanal and Small Scale Gold Mining in Eritrea		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Chemicals and Waste
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$700,000
Co-financing:		Total Project Cost:	\$700,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ogawa Masako	Agency Contact Person:	Kevin Helps

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	MO September 16, 2016 Yes. Eritrea submitted the letter on their steps taken toward becoming a Party to the Minamata Convention, and the letter to notify that ASGM is more than insignificant.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	MO September 16, 2016 Yes.	
Project Consistency	3. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?	MO September 16, 2016 Yes. The proposed project is aligned with CW 1 Program 2.	
	4. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant	MO September 16, 2016 Yes. The use of mercury in artisanal mining has been prohibited under the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	conventions?	mining proclamation, and the draft national environmental proclamation includes article to protect natural resources from harmful chemicals including mercury.	
Project Design	5. Are the components in Table A sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	MO September 16, 2016 Yes.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MO September 16, 2016 Yes.	
	7. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	MO September 16, 2016 Yes.	
	8. Is indicated cofinancing appropriate for an enabling activity?	MO September 16, 2016 Co-financing is not required for EA.	
Other Comments	9. Comments related to adequacy of information submitted by country for the financial management and procurement assessment <sup>1</sup> .	NA	
Resource Availability	10. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?		
	• The focal area allocation?	MO September 16, 2016 Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• The focal area set-aside?		

<sup>1</sup> Question 9 is applicable only to direct access proposal while question 10 (on fees) is not applicable to direct access proposal.  
EA review template: updated Feb2015

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation	<b>11. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	MO September 16, 2016 Program Manager recommends CEO approval.	
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 16, 2016	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.**