GEF-6 GEF Secretariat Review For Enabling Activity Proposal

GEF ID:	**9185**		
Country/Region:	**Regional (Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia, Swaziland)**		
Project Title:	**Development of Minamata Convention Mercury Initial Assessment in Africa**		
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:	**$792,700**
Co-financing:	**$61,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$853,700**
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 July 17, 2015 Yes. Lesotho acceded to the Convention in November 2014. Botswana, Namibia and Swaziland did not sign the Minamata Convention, but submitted letters on the steps taken by them toward becoming parties of the Convention. These letters were also sent to the Interim Secretariat of the Convention.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	MO July 17 2015 Please revise the amount of GEF resources in the endorsement letters. The total financing is $876,000, including Agency fee of $76,000.	All the endorsement letters have been revised and attached to the project document as annex 2.All the endorsement letters have been revised and attached to the project document as annex 2.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		MO August 12 2015 Comment cleared.	
Project Consistency	3. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?	MO July 17 2015 Yes. The MIA is aligned with Chemicals and Waste focal area objective 1, Program 2.	
	4. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MO July 17 2015 Yes.	
Project Design	5. Are the components in Table A sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	MO July 17 2015 Please identify important stakeholders and their roles/responsibilities, at least key ministries. MO August 17 2015 Comment cleared.	Project stakeholders were identified by the Executing Agency. NGOs, private sector representatives and other Ministries will be identified during the preparation for the inception workshop. The table with stakeholders is at pages 17 and 18.
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MO July 17 2015 Please explain how gender elements are considered in the institutional framework of project implementation.	Gender elements were considered in the institutional framework of project implementation. Please see page 18 and 19.
	7. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	MO July 17 2015 Project Management Cost (PMC) is too high. It should be smaller than $72,727, if the total project cost is $800,000. MO August 17 2015 Comment cleared.	Project management cost have been reduced to $72,700.
	8. Is indicated cofinancing appropriate for an enabling activity?	MO July 17 2015 Please clarify if co-financing of $2,461,050 is available for this project. This amount is shown in Table A as well as the letters from Namibia ($2,400,050) and Africa Institute for	Yes, cofinance from the Africa Institute is available for this project. Please see cofinance letter attached as annex 2. Table B has also been corrected.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Environmentally Sound Management of Hazardous and Other Wastes ($61,000), but Table B shows "NA". MO July 17 2015 Comment cleared.	
Other Comments	9. Comments related to adequacy of information submitted by country for the financial management and procurement assessment[1].	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 July 17 2015 Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• The focal area set-aside?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation	**11. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?**	MO July 17 2015 Not at this time. Please address the above comments. MO August 17 2015 All comments cleared. Project manager recommends CEO approval.	
Review Date (s)	First review*	July 17, 2015	
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 17, 2015	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

[1] Question 9 is applicable only to direct access proposal while question 10 (on fees) is not applicable to direct access proposal.

* **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.**