



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

GEF ID:	<b>9399</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Serbia</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Minamata Initial Assessment</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5634 (UNDP)</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):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	<b>\$200,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$97,220</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$297,220</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Lulwa Ali</b>	Agency Contact Person:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes. Serbia signed the convention on October 9th 2014.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, an endorsement letter dated 25 August, 2015 signed by the OFP has been provided.	
Project Consistency	3. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?	Yes, the project is aligned with CW1 program 2 for the development of EA for Minamata Convention.	
	4. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes. The project facilitates the Ratification and early Implementation of the Minamata Convention in Serbia.	
Project Design	5. Are the components in Table A sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project	Yes. The proposed EA and the project framework, including envisaged activities, are in line with the GEF	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	objectives and the GEBs?	Initial Guidelines for Enabling Activities for the Minamata Convention on Mercury.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes. It will include among others recommendations on how to improve gender dimensions and gender mainstreaming related to Mercury, and priorities actions in this area will be made and highlighted in the MIA report.	
	7. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes.	
	8. Is indicated cofinancing appropriate for an enabling activity?	This is an EA and co-financing is not a requirement. However, the recipient country is contributing in-kind US\$97,220 to the project.	
Other Comments	9. Comments related to adequacy of information submitted by country for the financial management and procurement assessment <sup>1</sup> .		
Resource Availability	10. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	NA	
	• The focal area allocation?	Yes. From GEF Mercury financing resources.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?	NA	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• The focal area set-aside?	NA	
Secretariat Recommendation			
	<b>11. Is EA clearance/approval</b>	Yes. PM recommend EA clearance.	

<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
Recommendation	<b>being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 09, 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.**