



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

GEF ID:	<b>9494</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>South Africa</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Development of Minamata Initial Assessment in South Africa</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
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>\$1,000,000</b>
Co-financing:		Total Project Cost:	<b>\$1,000,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ogawa Masako</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Kevin Helps</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	MO May 30, 2016 Yes. South Africa signed the Convention in October 2016.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	MO May 30, 2016 Yes.	
Project Consistency	3. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?	MO May 30, 2016 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 May 30, 2016 Yes.	
Project Design	5. Are the components in Table A sound and sufficiently clear and	MO May 30, 2016 Yes.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?		
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MO May 30, 2016 Yes.	
	7. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	MO May 30, 2016 Co-financing is not required for EA.	
	8. Is indicated cofinancing appropriate for an enabling activity?	MO May 30, 2016 Yes.	
Other Comments	9. Comments related to adequacy of information submitted by country for the financial management and procurement assessment <sup>1</sup> .	NA (this EA is not direct access proposal.)	
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 May 30, 2016 The project requested additional finance and provided adequate justification, as South Africa has large size of population and advanced industrial development, needs comprehensive assessment of legal gaps to ratify the convention, and will develop national emission factors for level 2 inventory.  Please revise Annex A, as it has numbers of decimal places for Person Weeks of national consultant, and the total amount is not correct for Project	The Annex A (page 16 of the project document) and Annex F (page 24 of the project document) have both been revised accordingly.

<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
		Coordinator. (Please also revise Annex F accordingly).	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• The focal area set-aside?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation	<b>11. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	MO May 30, 2016 Not at this time. Please address comments in box 10.  MO June 3, 2016 Comment cleared. The Program manager recommends CEO approval.	
Review Date (s)	First review*	May 30, 2016	
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 03, 2016	
	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.**