



GEF-6 GEF Secretariat Review For Enabling Activity Proposal

GEF ID:	9456		
Country/Region:	Tanzania		
Project Title:	Development of National Action Plans for Artisanal and Small Scale Gold Mining in the United Republic of Tanzania		
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:	\$500,000
Co-financing:		Total Project Cost:	\$500,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Dustin Schinn	Agency Contact Person:	Kevin Helps

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	DS, May 22, 2016: Yes, Tanzania is eligible per paragraph 21 of the Initial Guidelines for Enabling Activities for the Minamata Convention on Mercury.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	DS, May 22, 2016: Yes, the OFP has endorsed this EA on August 25, 2015.	
Project Consistency	3. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?	DS, May 22, 2016: Yes, the project aligns with the preparation of NAPs under Article 7 of the Convention.	
	4. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and	DS, May 22, 2016: Yes.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Design	assessments under relevant conventions?		
	5. Are the components in Table A sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>DS, May 22, 2016: Partly. While the overall approach of the project is clear, some questions remain. In particular: (1) Please elaborate on added value of Component 1 and consider merging it with Component 2, given that the national coordination mechanism should be closely involved in national capacity building, knowledge generation and other activities. (2) Please change Table A to make Monitoring and Evaluation a standalone component of the project framework, rather than adding it after the sub-total. (3) While the enabling activity will be consistent with Annex C of the Convention and therefore include a public health strategy, it seems unclear through which component of the enabling activity this goal will be achieved; please elaborate which of the components will address public health assessment and strategy.</p> <p>DS, June 13, 2016: Comments (1) and (2) and Agency responses have been discussed with Agency, ensuring that components are in line with other EA proposals, and comment (3) has been addressed directly. All comments cleared.</p>	<p>1) Component 1 is an important long term capacity building task of the project. It also contributes to the integration with the other NAPs implemented globally. These two aspects will be crucial when the implementation of the NAP is considered. Component 2 is more concerned with the management of this particular project. We feel these components should remain separate. 2) The inclusion of M&E as a separate line below project management costs has been the practice of all UNEP EAs under the Minamata Convention as for this type of small projects, a separate stand-alone component was not deemed necessary. 3) The gathering of existing public health data on the ASGM sector will be done in component 3 (text has been amended Page 7) and then the public health strategy in compliance with Annex C will be develop in component 4.</p>
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and	DS, May 22, 2016: Yes.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	CSOs considered?		
	7. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	DS, May 22, 2016: Yes, once comment under Question 5 is addressed.	
	8. Is indicated cofinancing appropriate for an enabling activity?	DC, May 22, 2016: Yes.	
Other Comments	9. Comments related to adequacy of information submitted by country for the financial management and procurement assessment ¹ .	DS, May 22, 2016: Information is adequate.	
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?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• The focal area set-aside?	DS, May 22, 2016: Yes.	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation	11. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?	DS, May 22, 2016: Not yet. Please address comments under Question 5. DS, June 13, 2016: Comments cleared. The PM recommends CEO approval.	
Review Date (s)	First review*		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.
EA review template: updated Feb2015

*** 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.**