



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	<b>5861</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Brazil</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Development of Minamata Convention on Mercury Initial Assessment in Brazil</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>POPs</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$821,918</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$1,690,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$2,511,918</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ibrahima Sow</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Jorge Ocaña,</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes. Brazil has signed the Minamata Convention
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? * <sup>1</sup>	Yes
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	Yes. UNEP coordinates a number of EA projects and is leading the Global mercury partnership on mercury and has developed among other tools, the UNEP mercury tool kit. Version II of the toolkit allows a comprehensive description of mercury sources as well as quantitative analysis of mercury
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country? *	Yes
Resource Availability	5. 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

<sup>1</sup> Questions 2, 3, 4, 18 and 19 are applicable only to EAs submitted through Agencies.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	• focal area set-aside?	Yes
Project Consistency	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	Yes
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	Yes. The project should facilitate the ratification and early Implementation of the Minamata Convention.
	8. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	Yes
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes, through the establishment of a coordination mechanism making full use of existing structures dealing with chemicals management
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	Yes
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes
	13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes
Project Financing	15. Is the itemized budget (including consultant fees, travel, office facilities, etc) justified?	Yes
	16. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes, 9.1%, within guidelines
	17. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes
	18. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	The Government of Brazil has committed the amount of \$ 1,650,000 in kind.
	19. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	20. Comments related to adequacy of information submitted by country for financial management and procurement assessment.	
Agency Responses	21. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:*	
	• STAP?	None received
	• Convention Secretariat?	None received
	• Other GEF Agencies?	None received.

Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation	22. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?	Yes, EA recommended for approval.
Review Date (s)	First review**	June 05, 2014
	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. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**