



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5409		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Development of a Plan for Global Monitoring of Human Exposure to and Environmental Concentrations of Mercury		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	POPs
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CHEM-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$850,000
Co-financing:	\$3,005,411	Total Project Cost:	\$3,855,411
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Evelyn Swain	Agency Contact Person:	Jorge Ocaña,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	<p>This is a global project, but no countries are listed as being associated with the project. Please provide the countries participating in the project.</p> <p>ES, 7/31/13: Appendix 5 clarifies where the proposed air monitoring sites will be, however, it is not clear if there will be labs associated with these sites, and it is also not clear if there will be human sampling also in the countries where the air monitoring sites are located.</p> <p>ES, 9/26/13: At this time the labs that will ultimately particulate in a regional</p>	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		monitoring project are not known. A component of this project will be to identify and run pilot tests on potential labs and develop a data bank of labs (similar to the GMP for POPs).	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	No. There are no countries or endorsements associated with this project. Please provide. ES, 7/31/13: Because this is a global project endorsement letters are not required.	
Resource Availability	3. 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	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>	Yes, this project is in line with Chem 3.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	<p>This is unclear because no countries have been identified. Please provide this information.</p> <p>ES, 7/31/13: This project is in line with Article 19 of the future Minamata Convention.</p>	
Project Design	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>No, countries need to be defined in order to tell if baseline is clear.</p> <p>ES, 7/31/13: The baseline project is well defined and the project will build off of the GMOS, COPHES, and GEF GMP projects, however it is not clear how and where the project will build off these projects, except for the air monitoring sites listed in Annex 5. Please explain how the labs and human sampling will build off of the baseline project. Also, will other matrices be monitored such as food, water, soil, etc. Also is there a need to strengthen the capacities of labs to monitor for mercury, if so how will these capacities be built.</p> <p>ES, 9/26/13: As stated in Q1 labs will be identified and samples tested through this project. Ambient air and hair will be the core matrices in this project. Other matrices such as fish, soil, and water are not a good good measure of global monitoring because their contamination depends largely on local sources, not global.</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	Yes, this is clear.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes, the benefits are identified and the incremental reasoning is appropriate.	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		No this is not clear. Please clarify if there will be socio-economic and gender dimensions in this project. ES, 7/31/13: This has been clarified. Comment cleared.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes, the role of CSOs is clear.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Yes, risks are considered.	Yes, risks are considered.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	The project will coordinate with the GEF POPs GMP, which is encouraged, as well coordinated with existing Hg monitoring plans. It is not clear if these are in line at the country or regional level since no countries have been identified for this project. ES, 7/31/13: A list of countries has been provided in Annex 5 for air monitoring sites, many of which coordinate with GMOS. Please describe how the labs and human sampling will coordinate with	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>GMOS and the GEF GMP.</p> <p>ES, 9/26/13: Labs will be identified and tested through this project building off what exists though the other projects (GMOS and GMP) and a global data bank will be a result.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>This project is innovative because it will create a global mercury monitoring system. It is sustainable because it creates standards that can be used globally and long term. This project can be scaled up.</p> <p>ES, 7/31/13: Is there a need to strengthen the capacities of labs and monitoring sites for this project to be sustainable?</p> <p>ES, 9/26/13: some capacity building of labs will be included in the project.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>This is a one step MSP.</p>
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		<p>Please elaborate on the cost effectiveness of this approach.</p> <p>ES, 7/31/13: This project has been designed to be cost effective by using existing labs and monitoring sites.</p>
	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes</p>	<p>Funding and co-funding can not be evaluated until countries participating in the project are known.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	and outputs?	<p>ES, 7/31/13: Funding and co-funding will be evaluated when additional information is provided.</p> <p>ES, 9/26/13: The funding for this project is too high. The budget should not exceed \$600,000. All components could be reduced, particularly component 4.</p> <p>ES, 12/2/13: The funding amount has been reduced to \$850,000 and justification for this amount was provided. -comment cleared</p>	
	<p>17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role?</p> <p><u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	Co-financing letters are provided.	
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	Yes. PMC is less than 10%.	
	<p>19. <u>At PIF</u>, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs?</p> <p><u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u>, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?</p>	No PPG is requested.	
	<p>20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>	NA	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes, tracking tools are included.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		None received.
	• Convention Secretariat?		None received.
	• The Council?		None received.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		None received.
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Not at this time. The issues listed above need to be clarified. ES, 7/31/13: Not at this time. The issues listed above need to be clarified. ES, 9/26/13: Not at this time. The budget is too high. ES, 12/2/13: The budget has been reduced and all issues addressed. Clearance is recommended.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	June 10, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	July 31, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 26, 2013	

*** 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.**