



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	<b>5865</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Mexico</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Development of Minamata Initial Assessment in Mexico</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>\$456,530</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$40,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$496,530</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. Mexico has signed the Minamata Convention on 10 October 2013.
	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.
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country? *	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.
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• the STAR allocation?	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes
	• focal area set-aside?	Yes

<sup>1</sup> Questions 2, 3, 4, 18 and 19 are applicable only to EAs submitted through Agencies.  
EA review template: updated June 7 2011

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
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. Mexico has signed the Minamata Convention and is currently implementing a project with the Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC) on the development of regulatory and policy options for decision-makers on mercury management activities.
	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?	I do not understand why under Project Stakeholders, the UNEP Regional Office for Europe, - instead of the UNEP Regional Office for LAC will have to identify opportunities for regional synergies and areas of cooperation. Please clarify Annex 3: Under 2.2, Moldova should be replaced by Mexico.
	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, in particular, Mexico endorsed along with Canada and USA the North American Regional Action Plan for mercury (NARAP) in order to reduce the levels of mercury in some environmental matrices.
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes.
	Project Financing	15. Is the itemized budget (including consultant fees, travel, office facilities, etc) justified?
16. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?		Yes. PM cost @ 9%, is 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?		This is an EA project, so co-financing is not a requirement; though Mexico is providing cofinang to the tune of \$40,000.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	19. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	N/A
	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:*	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>	None received
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>	None received
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>	None received

Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation	<b>22. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	Please address comments under section 10: Project design 5 June: Comments addressed: EA recommended for clearance.
Review Date (s)	First review**	June 03, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 05, 2014
	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.**