



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

GEF ID:	5494		
Country/Region:	Regional (Argentina, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Peru, Uruguay)		
Project Title:	Development of Mercury Risk Management Approaches in Latin America		
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;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$916,000
Co-financing:	\$2,894,434	Total Project Cost:	\$3,810,434
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Anil Sookdeo	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 ?		Yes
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?		Yes
Resource Availability	3. 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)?		

*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.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Strategic Alignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund focal area set-aside? 		
	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><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></p>		<p>Please clarify how the development of national implementation plans is consistent with the GEF 5 strategy on Mercury.</p> <p>Nov 14- The agency has clarified that the project will not fund the development of National Implementation Plans. The scope of the project has been revised to reflect this clarification - Comment cleared</p>
	<p>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>		Yes
Project Design	<p>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>		<p>Please clarify what, if any, are the overlaps with other ongoing projects in the region as well as the UNIDO project in Argentina, Ecuador and Peru and the UNDP project in Uruguay and Honduras.</p> <p>Please provide examples where the UNEP toolkit was used as well as the data that was generated from it, also provide the method for using this toolkit and justify why the funds from this project will be used to refine the toolkit further.</p> <p>Nov 14- Comment addressed</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?		No - Please clarify what are the activities that will need to be undertaken for the development of national action/implementation plans. Nov 14- The agency has clarified that the project will not fund the development of National Implementation Plans. The scope of the project has been revised to reflect this clarification - Comment cleared
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?		N/A
	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?		Please elaborate. Nov 14 - Comment cleared
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?		Please elaborate Nov 14 - Comment cleared
	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

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		<p>No. There is no description of the linkages/relationships with projects already funded by the GEF in this region and there are also no descriptions of the linkages and relationships with projects developed in this region by other agencies. Please analyze these projects, identify synergies, overlaps and propose how these will be addressed.</p> <p>Nov 14 - Comment cleared</p>
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <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>If executed well the project could serve as a regional model for developing inventories for mercury and identifying key sectors that need to be addressed.</p> <p>The description in this section of the MSP does not provide a clear argument on how the project can be innovative or sustainable.</p> <p>Please describe how the mercury toolkit was planned to be used by UNEP, how it has been used, what results have it generated and how it can be deployed at a regional level.</p> <p>Comment cleared</p>
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		N/A - one step MSP application
	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		<p>No. The budget tables presented in the annexs raise a number of questions:</p> <p>1. What activities corresponds to the contract of 110,000 for "to complete laboratory proficiency survey and</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	benefits?		<p>assessment"? Is this work not better covered in the GMP projects for Mercury that UNEP is proposing?</p> <p>2. What is the scope of work for "identify initial guidance materials and existing studies and information needs." 78,000 for such an activity appears very costly for what would be expected to be desktop studies.</p> <p>3. The costs identified for developing and disseminating lessons learned is very costly. Please justify these costs.</p> <p>4. The GEF 5 mercury strategy does not identify the development of national implementation plans as an area that would receive funding at this time. The allocation of 110,000 is therefore not an eligible cost at this time.</p> <p>Nov 14 - Comment cleared</p>
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		<p>The costs to the GEF are high. Please refer to section 15 above.</p> <p>Nov 14- Comment cleared</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? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?		N/A
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?		Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?		N/A
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		No
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		N/A
	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?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?		
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		Not at this time. The project needs to be re-designed to remove overlaps with other projects. Please contact GEFSEC before re-submitting a redesigned

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			project. Nov 14 - The project has been revised and is being recommended for CEO endorsement. The agency is encouraged to work with the countries to use this project to do an initial assessment of the mercury situation in the countries.
	First review*		July 29, 2013
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		November 14, 2013
	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.**