



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	5863		
Country/Region:	Regional (Cambodia, Philippines, Pakistan)		
Project Title:	Development of Minamata Initial Assessment in Three Asian Countries		
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):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$730,594
Co-financing:	\$1,702,084	Total Project Cost:	\$2,432,678
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Hiroaki Takiguchi	Agency Contact Person:	Jorge Ocaña

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	HT, June 4, 2014: Yes, Cambodia, Philippines and Pakistan have signed the Minamata Convention on Mercury.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? * ¹	HT, June 4, 2014: Yes.
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	HT, June 4, 2014: Yes.
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country? *	HT, June 4, 2014: Yes.
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• the STAR allocation?	N/A
	• the focal area allocation?	HT, June 4, 2014: Yes.
	• focal area set-aside?	HT, June 4, 2014: Yes.

¹ 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?	HT, June 4, 2014: Yes.
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	HT, June 4, 2014: Yes.
	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?	HT, June 4, 2014: Yes.
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	HT, June 4, 2014: Yes.
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	HT, June 4, 2014: Please address the following comments: a) Please correct the misspelling of the title (the word "assessment"). b) One of the purposes of GEF funding for MIA is to assist eligible countries to decide if there is justification to notify the Convention in accordance with Article 7 (artisanal and small-scale gold mining). After completing the project activities described in the proposal, will the countries be able to make a decision on the notification? Please explain. HT, June 11, 2014: a) Comment cleared. b) Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared.
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	HT, June 4, 2014: Yes.
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	HT, June 4, 2014: Yes.
	13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	HT, June 4, 2014: Yes.
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	HT, June 4, 2014: The Project Implementation Arrangements in Annex 10 (page 49) identifies "groundWorks" as the executing agency. This arrangement is inconsistent with the figure on page 24 and relevant descriptions. Please correct it.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		HT, June 11, 2014: Correction has been made. Comment cleared.
Project Financing	15. Is the itemized budget (including consultant fees, travel, office facilities, etc) justified?	HT, June 4, 2014: Yes.
	16. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	HT, June 4, 2014: The percentage of the Project Management Cost (PMC) before PMC (11.1% = \$73,094 / (\$642,500 + \$15,000)) exceeds the threshold (10%). Please reconsider the amount of PMC. HT, June 11, 2014: PMC has been reduced within the threshold. Comment cleared.
	17. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	HT, June 4, 2014: Requested GEF funding for Pakistan (\$300,000) and Philippines (\$300,000) exceeds the norm (\$200,000). Please justify why the two countries need the additional amount. What are their complexities of national circumstances? HT, June 11, 2014: Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared.
	18. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	HT, June 4, 2014: Yes, co-financing commitment letters have been attached.
	19. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	HT, June 4, 2014: Yes.
	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?	Comments not received as of June 4, 2014
	• Convention Secretariat?	Comments not received as of June 4, 2014
	• Other GEF Agencies?	Comments not received as of June 4, 2014

Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation	22. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?	HT, June 4, 2014: Please address the above comments. HT, June 11, 2014: All comments are cleared. CEO approval is recommended.
Review Date (s)	First review**	June 04, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 11, 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.**