



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	5879		
Country/Region:	Regional (Bolivia, Chile, Dominican Republic, Paraguay)		
Project Title:	Development of Minamata Initial Assessment in LAC		
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:	\$935,000	Total Project Cost:	\$1,665,594
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ibrahima Sow	Agency Contact Person:	Jorge Ocaña,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes, Bolivia, Chile and Dominican Republic have signed the Minamata convention on October 10, 2013. Paraguay has signed it on February 10, 2014.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? * ¹	Indicated amounts in the letters of endorsement are not consistent with the project grant. Please correct and submit revised letters
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.
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

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

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.
	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.
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	- The expected outputs for component 5 (p.17) should be corrected. - Under Project activities (p.36): activity 5.3 of the component 5 (p.14-15) is missing. Annex 5: under component 1: please replace "Determination" by "Establishment" (page 31) - Under table A: the total amount is not correct. It should be \$ 723,594. Please correct accordingly (p.2).
	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?	See section above
	17. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	18. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	Yes, co-financing is not a requirement, however participating countries will provide contribution.
	19. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	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?	None.
	• Convention Secretariat?	None.
	• Other GEF Agencies?	None.

Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation	22. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?	Not at this time. Please address the above comments. 12 June 2014 Comments addressed. EA approval is recommended.
Review Date (s)	First review**	June 10, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 12, 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.**