

# **Reducing global environmental risks through the monitoring and development of alternative livelihood for the primary mercury mining sector in Mexico**

*GEF Secretariat Review for Full Sized Project*

## **Basic Information**

**GEF ID**  
**10086**

**Countries**  
Mexico

**Project Title**  
Reducing global environmental risks through the monitoring and development of alternative livelihood for the primary mercury mining sector in Mexico

**GEF Agency(ies)**  
UNEP

**Agency ID**  
UNEP: 01294

**GEF Focal Area(s)**  
Chemicals and Waste

## **Program Manager Part I – Project Information**

### **Focal area elements**

**1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
Yes, this project is consistent with the Chemicals and Waste strategy.

Agency Response

### **Indicative project/program description summary**

**2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Will this project lead to any land restored? If so please all associated core indicators.

ES, 11/13/18: data on landscapes under improved practice added. -Comment cleared

Please add inputs for core indicator 11.

ES, 11/13/18: data added. -Comment cleared

Please add Rio Markers

ES, 11/17/18:

Rio Marker entries are confusing as both CC Adaptation and Mitigation have both 0 and 1 values. Rio Markers in Annex C does not match entry in the Portal. Rio Markers for both CCM and CCA should have values of "0" as the project does not describe any climate co-benefits.

ES, 11/19/18: corrected. Comment cleared

Agency Response

As consulted with GEFSEC, the project will not lead to land restored (the project will produce a plan for restoration) but instead contribute to core indicator 4 (areas of landscape under improved practices) and targets for this core indicator have been added.

Targets for core indicator 11 have been added

Rio Markers have been added in the taxonomy.

LB 11/19/18:

Rio Markers have been changed as requested and are consistent between the annex and the Portal

## **Co-financing**

**3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

ES, 11/17/18: All co-financing classified as "in-kind", of which half is "IM". It seems a considerable share of this could be classified as "public investment" or "grant", rather than "in-kind", consistent with the Co-Financing Guidelines. Where co-financing truly meets the

definition of "in-kind", it should typically be classified as "recurrent expenditures" rather than "investment mobilized".

ES, 11/19/18: Cofinancing has been corrected. Comment cleared  
Agency Response

LB, 11/19/18: Co-financing has been adjusted to reflect the guidelines.

## **GEF Resource Availability**

**4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
Yes.

Agency Response

### **The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

### **The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
Yes, this is in line with the CW allocation.

Agency Response

### **The LDCF under the principle of equitable access**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

### **The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

### **Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

### **Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

## **Project Preparation Grant**

### **5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

## **Core indicators**

### **6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Will this project lead to any land restored? If so please all associated core indicators.

Please add inputs for core indicator 11.

Please add Rio Markers

ES, 11/13/18: comments have been addressed. -Comments cleared

Agency Response

As consulted with GEFSEC, the project will not lead to land restored (the project will produce a plan for restoration) but instead contribute to core indicator 4 (areas of landscape under improved practices) and targets for this core indicator have been added.

Targets for core indicator 11 have been added

Rio Markers have been added in the taxonomy.

## **Project/Program taxonomy**

### **7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
Yes.

Agency Response

## **Part II – Project Justification**

### **1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
Yes.

Agency Response

### **2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Missing please provide

ES, 11/13/18: Baseline provided. -Comment cleared

Agency Response

A technical issue occurred between submission by agency and review by GEFSEC. The missing sections have been inserted again.

### **3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Missing, please provide

ES, 11/13/18: Alternative scenario provided. - Comment cleared

Agency Response

A technical issue occurred between submission by agency and review by GEFSEC. The missing sections have been inserted again.

**4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Missing, please provide.

ES, 11/13/18: Provided and well aligned with the CW strategy. -Comment cleared

Agency Response

A technical issue occurred between submission by agency and review by GEFSEC. The missing sections have been inserted again.

**5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Missing, please provide

ES, 11/13/18; Provided. -Comment cleared

Agency Response

A technical issue occurred between submission by agency and review by GEFSEC. The missing sections have been inserted again.

**6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Missing, please provide

ES, 11/13/18: GEBs provided. -Comment cleared

Agency Response

A technical issue occurred between submission by agency and review by GEFSEC. The missing sections have been inserted again.

## **7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Missing, please provide

ES, 11/13/18: Information provided on innovation, sustainability and scaling up. -Comment cleared

Agency Response

A technical issue occurred between submission by agency and review by GEFSEC. The missing sections have been inserted again.

## **Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

### **Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, this is included.

Agency Response

## **Stakeholders**

### **Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

## **Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

### **Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, this is articulated.

Agency Response

## **Private Sector Engagement**

**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
Yes.

Agency Response

## **Risks**

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
Yes.

Agency Response

## **Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
Yes.

Agency Response

## **Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
Yes.

Agency Response



## **Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
Yes.

Agency Response

## **Part III – Country Endorsements**

**Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
Yes.

Agency Response

## **GEFSEC DECISION**

### **RECOMMENDATION**

**Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
PIF and PPG are recommended for technical clearance.

### **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

## Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>