



**Report of the Global Environment Facility
to the Second Meeting of the Conference of the
Parties to the Minamata Convention on Mercury**

October 31, 2018

Table of Contents

List of Tables	3
List of Figures	3
Abbreviations and Acronyms	4
Executive Summary	5
Introduction	7
Part I: GEF's Work on Mercury during the Reporting Period	7
Programming during the Reporting Period	7
Response to Initial Guidance from the Conference of the Parties to the Minamata Convention ...	7
Cooperation with Secretariat of Minamata Convention	14
GEF's Participation at the First Conference of the Parties	15
Part II: GEF Support to the Minamata Convention in the GEF-6 Period	16
Overview of GEF Support for the Minamata Convention in GEF-6	16
Chemicals and Waste Portfolio in the Small Grants Programme	22
Monitoring and Evaluation of Mercury Projects in GEF-6	23
IEO Country Portfolio Evaluation	23
IEO Thematic Evaluation: Chemicals and Waste Focal Area Study	24
GEF Corporate Scorecard	24
Part III: Seventh Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund	25
Annex 1: Projects Approved in the Reporting Period (July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018)	27
Annex 2: List of GEF-6 Mercury Projects (July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018)	29
Enabling Activity Projects	29
Programs	37
Full-Sized Projects	37
Medium-Sized Projects	38
Annex 3: List of Mercury Projects Supported by Small Grants Programme in GEF-6	39

List of Tables

Table 1: Response to Initial Guidance from Conference of Parties to Minamata Convention	8
Table 2: GEF-6 Chemicals and Wastes Programs and Initial Indicative Allocations.....	16
Table 3: Resources Programmed for Implementation of the Minamata Convention in GEF-6.....	17
Table 4: Number of Countries Receiving Support in GEF-6.....	17
Table 5: List of Countries that Received GEF Support for Enabling Activities.....	20
Table 6: List of Projects Approved during the Reporting Period.....	27
Table 7: List of Enabling Activities Funded in GEF-6.....	29
Table 8: Single Focal Area Programs	37
Table 9: Multi Focal Area Programs	37
Table 10: Single Focal Area Full-Sized Projects.....	37
Table 11: Multi Focal Area Full-Sized Projects	38
Table 12: Medium-Sized Projects	38
Table 13: Small Grants Projects.....	39

List of Figures

Figure 1: Thematic Distribution of Allocated GEF-6 Mercury Funding	18
Figure 2: Agency Distribution of Allocated GEF-6 Mercury Funding.....	19
Figure 3: Regional Distribution of Allocated GEF-6 Mercury Funding	19
Figure 4: Sectors Receiving GEF-6 Support per Region	20

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ASGM	Artisanal Small-Scale Gold Mining
BRS	Basel, Rotterdam, and Stockholm Conventions
CEIT	Country with Economies in Transition
COP	Conference of the Parties
CW	Chemicals and Wastes
FSP	Full-sized Project
GEF	Global Environment Facility
HCW	Health Care Waste
IEO	Independent Evaluation Office
INC	Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee
LDC	Least Developed Country
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreement
MIA	Minamata Initial Assessment
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSP	Medium-sized Project
NAP	National Action Plan
ODS	Ozone Depleting Substance
POP	Persistent Organic Pollutant
SAICM	Strategic Approach to International Chemical Management
SGP	Small Grant Programme
SIDS	Small Island Developing State
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UPOP	Unintentional Persistent Organic Pollutant

Executive Summary

1. The Minamata Convention on Mercury is the most recent Convention in which the Global Environment Facility (GEF) is included in the Financial Mechanism.
2. The objective of the Convention is to protect the human health and the environment from anthropogenic emissions and releases of mercury and mercury compounds.
3. Article 13 of the Minamata Convention includes the GEF in the Financial Mechanism to provide new, predictable, adequate and timely financial resources to meet costs in support of implementation of this Convention as agreed by the Conference of the Parties.
4. The Minamata Convention was added to the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility during the Fifth Assembly of the Global Environment Facility in May 2014.
5. This report presents the work of the GEF in fulfilling its mandate under the Minamata Convention between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018 and responds to the guidance to the GEF from the first meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP 1) to the Minamata Convention on Mercury that took place from September 24 to 29, 2017. The guidance is contained in the annex to the Minamata COP decision MC-1/5.¹
6. The report additionally provides an account of the GEF's support to the Minamata Convention on Mercury over the sixth replenishment period (GEF-6) of July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018, as well as an overview of the results of the seventh GEF replenishment (GEF-7) process.
7. Since the first COP in September 2017, the GEF has approved two full-sized projects (FSPs) covering seven countries and seven enabling activity projects covering ten countries.
8. The resources committed during the reporting period is \$8.25 million.²
9. The sixth replenishment of the GEF (GEF-6) committed \$554 million of GEF resources for chemicals and waste focal area, of which \$141 million was allocated to the implementation of the Minamata Convention.
10. During GEF-6, \$148.7 million was programmed to implement the Minamata convention of which \$134 million was allocated to countries, \$2 million to project preparation and \$12.5 million to agency fees.

¹ United Nations Environment Programme, 2017, [Report of the Conference of the Parties to the Minamata Convention on Mercury on the work of its first meeting](#), UNEP/MC/COP.1/29.

² Excluding agency fees and project preparation grants.

11. The GEF-6 resources supported 85 countries to conduct Minamata Initial Assessments (MIA), which brings the total number of countries that received MIA support to date to 110.³

12. In GEF-6, National Action Plans for Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining (NAP) were also supported, with 32 countries receiving support.

13. Twenty-six (26) countries received support for implementation activities through programmatic approaches, FSPs and medium-sized projects in GEF-6.

14. On average, excluding enabling activities, the portfolio leveraged four dollars for every GEF dollar invested from co-financing.⁴

15. The corporate target for mercury reduction in the GEF-6 period was 1,000 metric tons. The Corporate Scorecard presented at the 54th GEF Council meeting in June 2018 showed that the GEF-6 mercury projects approved contributed 638 tons, or 64 percent of the GEF-6 corporate target for mercury reduction.^{5, 6} This was in part influenced by the large number of enabling activities without direct mercury reduction supported during the GEF-6 period. The GEF provided such support in response to a request made by the Sixth session of the intergovernmental negotiating committee on mercury (INC6) to consider enabling activities as well as expanded eligibility including non-signatories to access enabling activities resources from the GEF.⁷ The INC6 request was made in November 2014, after the indicative resource allocation and mercury reduction corporate target were agreed during the GEF-6 replenishment negotiations. During the GEF-6 period, 25 percent of the total resources were allocated to support enabling activities.

³ The GEF has supported MIAs starting in GEF-5.

⁴ Co-financing is not required for Enabling Activities.

⁵ The score card compiles Global Environmental Benefits at GEF Council approval and CEO Endorsement stages.

⁶ GEF, 2018, [GEF-6 Corporate Score Card](#), Council Document GEF/C.54/Info.03.

⁷ UNEP, 2015, Report of the intergovernmental negotiating committee to prepare a global legally binding instrument on mercury on the work of its sixth session, UNEP(DTIE)/Hg/INC.6/24 Annex III.

Introduction

16. This report presents the work of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to support the implementation of the Minamata Convention on Mercury between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018 (the reporting period). It also provides an account of the GEF's support to the Minamata Convention on Mercury over the sixth replenishment period (GEF-6) of July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018, as well as an overview of the seventh GEF replenishment (GEF-7).

17. The Minamata Convention on mercury is the most recent Convention that includes the GEF in its financial mechanism. The Convention was added to the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility during the Fifth GEF Assembly in May 2014.

18. The objective of the Convention is to protect human health and the environment from anthropogenic emissions and releases of mercury and mercury compounds.

Part I: GEF's Work on Mercury during the Reporting Period

19. This section provides information on the GEF's support of the Minamata convention for the reporting period of July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018.

PROGRAMMING DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD

20. The total resources⁸ for the implementation of the Minamata Conventions approved during the reporting period was \$8,249,092, of which \$2,025,000 was allocated to Minamata Initial Assessments (MIAs) and/or National Action Plans (NAPs) for Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining (ASGM) in ten countries. \$6,224,092 was allocated to two full-sized projects (FSPs) that provided resources to seven countries.

21. The full list of projects is presented in Annex 1. The two FSPs integrated mercury funding into larger projects, with one covering unintentional persistent organic pollutants (UPOPs) and mercury from waste, and the other covering biodiversity and mercury in the ASGM sector. The seven enabling activity projects supported MIAs and ASGM NAPs in ten countries.

RESPONSE TO INITIAL GUIDANCE FROM THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE MINAMATA CONVENTION

22. The first meeting of the Conference of Parties (COP 1) to the Minamata Convention on Mercury was held from September 24 to 29, 2017. The COP provided guidance to the GEF on overall strategies, policies, programme priorities and eligibility for access to and utilization of financial resources. The COP also provided guidance on an indicative list of categories of activities that could receive support from the GEF Trust Fund in the annex to decision MC-1/5. Table 1 below is the complete list of guidance and the GEF's response.

⁸ Excluding agency fees and project preparation grants.

Table 1: Response to Initial Guidance from Conference of Parties to Minamata Convention

COP Guidance		GEF's Response
Eligibility for access to and utilization of financial resources		
2	To be eligible for funding from GEF as one of the entities comprising the financial mechanism of the Minamata Convention on Mercury, a country must be a Party to the Convention and must be a developing country or a country with an economy in transition.	<p>The GEF's eligibility policy for mercury incorporates the criteria for funding enabling activities. The guidelines for these enabling activities are found in the information document of the 45th meeting of the GEF Council, revised in January 2014.⁹</p> <p>During GEF-6, prior to the Conference of the Parties, both signatory countries and parties were eligible for receiving funding from the GEF. In GEF-7, only Parties are eligible to access GEF resources.</p>
3	Activities that are eligible for funding from the GEF trust fund are those that seek to meet the objectives of the Convention and are consistent with the present guidance.	<p>According to the GEF Instrument paragraph 6 (e) the GEF shall: Operate as one of the entities comprising the financial mechanism of the Minamata Convention on Mercury, pursuant to its Article 13, paragraphs 5, 6 and 8. In such respects, the GEF shall operate under the guidance of, and be accountable to the Conference of the Parties, which shall provide guidance on overall strategies, policies, program priorities and eligibility for access to and utilization of financial resources. In addition, the GEF shall receive guidance from the Conference of the Parties on an indicative list of categories of activities that could receive support; and shall provide resources to meet the agreed incremental costs of global environmental benefits and the agreed full costs of some enabling activities, pursuant to Article 13, paragraph 7, of the Minamata Convention on Mercury.</p>

⁹ GEF, 2014, [Initial Guidelines for Enabling Activities for the Minamata Convention on Mercury](#), Council Document, GEF/C.45/Inf.05/Rev.01.

COP Guidance		GEF's Response
4	Signatories to the Convention are eligible for funding from GEF for enabling activities, provided that any such signatory is taking meaningful steps towards becoming a Party as evidenced by a letter from the relevant minister to the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme and to the Chief Executive Officer and Chairperson of the Global Environment Facility.	Up to June 30, 2018, the GEF supported a total of 110 countries through GEF-5 and GEF-6 to implement Minamata Initial Assessments (MIA) and 32 countries to conduct their artisanal and small-scale gold mining (ASGM) National Action Plans (NAP). 78 out of 89 Signatories received funding for these enabling activities. Of the remaining eleven countries, six have become Parties to date. Twenty-three countries that were non-signatory and non-party have accessed enabling activity resources through the varying of the eligibility criteria by the GEF Council through a decision by mail on January 14, 2015 at the request of the sixth session of the intergovernmental committee on mercury (INC6) to allow non-signatory, non-Party States to access resources for enabling activities from the GEF. This variation of the eligibility for non-signatories, non-parties is longer applicable as the COP 1 guidance only applies to signatories and Parties with respect to access of funding of enabling activities.
II. Overall strategies and policies		
5	In accordance with Article 13, paragraph 7, of the Convention, the GEF trust fund shall provide new, predictable, adequate and timely financial resources to meet costs in support of implementation of the Convention as agreed by the Conference of the Parties, including costs arising from activities that: (a) Are country-driven; (b) Are in conformity with programme priorities as reflected in relevant guidance provided by the Conference of the Parties;	This guidance has been used to inform the programming in GEF-6 and has been addressed in the GEF-7 replenishment negotiations, which concluded in April 2018. The new strategy is included in the summary of negotiations of the seventh replenishment of the GEF trust fund. ¹⁰

¹⁰ GEF, 2018, [Report On The Seventh Replenishment Of The GEF Trust Fund](#), Council Document GEF/A.6/05/Rev.01.

COP Guidance		GEF's Response
	<p>(c) Build capacity and promote the utilization of local and regional expertise, if applicable;</p> <p>(d) Promote synergies with other focal areas;</p> <p>(e) Continue to enhance synergies and co-benefits within the chemicals and wastes focal area;</p> <p>(f) Promote multiple-source funding approaches, mechanisms and arrangements, including from the private sector, if applicable; and</p> <p>(g) Promote sustainable national socioeconomic development, poverty reduction and activities consistent with existing national sound environmental management programmes geared towards the protection of human health and the environment.</p>	
III. Programme priorities		
6	<p>In accordance with article 13, paragraph 7, of the Convention, the GEF trust fund shall provide resources to meet the agreed incremental costs of global environmental benefits and the agreed full costs of some enabling activities.</p>	<p>This is reflected in the strategies of the GEF.</p> <p>In GEF-6, \$141 million was allocated for the implementation of the Minamata Convention. The GEF has programmed resources to meet the full cost of the MIAs and the ASGM NAPs. The GEF has programmed resources for several projects that are aimed at early implementation, particularly in the ASGM sector. In GEF-7, \$206 million is notionally allocated for the implementation of the Minamata Convention, including the agreed full costs of some enabling activities.</p>
7	<p>In particular, it should give priority to the following activities when providing financial resources to developing-country Parties and Parties with economies in transition:</p> <p>(a) Enabling activities, particularly Minamata Convention initial assessment activities and</p>	<p>This guidance has been used in the programming in GEF-6 and has been addressed in the programming priorities of the GEF-7 Chemicals and Waste Focal Area Strategy. All projects and programs in GEF-6 that seek to implement the</p>

COP Guidance		GEF's Response
	<p>national action plans for artisanal and small-scale gold mining;</p> <p>(b) Activities to implement the provisions of the Convention, affording priority to those that:</p> <p>(i) Relate to legally binding obligations;</p> <p>(ii) Facilitate early implementation on entry into force of the Convention for a Party;</p> <p>(iii) Allow for reduction in mercury emissions and releases and address the health and environmental impacts of mercury.</p>	<p>Minamata Convention were consistent with this guidance.</p>
8	<p>In providing resources for an activity, GEF should take into account the potential mercury reductions of a proposed activity relative to its costs in accordance with paragraph 8 of article 13 of the Convention.</p>	<p>In GEF-6, projects with potential for significant mercury reduction have been approved. The GEF continues to work with countries and agencies to look at the potential reduction of mercury relative to its cost.</p>
IV. Indicative list of categories of activities that could receive support		
A. Enabling activities		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Minamata Convention initial assessments (MIAs) 2. Preparation of national action plans for artisanal and small-scale gold mining in accordance with paragraph 3 of article 7 and Annex C 3. Other types of enabling activities as agreed by the Conference of the Parties 	<p>This guidance has been used to inform the programming in GEF-6 and has been addressed in the programming priorities of the GEF-7 Chemicals and Waste Focal Area Strategy. In GEF-6, all eligible enabling activities that were submitted to the GEF have received funding.</p>
B. Activities to implement the provisions of the Convention		
1. Activities to implement the provisions of the Convention that relate to legally binding obligations		
9	<p>When providing financial resources to eligible Parties for activities to implement the provisions of the Convention, GEF should afford priority to those activities that relate to legally binding obligations of Parties under the Convention and should take into account the potential mercury reductions of a proposed activity relative to its costs. Such activities</p>	<p>These have been included in the GEF-7 Chemicals and Waste Focal Area Strategy.</p>

COP Guidance		GEF's Response
	<p>could include those related to the following areas, listed in no particular order:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mercury supply sources and trade; • Mercury-added products; • Manufacturing processes in which mercury or mercury compounds are used; • Artisanal and small-scale gold mining; • Emissions; • Releases; • Environmentally sound interim storage of mercury, other than waste mercury; • Mercury wastes; • Reporting; • Relevant capacity-building, technical assistance and technology transfer in relation to the above. 	
<p>2. Activities to implement the provisions of the Convention that facilitate early implementation on entry into force of the Convention for a Party</p>		
10	<p>When considering activities to implement the provisions of the Convention that facilitate early implementation on entry into force, GEF should also consider providing support for activities that, although they are not the subject of a legal obligation under the Convention, may significantly contribute to a Party's preparedness to implement the Convention upon its entry into force for that country.</p>	<p>This will be addressed during programming in GEF-7 and will be reported on at subsequent COPs.</p>
11	<p>Within the context of the GEF mandate, such activities could include, inter alia, support for:</p> <p>(a) With regard to emissions, the development by Parties with relevant sources of emissions of national plans setting out the measures to be taken to control emissions and their expected targets, goals and outcomes;</p> <p>(b) With regard to releases, the development by Parties with relevant sources of releases of national plans setting out the measures to be</p>	<p>This will be addressed during programming in GEF-7 and will be reported on at subsequent COPs.</p>

COP Guidance		GEF's Response
	<p>taken to control releases and their expected targets, goals and outcomes;</p> <p>(c) With regard to contaminated sites, capacity-building for the development of strategies for identifying and assessing sites contaminated by mercury or mercury compounds and, as appropriate, the remediation of those sites;</p> <p>(d) Information exchange;</p> <p>(e) Public information, awareness and education;</p> <p>(f) Cooperation in the development and improvement of research, development and monitoring;</p> <p>(g) Development of implementation plans following initial assessments.</p>	
3. Activities to implement the provisions of the Convention that allow for the reduction of mercury emissions and releases and address both the health and environmental impacts of mercury		
12	<p>Activities to implement the provisions of the Convention that allow for the reduction of mercury emissions and releases and address both the health and environmental impacts of mercury may encompass activities relating to both binding and non-binding provisions, with priority to the legally binding provisions discussed above, that accord with the GEF mandate to deliver global environmental benefits and reflect the GEF chemicals and wastes focal area strategy.</p>	<p>This will be addressed during programming in GEF-7 and will be reported on at subsequent COPs.</p>
V. Review by the Conference of the Parties		
13	<p>In accordance with paragraph 11 of article 13, the Conference of the Parties will review, no later than at its third meeting, and thereafter on a regular basis, the level of funding, the guidance provided by the Conference of the Parties to GEF as one of the entities entrusted with operationalizing the mechanism established under this article and the mechanism's effectiveness and ability to</p>	<p>At the request of the COP, the GEF will provide information as it relates to the review described in paragraph 11 of article 13 of the Minamata Convention.</p>

COP Guidance		GEF's Response
	address the changing needs of developing-country Parties and Parties with economies in transition. On the basis of such review, the Conference of the Parties will take appropriate action to improve the effectiveness of the financial mechanism, including by updating and prioritizing as necessary its guidance to GEF.	

COOPERATION WITH SECRETARIAT OF MINAMATA CONVENTION

23. Since the adoption of the Convention in October 2013, the GEF Secretariat has initiated formal cooperation and communication with the Interim Secretariat of the Minamata Convention to enhance coordination, share information and collaborate on issues related to the implementation of the Convention. Since COP 1, cooperation has continued with the Secretariat of the Minamata Convention.

24. The Principal Coordinator of the Interim Secretariat of the Minamata Convention attended the 53rd meeting of the GEF Council in November 2017. The GEF Council was provided with the outcomes of COP 1 during the Convention heads panel for the relations with Conventions session at the GEF Council. The GEF Secretariat has also organized informal Multilateral Environmental Agreement (MEA) dialogues during GEF Council meetings, with the participation of high level representatives from Convention Secretariats, including the interim secretariat of the Minamata Convention and participants of the GEF Council meetings. Representatives of the Minamata interim secretariat were also actively engaged in the GEF-7 replenishment process and attended replenishment meetings.

25. The newly appointed Executive Secretary ad interim of the Minamata Convention attended the 54th GEF Council and sixth GEF Assembly in Da Nang, Viet Nam in June 2018. The Executive Secretary addressed the GEF Council during the session on the relations with Conventions and addressed the Assembly at plenary. The Executive Secretary also participated in the chemicals and waste round table during the sixth GEF Assembly and in several constituency meetings held prior to the sixth GEF Assembly.

26. The GEF routinely organizes chemicals and wastes task force meetings regarding the chemicals and wastes work stream in the context of the GEF. The meeting participants include representatives from the GEF implementing and project agencies, the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel of the GEF, and the secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm (BRS) Conventions, and the secretariat of the Minamata Convention. During the reporting period, a meeting was held in June 2018 to discuss the outcomes of GEF-6, the chemicals and wastes strategy for GEF-7 strategy, and shared information on project ideas and their statuses. Representatives of the Minamata Secretariat, including the new Executive Secretary, attended this meeting.

GEF'S PARTICIPATION AT THE FIRST CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

27. The GEF CEO led a delegation of the GEF Secretariat to COP 1 in September 2017. The GEF hosted a high-level side event on the GEF GOLD (Global Opportunities for Long-term Development of the ASGM Sector) program which featured the President of the Co-operative Republic of Guyana. The GEF CEO participated in a panel discussion during the high-level segment of the COP.

28. The GEF Secretariat representatives participated actively on the discussion on guidance to the GEF, Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the COP and the GEF Council, and effectiveness evaluation. The decision on the MOU was deferred to COP 2.

Part II: GEF Support to the Minamata Convention in the GEF-6 Period

OVERVIEW OF GEF SUPPORT FOR THE MINAMATA CONVENTION IN GEF-6

29. Under the GEF-6 chemicals and wastes strategy, \$554 million of GEF resources was committed at the time of replenishment, of which \$141 million was allocated to the implementation of the Minamata Convention. Table 2 summarizes the objectives and programs of the chemicals and wastes strategy and the GEF programming target.

Table 2: GEF-6 Chemicals and Wastes Programs and Initial Indicative Allocations

Focal Area Objective	Programs	Programing Target (\$ million)	
CW 1 Develop the enabling conditions, tools and environment to manage harmful chemicals and wastes	Program 1: Develop and demonstrate new tools and regulatory along with economic approaches for managing harmful chemicals and wastes in a sound manner	POPs	20
		Mercury	10
		SAICM	8
	Program 2: Support enabling activities and promote their integration into national budgets, planning processes, national and sectoral policies and actions, and global monitoring	POPs	20
		Mercury	30
CW 2 Reduce the prevalence of harmful chemicals and wastes and support the implementation of clean alternative technologies/substances	Program 3: Reduction and elimination of POPs	POPs	307
	Program 4: Reduction of anthropogenic emissions and releases of mercury to the environment	Mercury	78
	Program 5: Complete the phase out of ODS ^a in CEITs ^b and assist Article 5 countries under the Montreal Protocol to achieve climate mitigation benefits	ODS	25
	Program 6: Support regional approaches to eliminate and reduce harmful chemicals and wastes in LDCs ^c and SIDS ^d	POPs	28
		Mercury	23
		SAICM	5
	Sub Total (Mercury)		
Total			554

a: Ozone Depleting Substances; b: Countries with Economies in Transition; c: Least Developed Countries; d: Small Island Developing States

30. Table 3 below summarizes resources programed in GEF-6 for the implementation of the Minamata Convention, excluding project preparation grants and agency fees.

31. A total of \$148.7 million was programmed to implement the Convention in the GEF-6 period, including \$2 million for project preparation grants and \$12.5 million for agency fees.

Table 3: Resources Programmed for Implementation of the Minamata Convention in GEF-6

Project Type	GEF Resources (\$ million)¹¹
Enabling Activities (MIAs and NAPs)	34,322,045
Medium-Sized Projects	1,069,800
Full-Sized Projects, including programmatic approaches	98,903,626
Total	134,295,471

32. Table 4 presents the number of countries that received support from the resources described above:

Table 4: Number of Countries Receiving Support in GEF-6


Type of Project	Number of Countries
Minamata Initial Assessment	85
National Action Plans	32
Medium-Sized Projects	2
Full-Sized Projects, including programmatic approaches	24

33. Implementation of the Minamata Convention is funded under the chemicals and waste focal area and as such there are a number of projects that combine resources for the implementation of the Stockholm Convention and other focal areas with mercury resources. In this regard, calculation of co-financing ratio is not exact. In GEF-6, the overall average co-financing for projects that included resources for the Minamata Convention was one to four. This figure does not include enabling activities, for which co-financing is not required. FSPs tended to mobilize larger co-financing, with an average ratio of 1 to 5, while MSPs mobilized 1 to 3. For Enabling activities, the ratio was 1 to 0.1. Annex 2 summarizes the project approved during GEF-6.

¹¹ Excluding agency fees and project preparation grants.

34. Approved projects in GEF-6 included MIAs and ASGM NAPs to help countries identify needs and priority issues, and implementation work on priority sectors for the Convention, as illustrated in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Thematic Distribution of Allocated GEF-6 Mercury Funding¹²




35. As figure 1 shows, 25 percent of the resources in GEF-6 for mercury was allocated to enabling activities which do not have mercury emission reductions associated with them. These projects, however, were a priority for countries since INC6 since they set the conditions to implement the Convention and will allow more reductions in the GEF-7 period and beyond.

36. An additional 7 percent of GEF resources went to capacity building, primarily to China, which in the long-term will set the basis for significant future reductions of mercury.

37. For the implementation of the Minamata Convention, six agencies supported countries. They include Conservation International (CI), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNDP), West African Development Bank (BOAD), and the World Bank (WB). UNDP, UNEP and UNIDO also supported the enabling activities.


¹² VCM: Vinyl chloride monomer, HCW: Health care waste.

Figure 2: Agency Distribution of Allocated GEF-6 Mercury Funding




38. Figure 3 below shows the regional distribution of projects in GEF-6. The Asia region received the highest share of GEF resources during GEF-6, due to the large emissive sectors in those countries that have started project implementation.

Figure 3: Regional Distribution of Allocated GEF-6 Mercury Funding



39. Figure 4 below illustrates the sectors receiving funding per region. All regions undertook enabling activities with the highest proportion being in Africa followed by Latin America (excluding the Caribbean). Support for ASGM was in Africa, Asia and Latin America where ASGM activities are the highest. Additionally, a global coordinating project for ASGM was supported. The reduction of mercury chloride use in the Vinyl Chloride Monomer production sector was funded for China.

Figure 4: Sectors Receiving GEF-6 Support per Region



40. To support ratification of the convention, the GEF prioritized funding enabling activities. To date, the GEF has funded MIAs for 110 countries and 32 ASGM NAPs.¹³ The countries that received support up to the end of the GEF-6 period are presented in the following table.

Table 5: List of Countries that Received GEF Support for Enabling Activities

Minamata Initial Assessments		ASGM National Action Plans	
Parties	Non-Parties	Parties	Non-Parties
Antigua and Barbuda	Albania	Burkina Faso	Burundi
Argentina	Angola	Ecuador	Central African Republic
Armenia	Azerbaijan	Gabon	Congo

¹³ This figure is the total number of countries receiving GEF support, including countries funded in GEF-5.

Minamata Initial Assessments		ASGM National Action Plans	
Parties	Non-Parties	Parties	Non-Parties
Benin	Bangladesh	Ghana	Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)
Bolivia	Belarus	Guinea	Eritrea
Botswana	Belize	Honduras	Kenya
Brazil	Bosnia & Herzegovina	Indonesia	Kyrgyzstan
Burkina Faso	Burundi	Lao PDR	Mozambique
Chad	Cabo Verde	Madagascar	Myanmar
Chile	Cambodia	Mali	Tanzania
China	Cameroon	Mongolia	Uganda
Costa Rica	Central African Republic	Niger	Zimbabwe
Djibouti	Colombia	Nigeria	
Dominican Republic	Comoros	Paraguay	
El Salvador	Congo	Peru	
Gabon	Cook Islands	Senegal	
Gambia	Côte d'Ivoire	Sierra Leone	
Ghana	Dominica	Suriname	
Guinea	Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)	eSwatini (Swaziland)	
Guyana	Eritrea	Zambia	
Honduras	Ethiopia		
India	Georgia		
Indonesia	Grenada		
Jamaica	Guatemala		
Jordan	Guinea-Bissau		
Kiribati	Iraq		
Lao PDR	Kazakhstan		
Lesotho	Kenya		
Madagascar	Kyrgyzstan		
Mali	Macedonia		
Mauritania	Malawi		
Mauritius	Malaysia		
Mexico	Maldives		
Moldova	Marshall Islands		
Mongolia	Micronesia		
Namibia	Montenegro		
Niger	Morocco		
Nigeria	Mozambique		

Minamata Initial Assessments		ASGM National Action Plans	
Parties	Non-Parties	Parties	Non-Parties
Palau	Myanmar		
Panama	Nepal		
Paraguay	Niue		
Samoa	Pakistan		
Sao Tome & Principe	Papua New Guinea		
Senegal	Philippines		
Seychelles	Serbia		
Sierra Leone	South Africa		
Sri Lanka	St Lucia		
St Kitts & Nevis	St Vincent & Grenadines		
Suriname	Sudan		
eSwatini	Tanzania		
Togo	Tonga		
Viet Nam	Trinidad and Tobago		
Zambia	Turkey		
	Uganda		
	Vanuatu		
	Yemen		
	Zimbabwe		
53	57	20	12

41. The GEF-6 portfolio of projects supported synergies across the Chemicals Conventions as well as across focal areas. During GEF-6, three programs, six FSPs and two MSPs were supported to implement the Minamata Convention. Among these, five projects including one of the programs implement both the Stockholm Convention and the Minamata Convention in sectors of relevance for both Conventions such as healthcare, waste management, and scrap processing. There were also two projects including one program that were multifocal area and included the Biodiversity focal area and the International Waters focal area. Details are in Annex 2.

CHEMICALS AND WASTE PORTFOLIO IN THE SMALL GRANTS PROGRAMME

42. The GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) promotes the implementation of the Minamata Convention at local and community level by providing financial and technical support to civil society organizations in addressing mercury management issues. SGP tests and pilots community-based approaches to the reduction, elimination and prevention of mercury use, and promotes safe handling of mercury-containing products. Furthermore, SGP supports local communities to develop local communities' awareness and capacities. During GEF-6, SGP has supported 16

projects on mercury management with a total of \$674,859 GEF funding, having generated \$689,794 co-financing. Annex 3 includes the list of projects supported by SGP during GEF-6.

43. At the global level, to promote mercury management portfolio development, a special funding window was opened to support activities addressing mercury contamination in ASGM in more than ten countries. Additionally, a global project was launched in 2018, executed by European Environment Bureau's Zero Mercury Working Group, to provide targeted trainings to civil society organizations for the implementation of the Minamata Convention, including awareness raising for global environmental conventions and campaigns to influence government policies. The first regional training workshop was held in Bangkok, Thailand on May 17 and 18, 2018, and trained about 40 Non-Governmental Organization (NGOs).

MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF MERCURY PROJECTS IN GEF-6

44. GEF projects and focal area portfolio are monitored by the GEF Secretariat through its Annual Portfolio Monitoring Report and Corporate Scorecard and evaluated by the GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). The GEF IEO is responsible for undertaking independent evaluations that involve a set of projects from more than one Implementing or Executing Agency. These evaluation results are presented by the following reports:

- (a) Annual Performance Reports
- (b) Annual Country Portfolio Evaluations
- (c) Thematic Evaluations: programs, processes, and cross-cutting or focal areas
- (d) Comprehensive Evaluations of the GEF: Conducted every four years as inputs to the replenishment process.

45. The GEF IEO supports knowledge sharing and follow-up of evaluation recommendations. It works with the GEF Secretariat and the GEF Agencies to establish systems to disseminate lessons learned and best practices emanating from monitoring and evaluation activities and provides independent evaluative evidence to the GEF knowledge base.

IEO COUNTRY PORTFOLIO EVALUATION

46. The GEF IEO has submitted the country portfolio evaluation reports for 15 countries to the GEF Council during GEF-6. In these reports, one evaluation report considered the mercury activities in Tajikistan.

47. The evaluation report on Tajikistan concluded that GEF support to dealing with chemicals issues in Tajikistan was effective in the ODS sector. Results on the reduction of POPs are mixed. On mercury, it argued that Tajikistan has not yet signed the Convention, although mercury is among the major mineral resources extracted in Tajikistan, where chemicals leaking in waters because of mining activities is a cause of concern. It recommended that mercury, POPs, and other hazardous chemicals related issues should be given priority in Tajikistan.

48. In accordance with the guidance to the GEF from COP 1, only signatory countries and Parties are eligible to access GEF resources to conduct enabling activities so Tajikistan is currently not eligible to access the GEF until it becomes a party to the Minamata Convention.

IEO THEMATIC EVALUATION: CHEMICALS AND WASTE FOCAL AREA STUDY

49. The GEF IEO submitted the chemicals and wastes focal area study to the 52nd meeting of the GEF Council.¹⁴ The purpose of this study is to provide insights and lessons for the focal area going forward into the next replenishment cycle (GEF-7), based on evidence from an analysis of the chemicals and wastes portfolio's projects and terminal evaluations. The focal area study findings were also incorporated into the Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF, which directly fed into the GEF seventh replenishment process.

50. The study confirms that the chemicals and wastes focal area of the GEF has evolved through the GEF-4, GEF-5, and GEF-6 phases to remain highly relevant, including expanding to cover new global priorities such as mercury and embracing synergies between chemicals issues. The transition to a single chemicals and waste focal area has been synergistic. Reliable data on the aggregate impact of closed chemicals and wastes projects in terms of tons of POPs, ODS, mercury, and other chemicals and related wastes phased out, reduced, or disposed were not consistently available over all regions highlighting the need for systematic data collection and monitoring.

51. The recommendations include support for reforms, where the GEF may want to consider providing more support for broad-based regulatory reform and sector-wide approaches, to address chemicals and wastes issues more holistically. Also, given the challenges this study faced in tallying the verified results of the GEF chemicals and wastes focal area, the GEF's monitoring procedures deserve more attention.

52. In GEF-6, targets for the Minamata Convention, Stockholm Convention and Montreal Protocol were set and tracked. In GEF-7, the strengthened results framework forms the backbone of the programming strategy. These two actions are expected to address data collection and analysis needs from GEF-6 and beyond.

GEF CORPORATE SCORECARD

53. In GEF-6, several corporate indicators were set to monitor the progress of implementation of the GEF-6 programming strategy. The GEF Secretariat presented the final GEF-6 Corporate Scorecards at the 54th GEF Council, held in June 2018, including the results of chemicals and wastes focal area in: (i) contribution to the generation of global environment benefits; and (ii) cumulative summary of GEF-6 utilization of funds against the programming targets.¹⁵

54. The Corporate Scorecard presented at the 54th Council showed that the GEF-6 projects approved contributed 638 tons (64 percent) of the GEF-6 corporate target of 1,000 tons for

¹⁴ GEF IEO, 2017, [Chemicals and Waste \(CW\) Focal Area Study 2017](#).

¹⁵ GEF, 2018, [GEF-6 Corporate Score Card](#), Council Document, GEF/C.54/Inf.03.

mercury reduction. It also showed that the GEF had programmed 101 percent of the targeted mercury resources for GEF-6. The programming for the Minamata Convention takes into consideration the impact of the shortfall due to the exchange rate, and reflects significant resources programmed prior and up to that time.

55. The lower-than anticipated mercury reduction figure for GEF-6 was in part influenced by the large number of enabling activities without direct mercury reduction supported during the GEF-6 period. The GEF provided such support in response to a request made by the Sixth session of the intergovernmental negotiating committee on mercury (INC6) to consider enabling activities as well as expanded eligibility including non-signatories that are taking bona fide steps to ratify the Convention to access enabling activities resources from the GEF.¹⁶ The INC6 request was made in November 2014, after the indicative resource allocation and mercury reduction corporate target were agreed during the GEF-6 replenishment negotiations.

56. These enabling activities, as well as capacity building, are foundational activities to enable countries to identify needed actions and plans for future significant mercury reductions. Also, such support is likely to have had positive effects on non-signatories to continue to take steps to ratify the Convention.

Part III: Seventh Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund

57. Negotiations for the seventh replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund (GEF-7) were successfully concluded on April 25, 2018 in Stockholm, Sweden when 28 countries pledged a total of \$4,065 million towards programming during the GEF-7 period (July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2022). The 28 countries are: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovenia, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, and the United States of America.

58. The GEF Council endorsed the outcomes of the replenishment process at its 54th meeting, including the Programming Directions, Policy Recommendations, and Replenishment Resolution.¹⁷

59. The Participants allocated a total of \$599 million to the chemicals and waste focal area, representing some 15 percent of the total GEF-7 resource envelope, of which \$206 million is indicatively allocated to mercury. The GEF-7 notional allocation for mercury is a significant increase from the GEF-6 figure of \$141 million.

60. GEF-7 seeks to phase out, reduce, and where possible eliminate mercury in priority sectors of the Convention. Funding for mercury is included in the four GEF-7 chemicals and waste

¹⁶ UNEP, 2015, Report of the intergovernmental negotiating committee to prepare a global legally binding instrument on mercury on the work of its sixth session, UNEP(DTIE)/Hg/INC.6/24 Annex III.

¹⁷ GEF, 2018, [Summary of the Negotiations of the Seventh Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund](#), Council Document GEF/C.54/19/Rev.02.

programming lines and includes support for enabling activities, reduction of mercury emissions and releases from sectors specified by the Minamata Convention, as well as phase out and elimination of mercury in products and processes that are included in the Minamata Convention. Detailed areas that may receive funding can be found in the summary of negotiations of the Seventh Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund.¹⁸

61. In addition, the GEF-7 Impact Programs on (i) Food, Land-Use and Restoration, (ii) Sustainable Cities, and (iii) Sustainable Forest Management for Major Biomes are expected to deliver global environmental benefits for Chemicals and Waste including mercury.

¹⁸ GEF, 2018, [Report On The Seventh Replenishment Of The GEF Trust Fund](#), Council Document, GEF/A.6/05/Rev.01.

Annex 1: Projects Approved in the Reporting Period (July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018)

GEF grant includes the GEF project grant allocated to mercury components only, excluding associated fees and project preparation grant.

Table 6: List of Projects Approved during the Reporting Period

Country	Country List	Title	Type	Agency	GEF Grant (\$)	Co-Financing (\$)
Argentina		Minamata Initial Assessment for Argentina	EA	UNDP	200,000	
Belize		Development of Minamata Initial Assessments (MIA) in the Caribbean (Belize)	EA	UNEP	150,000	
Guyana		Strengthening the Enabling Framework for Biodiversity Mainstreaming and Mercury Reduction in Small and Medium-scale Gold Mining Operations	FP	UNDP	892,759	29,662,745
Kyrgyz Republic		Development of Minamata Initial Assessment and Updating of National Action Plan for Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining	EA	UNEP	700,000	
Marshall Islands		Development of A Minamata Initial Assessment in Marshall Islands	EA	UNEP	125,000	
Micronesia		Development of a Minamata Initial Assessment in the Federated States of Micronesia	EA	UNEP	125,000	
Niue		Development of A Minamata Initial Assessment in Niue	EA	UNEP	125,000	
Regional	Antigua And	Development of Minamata Initial Assessments (MIA) in the	EA	UNEP	600,000	

Country	Country List	Title	Type	Agency	GEF Grant (\$)	Co-Financing (\$)
	Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St. Vincent and Grenadines	Caribbean (Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St. Vincent and the Grenadines)				
Regional	Burkina Faso, Benin, Mali, Niger, Senegal, Togo	Impact Investment and Capacity Building in Support of Sustainable Waste Management to Reduce Emissions of Unintentional POPs (UPOPs) and Mercury in West Africa	FP	BOAD	5,331,333	77,000,000
Total					8,249,092	99,253,626

Annex 2: List of GEF-6 Mercury Projects (July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018)

GEF grant includes the GEF project grant allocated to mercury components only, excluding associated fees and project preparation grant.

ENABLING ACTIVITY PROJECTS

Table 7: List of Enabling Activities Funded in GEF-6

Country	Country List	Title	Type	Agency	Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
Albania		Minamata Initial Assessment for Albania	MIA	UNDP	200,000	
Argentina		Minamata Initial Assessment for Argentina	MIA	UNDP	200,000	
Azerbaijan		Strengthen national decision making towards ratification of the Minamata Convention and build capacity towards implementation of future provisions	MIA	UNDP	200,000	
Belarus		Development of a Minamata Initial Assessment	MIA	UNEP	200,000	
Belize		Development of Minamata Initial Assessments (MIA) in the Caribbean (Belize)	MIA	UNEP	150,000	
Bosnia-Herzegovina		Strengthen Bosnia and Herzegovina Decision-making Towards Becoming a Party to the Minamata Convention and Build Capacity Towards Implementation of Future Provisions	MIA	UNDP	200,000	
Burkina Faso		National Action Plan on Mercury in the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining Sector in Burkina Faso	NAP	UNIDO	500,000	216,000

Country	Country List	Title	Type	Agency	Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
Cameroon		Development of Minamata Initial Assessment in Cameroon	MIA	UNEP	200,000	
Chad		Minamata Convention Initial Assessment in Chad	MIA	UNIDO	200,000	78,600
Colombia		Minamata Convention Initial Assessment (MIA) in the Republic of Colombia	MIA	UNIDO	200,000	8,000
Congo DR		Development of Minamata Initial Assessment and National Action Plan for Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining in Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)	MIA, NAP	UNEP	1,000,000	
Djibouti		Development of a Minamata Initial Assessment in Djibouti	MIA	UNEP	200,000	
Ecuador		National Action Plan on Mercury in the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining Sector in Ecuador	NAP	UNIDO	500,000	81,000
El Salvador		Development of a Minamata Initial Assessment in El Salvador	MIA	UNEP	200,000	
Eritrea		Development of Minamata Initial Assessment and National Action Plan for Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining in Eritrea	MIA, NAP	UNEP	700,000	
Gabon		National Action Plan on Mercury in the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining sector in Gabon	NAP	UNIDO	500,000	161,000
Ghana		Development of Minamata Convention Initial Assessment (MIA) for Ghana	MIA	UNDP	200,000	

Country	Country List	Title	Type	Agency	Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
Ghana		National Action Plan on Mercury in the Artisanal and Small-scale Gold Mining Sector in Ghana	NAP	UNIDO	500,000	55,250
Global	Bangladesh, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania, Mozambique, Samoa	Strengthen national decision making towards ratification of the Minamata Convention and build capacity towards implementation of future provisions	MIA	UNDP	1,000,000	
Guatemala		Minamata Convention: Initial Assessment in Guatemala	MIA	UNIDO	200,000	78,600
Guyana		Minamata Initial Assessment for Guyana	MIA	UNDP	200,000	
Honduras		Development of Minamata Initial Assessment and National Action Plan for Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining in Honduras	MIA, NAP	UNEP	700,000	
India		Improve Mercury Management in India	MIA	UNDP	1,000,000	
Indonesia		Development of Minamata Initial Assessment and National Action Plan for Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining in Indonesia	MIA, NAP	UNEP	700,000	
Iraq		Develop the National Implementation Plan for the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and the Minamata Initial Assessment for the Minamata Convention on Mercury in Iraq	MIA	UNEP	200,000	

Country	Country List	Title	Type	Agency	Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
Jordan		Strengthen national decision making towards ratification of the Minamata Convention and build capacity towards implementation of future provisions	MIA	UNDP	200,000	
Kazakhstan		Minamata Initial Assessment	MIA	UNDP	400,000	
Kenya		Development of a Minamata Initial Assessment	MIA	Direct access	200,000	
Kyrgyz Republic		Development of Minamata Initial Assessment and Updating of National Action Plan for Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining	MIA, NAP	UNEP	700,000	
Lao PDR		Development of Minamata Initial Assessment and Updating of National Action Plan for Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining	MIA, NAP	UNEP	700,000	
Macedonia		Development of a Minamata Initial Assessment	MIA	UNEP	200,000	
Madagascar		Development of National Action Plan for Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining in Madagascar	NAP	UNEP	500,000	
Malaysia		Minamata Convention Initial Assessment in Malaysia	MIA	UNDP	250,000	250,000
Maldives		Development of a Minamata Initial Assessment in Maldives	MIA	UNEP	200,000	
Marshall Islands		Development of A Minamata Initial Assessment in Marshall Islands	MIA	UNEP	125,000	
Micronesia		Development of a Minamata Initial Assessment in the Federated States of Micronesia	MIA	UNEP	125,000	

Country	Country List	Title	Type	Agency	Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
Mongolia		Development of National Action Plan for Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining	NAP	UNEP	500,000	
Mongolia		Advanced Minamata Initial Assessment in Mongolia	MIA	UNIDO	200,000	18,600
Montenegro		Minamata Initial Assessment for Montenegro	MIA	UNDP	200,000	20,000
Morocco		Strengthen the National Decision-Making Mechanism to Ratify the Minamata Convention and Strengthen National Capacities for the Implementation of its Futures Provisions	MIA	UNDP	200,000	
Mozambique		National Action Plan on Mercury in the Mozambican Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining sector	NAP	UNIDO	500,000	84,000
Myanmar		Development of Minamata Initial Assessment and National Action Plan for Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining in Myanmar	MIA, NAP	UNEP	700,000	
Nepal		Minamata Initial Assessment in Nepal	MIA	UNIDO	200,000	108,600
Nigeria		National Action Plan on Mercury in the Nigerian Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining sector	NAP	UNIDO	500,000	373,000
Niue		Development of A Minamata Initial Assessment in Niue	MIA	UNEP	125,000	
Panama		Minamata Initial Assessment for Panama	MIA	UNDP	200,000	

Country	Country List	Title	Type	Agency	Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
Papua New Guinea		Development of Minamata Initial Assessment in Papua New Guinea	MIA	UNEP	300,000	
Paraguay		Development of National Action Plans for Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining in Paraguay	NAP	UNEP	500,000	
Peru		National Action Plan on Mercury in the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining Sector in Peru	NAP	UNIDO	500,000	217,000
Regional	Angola, Malawi, Zimbabwe	Development of Minamata Convention on Mercury Initial Assessment in Africa	MIA	UNEP	547,945	505,000
Regional	Antigua And Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St. Vincent and Grenadines	Development of Minamata Initial Assessments (MIA) in the Caribbean (Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St. Vincent and the Grenadines)	MIA	UNEP	600,000	
Regional	Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia, Swaziland	Development of Minamata Initial Assessment	MIA	UNEP	800,000	61,000
Regional	Burkina Faso, Benin, Niger, Togo	Minamata Convention Initial Assessment in Francophone Africa II	MIA	UNIDO	800,000	134,400
Regional	Burundi, Central African Republic, Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Gabon	Development of Minamata Convention Mercury Initial Assessment in Africa	MIA	UNEP	1,000,000	60,000

Country	Country List	Title	Type	Agency	Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
Regional	Burundi, Central African Republic, Congo, Kenya, Swaziland, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe	Regional Project on the Development of National Action Plans for the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining in Africa	NAP	UNEP	4,000,000	50,000
Regional	Cabo Verde, Sao Tome and Principe	Minamata Convention: Initial Assessment in Cabo Verde and Sao Tome and Principe	MIA	UNIDO	400,000	187,200
Regional	Cook Islands, Kiribati, Palau, Tonga, Vanuatu	Development of Minamata Convention Mercury Initial Assessment in Pacific	MIA	UNEP	500,000	20,000
Regional	Guinea, Mali, Senegal	Minamata Convention Initial Assessment in Francophone Africa I	MIA	UNIDO	600,000	175,800
Regional	Guinea, Niger	Development of National Action Plan for Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining in Guinea and Niger	NAP	UNEP	1,000,000	
Regional	Jamaica, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago	Development of Minamata Initial Assessment in the Caribbean (Trinidad and Tobago, Jamaica, St Kitts and Nevis, St Lucia)	MIA	UNEP	600,000	
Regional	Mali, Senegal	Development of National Action Plan for Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining Mali and Senegal	NAP	UNEP	1,000,000	
Serbia		Minamata Initial Assessment	MIA	UNDP	200,000	97,220

Country	Country List	Title	Type	Agency	Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
Seychelles		Strengthen National Decision Making Towards Ratification of the Minamata Convention and Build Capacity Towards Implementation of Future Provisions.	MIA	UNDP	199,100	25,000
Sierra Leone		Development of Minamata Initial Assessment and National Action Plan for Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining in Sierra Leone	MIA, NAP	UNEP	700,000	
South Africa		Development of Minamata Initial Assessment in South Africa	MIA	UNEP	1,000,000	
Sri Lanka		Minamata Convention: Initial Assessment in Sri Lanka	MIA	UNIDO	200,000	38,600
Sudan		Minamata Convention: Initial assessment in the Republic of Sudan	MIA	UNIDO	200,000	118,600
Suriname		Minamata Initial Assessment for Suriname	MIA	UNDP	200,000	
Suriname		Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining (ASGM) National Action Plan (NAP) for Suriname	NAP	UNDP	500,000	
Tanzania		Development of National Action Plans for Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining in the United Republic of Tanzania	NAP	UNEP	500,000	
Turkey		Minamata Convention: Initial Assessment in Turkey	MIA	UNIDO	500,000	29,000
TOTAL					34,322,045	3,251,470

PROGRAMS

Table 8: Single Focal Area Programs

Agency	Country	Title	GEF Grant (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
UNEP, UNDP, UNIDO, CI	Global (Burkina Faso, Colombia, Guyana, Indonesia, Kenya, Mongolia, Peru, Philippines)	Global Opportunities for Long-term Development of ASGM Sector - GEF GOLD	45,262,294	135,174,956
World Bank	Regional (Ghana, Kenya, Senegal, Tanzania, Zambia)	EHPMP - Environmental Health and Pollution Management Program in Africa	13,486,239	98,600,000
TOTAL			58,748,533	233,774,956

Table 9: Multi Focal Area Programs

Agency	Country	Title	GEF Grant (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
UNEP	Regional (Albania, Bosnia- Herzegovina, Egypt, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Montenegro, Tunisia)	Mediterranean Sea Programme (MedProgramme): Enhancing Environmental Security	5,250,000	20,500,000

FULL-SIZED PROJECTS

Table 10: Single Focal Area Full-Sized Projects

Agency	Country	Title	GEF Grant (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
UNIDO	China	Demonstration of Mercury Reduction and Minimization in the Production of Vinyl Chloride Monomer	16,200,000	99,000,000
World Bank	China	Capacity Strengthening for Implementation of Minamata Convention on Mercury	8,000,000	8,000,000
UNDP	Colombia	Reducing UPOPs and Mercury Releases from Healthcare Waste Management, e- Waste Treatment, Scrap Processing and Biomass Burning	686,000	1,000,000

Agency	Country	Title	GEF Grant (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
UNDP	Ecuador	National Program for the Environmental Sound Management and Live Cycle Management of Chemical Substances	3,795,000	15,131,702
BOAD	Regional (Burkina Faso, Benin, Mali, Niger, Senegal, Togo)	Impact Investment and Capacity Building in Support of Sustainable Waste Management to Reduce Emissions of Unintentional POPs (UPOPs) and Mercury in West Africa	5,331,334	77,000,000
TOTAL			34,012,334	200,131,702

Table 11: Multi Focal Area Full-Sized Projects

Agency	Country	Title	GEF Grant (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
UNDP	Guyana	Strengthening the Enabling Framework for Biodiversity Mainstreaming and Mercury Reduction in Small and Medium-scale Gold Mining Operations	892,759	29,662,745

MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS

Table 12: Medium-Sized Projects

Agency	Country	Title	GEF Grant (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
UNIDO	Tunisia	Improve Mercury Management in Tunisia	600,000	2,350,000
UNDP	Vietnam	Application of Green Chemistry in Vietnam to Support Green Growth and Reduction in the use and Release of POPs/harmful Chemicals	469,800	1,000,000
TOTAL			1,069,800	3,350,000

Annex 3: List of Mercury Projects Supported by Small Grants Programme in GEF-6

Table 13: Small Grants Projects

No	Country	Grantee Name	Project Title	Duration	SGP Grant (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
1	Belarus	International Public Organization “Ecoproject “Partnership”	Towards increased capacities of environmental NGOs in Belarus to participate in waste management policy formulation and enforcement	3/2014-4/2016	48,950	4,895
2	China	Shanghai Zhonggu Charity Youth Development Center	Recycling and Environmentally Sound Disposal of Used Computers	10/2014-10/2016	50,000	151,448
3	Ghana	HATOF Foundation	Capacities of civil society to contribute to the implementation of multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs)	11/2016-3/2018	21,800	24,600
4	Ghana	Green Waterhut	Promoting mercury management among artisanal miners and processing of plastic waste into fuel in Wakawaka, Jama, and Banda Nkwanta, within the Black Volta Basin	11/2016-7/2018	23,500	24,000
5	Ghana	Green Waterhut	Development of baseline data and strategic document for the economic, ecological and social transformation of the Black Volta Basin	9/2015-12/2015	25,000	27,000
6	Global	European Environment Bureau Zero Mercury Working Group	Implementing the Minamata Convention: building NGO coalitions to reduce mercury use, release and exposure	1/2018-12/2019	150,000	150,023
7	Guyana	Global Youth Movement - Guyana	Community Environment, Health and Recycling Project	2/2014-6/2015	50,000	65,908
8	Malaysia	Persatuan Kesedaran Dan Pendidikan 3r Kuala Lumpur	Awareness campaign on sustainable waste management as opposed to incinerator	10/2014-5/2015	2,000	

No	Country	Grantee Name	Project Title	Duration	SGP Grant (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
9	Malaysia	Pertubuhan Gerakan Belia Bersatu Malaysia Caw. Pulau Pangkor	Chemical pollutants from solid waste landfill area and its minimization by engaging the local community in 3r (reduce, reuse and recycle) program	10/2014-2/2015	2,000	
10	Malaysia	The Electrical and Electronics Association of Malaysia	Knowledge enhancement of the community through capacity building for the protection of the environment and community health for mercury containing products in the lighting industry in Malaysia	5/2014-7/2015	30,000	12,500
11	Nepal	Women Environment Preservation Committee	E-waste Management, Mass Media Campaign and Electrification from Biogas	4/2014-5/2015	45,000	23,430
12	St Vincent and Grenadines	Constructive Solutions Inc.	Developing Good Environmental Practices for Managing and Disposal of Hazardous Materials found in E-Waste across St. Vincent & the Grenadines	7/2015-6/2016	40,239	73,039
13	Suriname	The Back Lot	Mercury Public Awareness Programme	8/2014-8/2015	50,000	49,496
14	Ukraine	NGO Vavilon	Implementation of mechanism for collection and recycling of used mercury lamps in retail chains	5/2016-11/2016	45,255	30,840
15	Ukraine	NGO "Center for ecology-concerned parents "Dhzerela radosti"	Organization of collection and recycling points for mercury containing lighting products	5/2016-11/2016	45,530	31,540
16	Ukraine	NGO "Green Sail"	Organization of collection points for energy efficient lighting products containing mercury and development of the mechanism for its utilization	6/2016-11/2016	45,585	21,075