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| **Brief project description:**  In January 2013, a UN agreement was reached for the establishment of a globally legally binding Convention on Mercury “*The Minamata Convention on Mercury*”. The Convention was adopted and opened for signature on 10 October 2013, at a Conference of Plenipotentiaries (Diplomatic Conference) in Kumamoto, Japan. To date 128 countries have signed the Convention, while 10 countries have ratified it. The government of Suriname although not in the position to sign the Minamata convention at the time of it being available for signature has stated that it does fully support the objective of the convention to protect human health and the environment from anthropogenic emissions and release of Mercury. The Convention will enter into force 90 days after it has been ratified by 50 nations. The Minamata Convention is a global treaty to protect human health and the environment from the adverse effects of mercury. The major highlights of the Minamata Convention on Mercury include a ban on new mercury mines, the phase-out of existing ones, control measures on air emissions, and the international regulation of the informal sector for artisanal and small-scale gold mining. To facilitate the early entry into force of the Convention, a Mercury Initial Assessment (MIA) will provide a basis for any further work towards ratification and implementation. As such the development of a country’s MIA will assist a country in taking its decision to ratify and notify the convention in accordance with article 7; to develop its National Implementation Plan in accordance with Article 20; and to prepare a national plan to reduce emissions of mercury in accordance with Article 8. Therefore, the Project’s objective is for the Government of Suriname to undertake a Mercury Initial Assessment (MIA) to establish a national foundation to undertake future work towards the implementation of the Convention. The project’s expected outcomes will be a description of the following: (a) National Mercury profile, including significant sources of emissions and releases, as well as inventories of mercury and mercury compounds; (b) Structures, institutions, legislation already available to implement the Convention; (c) Barriers that would hinder or prevent implementation; and, (d) Technical and financial needs for implementation of the Convention, including resources from the GEF, national sources, bilateral sources, the private sector and others. | | |
| **Signatures** | | |
| **Signature:** | **Agreed by Government** | **30/August/2016:** |
| **Signature:**  **Mr. Cedric Nelom** | **Agreed by Implementing Partner** **NIMOS** | **30/August/2016:** |
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# Development Challenge

1. Mercury is a global pollutant. Like persistent organic pollutants (POPs), mercury remains in the environment where it circulates among air, water, sediments, soil, and biota in various forms. Atmospheric mercury can be transported long distances, taken up by microorganisms and concentrated up the food chain. Mercury can cause serious damage to ecosystems.

2. The three most common forms of mercury (elemental, inorganic and methyl mercury) are all detrimental to human health and especially dangerous for fetuses and young children because of their toxicity to the nervous systems (brain and spinal cord). Exposure to elemental mercury, mercury in food, and mercury vapors poses significant health risks including kidney, heart and respiratory problems, tremors, skin rashes, vision or hearing problems, headaches, weakness, memory problems, and emotional changes.

3. In order to address the challenges posed by mercury on a global scale, in 2009 the decision was taken to start UN negotiations for a global, legally-binding treaty to prevent emissions and releases of mercury. The UN negotiations were concluded in January 2013 with 147 governments agreeing to the draft convention text for the Minamata Convention on Mercury.

4. The Convention was adopted and opened for signature on 10 October 2013, at a Conference of Plenipotentiaries (Diplomatic Conference) in Kumamoto, Japan. The Minamata Convention on Mercury - named after a city in Japan where serious health damage occurred as a result of mercury pollution in the mid-20th Century - will aim to reduce mercury emissions from all sources, including gold mining, dental practices, chlor-alkali plants, coal combustion, medical uses as well as waste management, storage, fate and transport in the atmosphere and other related issues.

5. Eighty six (86) countries and the European Union signed the Minamata Convention on the first day it was open. A further five countries signed the Convention on the final day of the Diplomatic Conference, 11 October 2013. To date 128 countries have signed the Convention[[1]](#footnote-1). On November 6, 2013 the United States of America was the first country to ratify the Minamata Convention, as such it became the first party to the Convention.

6. The Convention will enter into force 90 days after it has been ratified by 50 nations. It is expected that the Convention will come into force within the next 3 – 5 years, most likely before the end of the GEF-6 funding cycle.

7. In this sense, although Suriname hasn´t signed the Minamata Convention, the country is taking meaningful steps towards becoming a party to the Convention, considering is experience and commitment to the other 30 multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) of which Suriname is part of. Currently, Suriname is undertaking a series of national consultations and developing a policy roadmap that will support the national Government in the accession process, and it is actively following the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee on Mercury.

1. Currently, Suriname lacks an integrated framework on environmental legislation. The existence of challenges on the mercury-related issues in the country is acknowledged, but a deeper analysis must be undertaken to understand the degree of emissions, releases and their impacts, as well as alternatives that can meet Suriname´s needs.
2. Moreover, mining is an important sector of Suriname's economy and has grown significantly over the last decade (especially gold mining), contributing an estimated 1.62 billion USD in 2012 versus 34 million USD in 2000. In 2011, small-scale gold mining was believed to provide 20,000 direct jobs as well as a significant number of indirect jobs in subsidiary services. Small-to-medium scale gold mining is mostly illegal in nature. The small-to-medium scale gold mining sector uses mercury to bind the gold for easy handling. This so called “gold-mercury amalgam” is burned in the open to separate the mercury from the gold. This gold is then sold to official gold buyers and the numerous jewelry shops in town where it is further purified, frequently with the use of mercury. There are public health concerns on the mercury emissions from this sector and a few initiatives have been taken to address these concerns.
3. For example, prior to making a decision on whether or not to ratify the Minamata Convention, in 2014 the Government of Suriname, through the NIMOS, conducted a preliminary assessment of the impacts of the Convention related to the current policy and institutional framework, as well as technical and human capacity in the country. Through a participative approach, relevant stakeholders were divided into two groups, namely “mercury-regulating institutions” and “mercury users/handlers”, which were identified to be involved. Most of the 80 identified stakeholders indicated that the use of mercury has to be banned in a phased manner in Suriname and that the Government of Suriname should ratify the Minamata Convention in line with the national priorities and needs.
4. Furthermore, the Government is seeking out ways in updating and/or creating the legal and institutional framework to regulate the sector and the devastating environmental impacts cited in several studies. These studies, which have been carried out over the past years on mercury releases, contamination, freshwater quality and human health in the hinterland, provide data on ecological and health impacts. In this sense, undertaking an Assessment on the currently situation of Mercury-related issues (including top-down inventories) in the country is essential to guide the decision-making process, as well as to assure that the best information is made available to the stakeholders involved in the accession process to the Minamata Convention.
5. Finally, there are no mandatory environmental and social impact assessments (ESIAs) for mines - only voluntary general guidelines for ESIAs and guidelines for the mining sector. To date only large scale gold mining companies have conducted ESIAs voluntarily, but these companies are mining without the use of mercury, however, mercury can still be released in the production process. No legislation/regulation exists in relation to emission standards in the mining industry either. It is anticipated that the existing Mining Act needs to be updated as it dates back to the Mining Decree E-58 of 1986.
6. This proposed MIA Enabling Activity should enable Suriname to assess the current situation pertaining to the management of Mercury and to carry out a detailed assessment of the impacts of the Minamata Convention.

# Strategy

1. The project framework, including envisaged activities, are entirely in line with the GEF Initial Guidelines for Enabling Activities for the Minamata Convention on Mercury (GEF/C.45/Inf.05).
2. *Project Objective:* the project’s objective is to undertake a Mercury Initial Assessment to enable the Government to determine the national requirements and needs for the ratification of the Minamata Convention and establish a sound foundation to undertake future work towards the implementation of the Convention.
3. *Project Goals*: the project will achieve its objective by reaching 4 goals as specified in the GEF guidelines (GEF/C.45/Inf.05 paragraph 19), as well as a fifth goal on mainstreaming, as follows:

Goal 1 - Undertake an assessment of legislation and policies in regard to the implementation of Convention provisions of Article 3; Article 5; Article 7 (including legislation and policy to cover formalization, worker health and safety); Article 8 (specifically in regard to relevant national air pollution/emission standards and regulations); Article 9 (specifically in regard to the ability to identify and categorize sources of releases). The policy and legislative assessment will be undertaken through a review of existing legislation on chemicals management and identification of the gaps prevalent in association to issues of mercury. In addition the legislation review will assess the necessary steps for the establishment of a National Mercury Coordination/Consultation Mechanism.

Goal 2 - Undertake an initial assessment of Mercury in the following categories:

• Stocks of mercury and/or mercury compounds and import and export procedures including an assessment of the storage conditions;

• Supply of mercury, including sources, recycling activities and quantities;

• Sectors that use mercury and the amount per year, including manufacturing processes, ASGM and mercury added products;

• Trade in mercury and mercury containing compounds

Goal 3 - Identify:

• Emission sources of mercury;

• Release sources of mercury to land and water.

Goal 4 - Identify key stakeholders involved in the project, and also that are either directly influenced or play an important role in managing the obligations of the conventions: Assessing institutional and capacity needs to implement the Convention.

Goal 5 - Determine the coordination and decision making systems needed to mainstream the national priorities on mercury in national plans and policies: The institutional capacity gaps identified and the findings of the legislation and policy review will be used to formulate a number of priority actions, which will be included in the Mercury Initial Assessment Report. Proposed actions will be discussed and agreed upon among the key stakeholders mentioned above, through several rounds of discussions.

# Results and Partnerships

18. The project will be implemented through National Implementation Modality (NIM) with the NIMOS as the execution agency. The NIMOS coordinates the implementation of the work on the Environment (including Chemical Management), through the established Inter Ministerial Advisory Committee (IMAC), which includes relevant ministry bodies and representatives of civil society and private sector. The proposed EA project has been organized into three components with their outcomes, as follows:

**Component 1. Enabling environment for decision-making on the ratification of Minamata**.

Outcome 1.1. Establishing a national decision making structure on Mercury: Making use of current and future mechanisms, such as the IMAC, UNDAF Programme Coordination Group (PCG) a national decision-making structure on Mercury (“Mercury Coordination/Consultation Mechanism -MCM”) will be established in line with national capacities and existing structures and practices present in the project countries and where feasible will build/expand on similar structures established in support of other chemicals-related MEAs. The assessment discussed below will create the right set up for a coordinating and decision-making body.

Outcome 1.2. Conducting an assessment of the policy and regulatory framework and institutional capacity needs in regard to the implementation of the Convention’s provisions: The work will begin with a review of the structures, institutions and policies and regulations already in place and will analyze the Barriers that would hinder or prevent implementation of the Convention will be identified. Upon the identification of capacity/regulatory gaps, and considering the barriers (in relation to the Convention´s obligations), these will be discussed and reviewed by the “MCM”. The results of these discussions will set the course of work under component 2 of this proposal, in particular to the development of the MIA Report.

Outcome 1.3 Raising awareness on the environmental and health impacts of Mercury: Targeted information awareness activities will be supported on the risks of Mercury and mercury-associated impact on human health and the environment. Awareness raising with target decision makers, the general public and population groups at risk. A stakeholder mapping exercise will be performed to discuss the different profiles, relationships, concerns and expectations that need to be addressed in the awareness raising program. This will help determining the type and content of the mercury awareness programs that considers governmental policy objectives under the Minamata Convention.

Outcome 1.4 Mainstreaming Hg priorities into national policies/plans: the mainstreaming exercise will be led and supported by the interim ministerial coordination committee with the objective to include mercury priorities into national policies and development plans. The mainstreaming exercise will also include a socio-economic study on the effects of mercury and alternatives in ASGM and the relevant sectors that were identified in the inventory, which can help inform priority setting for this sector and support decision making to facilitate the mainstreaming of selected priorities.

**Component 2. Development of the National Mercury Profile and Mercury Initial Assessment Report.**

Outcome 2.1 Building national capacity to under the Mercury Inventory: National capacity to undertake the Mercury Inventory will be built through training, which will be conducted and facilitated by the project’s international technical advisor. Training will be provided on data collection methodologies, reliability, credibility, data analysis, etc. Training will be targeted towards a group of national technical experts who will conduct and develop the National Mercury Profile. Training will also be targeted towards key government representatives who make up the MCM and who need sufficient knowledge about conducting a Mercury Inventory to be able to review it and comment on it.

Outcome 2.2 Conducting the Mercury Inventory and prepare the National Mercury Profile: The inventory will make use of the UNEP "Toolkit for identification and quantification of mercury releases" , which is intended to assist countries to develop a national mercury releases inventory. It provides a standardized methodology and accompanying database enabling the development of consistent national and regional mercury inventories. Throughout the data collection, analysis and preparation of the Mercury Inventory, the national expert team will be guided by an international technical advisor. After completion of the data gathering stage, a National Mercury Profile, including significant sources of emissions and releases, as well as inventories of mercury and mercury compounds, will be prepared for review, approval and adoption during a national stakeholder workshop.

Outcome 2.3. Preparing the National MIA Report: Following the finalization of the project activities as envisaged under component 1 (1.1 – 1.4) as well as completion of the project activities 2.1 and 2.2 (see above), the national project team will prepare a National MIA Report. Expert teams will draft proposals for actions to be included in the Mercury Initial Assessment Report on how to address the pertinent gaps and barriers. These proposals will also include an overview of the costs to the Government in meeting its obligations under*.*

**Component 3. Monitoring and Evaluation**

Outcome 3.1. Project monitoring and evaluation implemented: M&E and adaptive project management are applied to provide feedback to the project coordination process and Terminal Evaluation report formulated. As part of adaptive project management, whereby the focus is on realization of strategic project outputs/results per indicators as defined within the Theory of Change, given the context. Lessons learnt and best practices will be disseminated through awareness, information and knowledge sharing programs to identified target groups and through various mechanism. Among the mechanisms to be used will be inter-Agency MoUs, National platforms and knowledge sharing networks.

19. Following key partners will provide inputs to the process of developing the MIA:

* Ministry of Natural Resources: the Ministry of Natural Resources, its Geological Mining Division (GMD) has the responsibility for the sound management and use of natural resources that also issues ASGM mining licenses.
* Office of the President: The presidential Commission to Regulate the Gold Sector; was established by the government in 2010. OGS is leading the reform effort to develop sustainable and environmentally responsible gold mining practices and transform informal small-scale gold mining into a viable sub-sector of the mining and national economy of Suriname and The office for the coordination of Environment (National environmental and Climate Change policy).
* Ministry of Finance (MinFIN): Responsible for obtaining and allocating resources necessary for state institutions, in accordance with the priorities of the public policy. Especially in the area of customs, it is related to establish regulation, controls, monitoring of all imports and exports of different products.
* Ministry of Health (MV): The Ministry of Health is responsible for the development and implementation of health policies and assumes responsibilities related to monitoring, control, regulation and standardization. In addition, the Ministry of Health registers medical devices and monitors companies that import, manufacture, distribute and / or store medical equipment and devices.
* Ministry of Trade & Industry (MinHI): responsible to regulate the local and international trade/business. In this respect, the MinHI issues permits to import and export merchandise, among others, mercury, as well permits to establish gold and silver smiths. Based on the Decree Negative List, it regulates import and export of goods.
* Ministry of Justice & Police: responsible for tracking illegally obtained mercury in case this goes out of sight of Customs.
* The Foreign Currency Committee: issues the permits to export gold.
* Indigenous and Maroon tribes: There are several indigenous and maroon tribes living in the interior of Suriname - including Trio, Wayana, Arowak, Caraib, Saramaccan, Aucaan, Matuarier, Paramacca, Kwinti and Aluku People – that are dependent on natural resources contaminated with Mercury, for their livelihoods.
* Private Sector: The jewelry sector purchases gold from ASGM miners and purifies those in their furnaces, thereby emitting methyl-mercury. Some of the ASGM groups are organized in foundations and associations and are important stakeholders to be reached out, however, the majority of miners are not organized.
* Research Institutes: The Anton de Kom University of Suriname, through its institutes such as the NZC (Nationale Zoologische Collectie), the CMO (Centrum voor Milieu Onderzoek) and the CELOS (Centrum voor Landbouwkundig Onderzoek in Suriname) have conducted research and projects on the fate of mercury.

**Mainstreaming Gender**

20. Generally, two groups are more sensitive to the effects of mercury. Fetuses and people who are regularly exposed (chronic exposure) to high levels of mercury (such as populations that rely on subsistence fishing or people who are occupationally exposed). As Mercury is passed on from mother to child, and fetuses and children are most susceptible to developmental effects due to mercury.

21. The MIA will pay particular attention to assessing national capacity to keep such risk groups safe. Recommendations on how to improve gender dimensions and gender mainstreaming related to Mercury, and priorities actions in this area will be highlighted in the MIA report

# Feasibility

Cost efficiency and effectiveness*:* The cost-effectiveness of the project will be assured through the management of the project with synergies from other POPs- and chemicals-related projects in Suriname. The project will involve national experts as much as possible to facilitate the collection of accurate information and to establish a high-responsiveness of the project to keep a steady momentum in project implementation with an international technical advisor providing succinct, specific input where local expertise gaps exist. Information dissemination with the general public and specific local communities will be more effective through integrating the work through existing activities

Risk Management*:*

Table 1. Project Risks Assessment and Mitigation Measures

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project risks** | | | | | |
| **Description** | **Type** | **Impact &**  **Probability** | **Mitigation Measures** | **Owner** | **Status** |
| **Administrative** | **Administrative** | Slow hiring processes (consultants, consultancy services, etc.) due to Government processes. | UNDP CO support will improve outreach to potential consultants and consultancy firms, as well as speed up recruitment and procurement processes | UNDP CO | No change |
| **Coordination** | **Coordination** | Poor coordination between key government Agencies and Ministries, as well as other stakeholders. | The project will establish a consultation group/ process in order to account for the institutions and assure proper coordination. | NIMOS | No change |
| **Technical** | **Technical** | Insufficient awareness, technical knowledge, data availability, etc. available to undertake the MIA | Project will start with the training of consultants and stakeholders on the methodology to be used to carry out the MIA. Secondly the project will carry out a number of awareness raising activities and ensure consultations among key stakeholders to facilitate obtaining data. | Project Team | Reducing |
| **Project Team** | **Project Team** | Difficulties in recruitment of a Project Manager with the necessary qualifications for the amount allocated in the Budget | A Project Manager may be shared between two or more chemicals related projects so that his/her time can be shared among projects. | UNDP CO | No Change |

Social and environmental safeguards*:* This project is an initial assessment, where most of its activities involves desk research, surveys and consultation, so social and environmental risks are not associated with its implementation.

*.*

# Project Results Framework

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Intended Outcome as stated in the UNDAF/Country Programme Results and Resources Framework:** *By 2016, government formulates and implements harmonized, equity focused, and gender sensitive MDG-oriented key legislation, policies, and budgets in accordance with the government’s commitments to international human rights conventions and other internationally agreed development goals.* | | | | | |
| **Outcome indicators as stated in the Country Programme Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and targets:**  Implementation status of Action Plan of Sound Management Chemicals (SMC)  BL: No action plan on SMC T: National Situation Report (NSR) on Sound Management Chemicals (SMC) finalized and Priority actions agreed | | | | | |
| **Applicable Outputs from the 2014 – 2017 UNDP Strategic Plan:**  Output 1.3: Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste. | | | | | |
| **Applicable Output Indicators from the UNDP Strategic Plan Integrated Results and Resources Framework:**  Output 1.3 indicator 1.3.1: Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national and/or subnational level. | | | | | |
|  | **Objective and Outcome Indicators** | **Baseline****[[2]](#footnote-2)** | **Mid-term Target**2 | **End of Project Target**2 | **Assumptions[[3]](#footnote-3)** |
| **Project Objective:** Undertake a Initial Mercury Assessment to identify the national mercury challenges and the extent to which legal, policy and regulatory framework will enable Suriname to implement future obligations under the Minamata Convention | *Minamata Initial Assessment document* | *No MIA exists* | *N/A* | *MIA prepared and transmitted to the Minamata Conv. Secretariat* | *This is an Enabling Activity* |
| **Component 1. Enabling environment for decision-making on the ratification of Minamata**.  Outcome 1.1. Establishing a national decision making structure on Mercury | *Formalization of a centralized committee* | *No MCM exists* | *N/A* | *Institutional structure of MCM in place and advising the President.* | *This is an Enabling Activity* |
| **Component 1. Enabling environment for decision-making on the ratification of Minamata**  Outcome 1.2. Conducting an assessment of the policy and regulatory framework and institutional capacity needs in regard to the implementation of the Convention’s provisions: | *Number of Policy and Regulations* | *Diffuse framework* | *N/A* | *Action Plan to remove barriers and list of policies/regulations to implement the convention developed.* | *This is an Enabling Activity* |
| *Matrix of Barriers* | *Unknown barriers* | *N/A* |
| **Component 1. Enabling environment for decision-making on the ratification of Minamata**  Outcome 1.3 Raising awareness on the environmental and health impacts of Mercury | *Over-arching awareness strategy* | *Limited targeted awareness pieces* | *N/A* | *Comprehensive medium term awareness strategy developed* | *This is an Enabling Activity* |
| **Component 1. Enabling environment for decision-making on the ratification of Minamata**  Outcome 1.4 Mainstreaming Hg priorities into national policies/plans: | *Number of legislations, policies and guidelines.* | *Co comprehensive approach on Hg issues exists* | *N/A* | *One Action Plan for the mainstreaming in the public policies developed with suggested policies to be drafted.* | *This is an Enabling Activity* |
| **Component 2. Development of the National Mercury Profile and Mercury Initial Assessment Report.**  Outcome 2.1 Building national capacity to under the Mercury Inventory | *Number of people able to apply surveys and undertaken inventories* | *No official training had been conducted* | *N/A* | *National team of Officers at NISMO trained* | *This is an Enabling Activity* |
| **Component 2.**  **Development of the National Mercury Profile and Mercury Initial Assessment Report.**  Outcome 2.2 Conducting the Mercury Inventory and prepare the National Mercury Profile | *Number of samples and locations surveyed* | *Limited inventories undertaken at ASGM area only* | *N/A* | *Areas with mercury use surveyed.* | *This is an Enabling Activity* |
| **Component 2. Development of the National Mercury Profile and Mercury Initial Assessment Report.**  Outcome 2.3. Preparing the National MIA Report | *Final report* | *No Action Plan exists* | *N/A* | *One Report containing the full MIA prepared and an Action Plan approved locally.* | *This is an Enabling Activity* |
| **Component 3. Monitoring and Evaluation**  Outcome 3.1. Project monitoring and evaluation implemented | *Number of evaluation and monitoring missions* | *N/A* | *N/A* | *3 missions undertaken* | *This is an Enabling Activity* |

# Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan

The project results as outlined in the project results framework will be monitored annually and evaluated periodically during project implementation to ensure the project effectively achieves these results. *Supported by Component Four: Knowledge Management and M&E, the project monitoring and evaluation plan will also facilitate learning and ensure knowledge is shared and widely disseminated to support the scaling up and replication of project results.*

Project-level monitoring and evaluation will be undertaken in compliance with standard UNDP requirements as outlined in the [UNDP POPP](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/accountability/programme_and_operationspoliciesandprocedures.html) and [UNDP Evaluation Policy](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/accountability/evaluation/evaluation_policyofundp.html). Though these UNDP requirements are not detailed in this section of the project document, the UNDP Country Office will ensure UNDP M&E requirements are met in a timely fashion and to high quality standards. The additional and mandatory GEF-specific M&E requirements as outlined in this section will be undertaken in accordance with the [GEF M&E policy](http://www.thegef.org/gef/Evaluation%20Policy%202010) and GEF guidance materials (link to be added)[[4]](#footnote-4). In addition to these mandatory UNDP and GEF M&E requirements, other M&E activities deemed necessary to support project-level adaptive management, and the exact role of project target groups and other stakeholders in project M&E activities, will be finalized during the Inception Workshop and will be detailed in the Inception Report.

**Oversight and monitoring responsibilities:**

The primary responsibility for day-to-day project implementation and regular monitoring rests with the Project Manager. The Project Manager will develop annual work plans based on the multi-year work plan included in the annexes, including annual targets at the output level to ensure the efficient implementation of the project. The Project Manager will ensure that the standard UNDP and GEF M&E requirements are fulfilled to the highest quality. This includes, but is not limited to, ensuring the results framework indicators are monitored annually in time for reporting (i.e. GEF PIR), and reporting to the Project Board at least once a year on project progress. The Project Manager will inform the Project Board and the UNDP Country Office of any delays or difficulties as they arise during implementation, including the implementation of the M&E plan, so that the appropriate support and corrective measures can be adopted. The Project Manager will also ensure that all project staff maintain a high level of transparency, responsibility and accountability in monitoring and reporting project results.

The UNDP Country Office will support the Project Manager as needed, including through annual supervision missions. The UNDP Country Office is responsible for complying with all UNDP project-level M&E requirements as outlined in the [UNDP POPP](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/accountability/programme_and_operationspoliciesandprocedures.html). This includes ensuring the UNDP Quality Assurance Assessment during implementation is undertaken annually; that annual targets at the output level are developed, and monitored and reported using UNDP corporate systems; and, updating the UNDP gender marker on an annual basis based on progress reported in the GEF PIR and UNDP ROAR reporting. Any quality concerns flagged by the process must be addressed by project management. Additional M&E and implementation quality assurance and troubleshooting support will be provided by the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor and the UNDP-GEF Unit as needed. The project target groups and stakeholders including the GEF Operational Focal Point will be involved as much as possible in project-level M&E. Per GEF guidance this project is not eligible for midterm review and terminal evaluations.

**Audit Clause**: The project will be audited according to UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable audit policies on NIM implemented projects.

**Additional GEF monitoring and reporting requirements:**

Inception Workshop and Report: A project inception workshop will be held after the project document has been signed by all relevant parties to: a) re-orient project stakeholders to the project strategy and discuss any changes in the overall context that influence project implementation; b) discuss the roles and responsibilities of the project team, including reporting and communication lines and conflict resolution mechanisms; c) review the results framework and discuss reporting, monitoring and evaluation roles and responsibilities and finalize the M&E plan; d) review financial reporting procedures and mandatory requirements, and agree on the arrangements for the annual audit; e) plan and schedule Project Board meetings and finalize the first year annual work plan. The Project Manager will prepare the inception report no later than one month after the inception workshop. The final inception report will be cleared by the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, and will be approved by the Project Board.

GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR): The Project Manager, the UNDP Country Office, and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor will provide objective input to the annual GEF PIR covering the reporting period July (previous year) to June (current year) for each year of project implementation. The Project Manager will ensure that the indicators included in the project results framework are monitored annually well in advance of the PIR submission deadline and are reported on accordingly in the PIR. The PIR that is submitted to the GEF each year must also be submitted in English and shared with the Project Board. The UNDP Country Office will coordinate the input of the GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders to the PIR. The quality rating of the previous year’s PIR will be used to inform the preparation of the subsequent PIR. The project’s terminal PIR along with the terminal evaluation (TE) report and corresponding management response will serve as the final project report package. The final project report package shall be discussed with the Project Board during an end-of-project review meeting to discuss lesson learned and opportunities for scaling up.

GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools: In line with its objective and the corresponding GEF Focal Areas/ Programs, this project will prepare the following GEF Tracking Tool(s): *list the required GEF Tracking Tool(s), as agreed with the UNDP-GEF RTA.* The baseline/CEO Endorsement GEF Focal Area Tracking Tool(s) – submitted in Annex to this project document – will be updated by the Project Manager/Team. If applicable the updated GEF Tracking Tool(s) will be submitted to the GEF.

The UNDP Country Office will retain all M&E records for this project for up to seven years after project financial closure in order to support ex-post evaluations undertaken by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office and/or the GEF Independent Evaluation Office.

**Table 2 - Mandatory GEF M&E Requirements and M&E Budget:**

***Note to project developers:*** *Delete rows with italic text as appropriate (e.g. if the project is medium-sized).*

| **GEF M&E requirements** | **Primary responsibility** | **Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget[[5]](#footnote-5) (US$)** | | **Time frame** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GEF grant** | **Co-financing** |
| **Inception (kick off) Workshop** | UNDP Country Office | USD 3,500 | None | Within two months of project document signature |
| **Inception Report** | Project Manager | None | None | Within two weeks of inception workshop |
| **Standard UNDP monitoring and reporting requirements as outlined in the UNDP POPP** | UNDP Country Office | None | None | Quarterly, annually |
| **Monitoring of indicators in project results framework *NIMOS*** | Project Manager | Per year: USD 9,000 | None | Annually |
| **GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR)** | Project Manager and UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF team | None | None | Annually |
| **HACT Audit as per UNDP audit policies** | UNDP Country Office | Per year: USD 1,000 | None | Annually or other frequency as per UNDP Audit policies |
| **Supervision missions** | UNDP Country Office | None**[[6]](#footnote-6)** | None | Annually |
| **Oversight missions** | UNDP-GEF team | None6 | None | Troubleshooting as needed |
| **GEF Secretariat learning missions/site visits** | Project Manager and UNDP-GEF team | None | None | To be determined. |
| **TOTAL indicative COST**  Excluding project team staff time, and UNDP staff and travel expenses | | *14,500* | None |  |

# Governance and Management Arrangements

Roles and responsibilities of the project’s governance mechanism: The project will be implemented following UNDP’s support to national implementation modality, according to the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between UNDP and the Government of Suriname*,* and the United Nations Development Assistance Action Plan (UNDAP). The **Implementing Partner** for this project is National Institute for Environment and Development*.* The Implementing Partner is responsible and accountable for managing this project, including the monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, achieving project outcomes, and for the effective use of UNDP resources.

The project organisation structure is as follows:

**Project Manager**

**Project Board**

**Senior Beneficiary:**

***Local communities***

***Goldminers***

**Executive:**

***NIMOS***

**Senior Supplier:**

***University of Suriname***

***UNDP***

**Project Assurance**

**UNDP Suriname Office Programme Officer**

**IMAC/MCM/PCG Environment**

**Project Organization Structure**

**TEAM A**

**MIA Assessment**

**TEAM C**

**MIA and ASGM**

**Education and Awareness**

**TEAM B**

**ASGM general Assessment**

The **Project Board** (also called Project Steering Committee) is responsible for making by consensus, management decisions when guidance is required by the Project Manager, including recommendation for UNDP/Implementing Partner approval of project plans and revisions. In order to ensure UNDP’s ultimate accountability, Project Board decisions should be made in accordance with standards that shall ensure management for development results, best value money, fairness, integrity, transparency and effective international competition. In case a consensus cannot be reached within the Board, final decision shall rest with the UNDP Programme Manager. The terms of reference for the Project Board are contained in Annex*.* The Project Board may be comprised of representatives from the following organizations: Ministry of Natural Resources, NIMOS, Ministry of Trade and Industry, Ministry of Health, UNDP.

The **Project Manager** will run the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of the Implementing Partner within the constraints laid down by the Board. The Project Manager function will end when the final project report, and other documentation required by the GEF and UNDP, has been completed and submitted to UNDP (including operational closure of the project).

The **project assurance** roll will be provided by UNDP, who will augment this role to ensure that its fiduciary, environmental and social safeguards and standards are maintained. Further, the Project Assurance role supports the Project Board by carrying out objective and independent project oversight and monitoring functions. This role ensures appropriate project management milestones are managed and completed

Governance role for project target groups:

A number of technical working groups consisting also of beneficiaries are to be established as counterpart groups to different project and technical assessment teams at the start of project implementation. For this beneficiaries and stakeholders were requested at recent meeting (April 2016) to indicate interest and provide names of nominees. The technical working groups are to ensure participatory preparation as well as additional quality assurance and ownership of deliverables.

UNDP Direct Project Services as requested by Government:

The enclosed letter of agreement identifies per which UNDP support services to NIM will be provided to the implementing partner of the project, the national institute for Environment and Development.

As per Determination and Decision of the UNDP’s Executive Board on the Policy on Cost Recovery from Regular and Other Resources, UNDP shall recover costs for the provision of project related general management services (GMS) and direct project services (DPS). As an Implementing Agency of the GEF, UNDP earns a fee upon approval of each project which is to be used to cover specific project assurance and oversight costs incurred by UNDP. For the Country Office, these services are related to the provision of project cycle management services; thus, the GEF fee is provided to cover the specialized project cycle management service indirect costs. At the Country Office level, project cycle management services performed by UNDP Country Offices are broadly analogous to General Management Support (GMS) and cover support to project development and oversight of implementation stages. The UNDP-GEF Unit will support the Country Office by providing a suite of specialized technical services as required by the GEF.

If the Implementing Partner requests UNDP to provide direct services specific to project inputs, then UNDP’s costs must be recovered in full accordance with GEF-specific Bureau of Management Services (BMS) policy on Direct Project Costs (DPCs). This GEF and Adaptation Fund specific policy is available in the POPP. In summary, to comply with BMS policy, UNDP will need to ensure for each project that: (a) a Letter of Agreement (LOA) between UNDP and the Implementing Partner has been entered into clearly documenting the services requested and the associated costs; and (b) the DPCs are within the Project Management Cost (PMC) component of the project budget. If direct project services are requested after the date of GEF CEO Endorsement, prior approval of any DPCs will be needed from the GEF Secretariat. An appropriate separation between project oversight and direct project support is required in accordance with the UNDP Internal Control Framework.

Agreement on intellectual property rights and use of logo on the project’s deliverables**:** In order to accord proper acknowledgement to the GEF for providing funding, the GEF logo will appear together with the UNDP logo on all promotional materials, other written materials like publications developed by the project, and project hardware. Any citation on publications regarding projects funded by the GEF will also accord proper acknowledgement to the GEF.

Project management*:* project is national in scope with project office operated out of NIMOS in the Capital of Paramaribo.

# Financial Planning and Management

The total cost of the project is USD 200,000*.* This is financed through a GEF grant of USD 200,000. UNDP, as the GEF Implementing Agency, is responsible for the execution of the GEF resources and the cash co-financing transferred to UNDP bank account only.

Parallel co-financing: Is it is an Enabling Activity, no co-finance requirements appl.:

Budget Revision and Tolerance: As per the UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP POPP, the project board can agree on a budget tolerance level for each plan under the overall annual work plan allowing the project manager to expend up to the tolerance level beyond the approved project budget amount for the year without requiring a revision from the project board. Should the following deviations occur, the Project Manager and UNDP Country Office will seek the approval of the UNDP-GEF team as these are considered major amendments by the GEF: a) budget re-allocations among components in the project with amounts involving 10% of the total project grant or more; b) introduction of new budget items/or components that exceed 5% of original GEF allocation.

Project Closure: Project closure will be conducted as per the UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP POPP (see (<https://info.undp.org/global/popp/ppm/Pages/Closing-a-Project.aspx>) on an exception basis only, a no-cost extension beyond the initial duration of the project will be sought from in-country UNDP colleagues and then the UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator.

Operational completion: The project will be operationally completed when the last UNDP-financed inputs have been provided and the related activities have been completed including the final clearance of the Terminal Evaluation Report that must be available in English, and after the final project board meeting. The Implementing Partner through a Project Board decision, will notify the UNDP Country Office when the operational closure has been completed. The relevant parties will then agree on the disposal of any equipment that is still the property of UNDP.

Financial completion: The project will be financially closed when the following conditions have been met: a) the project is operationally completed or has been cancelled; b) the implementing partner has reported all financial transactions to UNDP; c) UNDP has closed the accounts for the project; d) UNDP and the implementing partner have certified a final Combined Delivery Report (which serves as final budget revision).

The project will be financially completed within 12 months of operational closure or after the date of cancellation. Between operational and financial closure, the implementing partner will identify and settle all financial obligations and prepare a final expenditure report. The UNDP Country Office will send the final signed closure documents including confirmation of final cumulative expenditure and unspent balance to the UNDP-GEF Unit for confirmation before the project will be financially closed in Atlas by the Country Office.

Refund to Donor: should a refund of unspent funds to the GEF be necessary, this will be managed directly by the UNDP-GEF Unit in New York.

# Legal Context

This project document shall be the instrument referred to as such in Article 1 of the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between the Government of (country) and UNDP, signed on (date).   All references in the SBAA to “Executing Agency” shall be deemed to refer to “Implementing Partner.”

1. Consistent with the Article III of the SBAA *[or the Supplemental Provisions]*, the responsibility for the safety and security of the Implementing Partner and its personnel and property, and of UNDP’s property in the Implementing Partner’s custody, rests with the Implementing Partner. To this end, the Implementing Partner shall:
2. put in place an appropriate security plan and maintain the security plan, taking into account the security situation in the country where the project is being carried;
3. assume all risks and liabilities related to the Implementing Partner’s security, and the full implementation of the security plan.

UNDP reserves the right to verify whether such a plan is in place, and to suggest modifications to the plan when necessary. Failure to maintain and implement an appropriate security plan as required hereunder shall be deemed a breach of the Implementing Partner’s obligations under this Project Document [and the Project Cooperation Agreement between UNDP and the Implementing Partner][[7]](#footnote-7).

1. The Implementing Partner agrees to undertake all reasonable efforts to ensure that no UNDP funds received pursuant to the Project Document are used to provide support to individuals or entities associated with terrorism and that the recipients of any amounts provided by UNDP hereunder do not appear on the list maintained by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). The list can be accessed via <http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1267/aq_sanctions_list.shtml>. This provision must be included in all sub-contracts or sub-agreements entered into under/further to this Project Document.
2. Consistent with UNDP’s Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures, social and environmental sustainability will be enhanced through application of the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (http://www.undp.org/ses) and related Accountability Mechanism (http://www.undp.org/secu-srm).
3. The Implementing Partner shall: (a) conduct project and programme-related activities in a manner consistent with the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards, (b) implement any management or mitigation plan prepared for the project or programme to comply with such standards, and (c) engage in a constructive and timely manner to address any concerns and complaints raised through the Accountability Mechanism. UNDP will seek to ensure that communities and other project stakeholders are informed of and have access to the Accountability Mechanism.

All signatories to the Project Document shall cooperate in good faith with any exercise to evaluate any programme or project-related commitments or compliance with the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards. This includes providing access to project sites, relevant personnel, information, and documentation.

# Total Budget and Work Plan

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Atlas Proposal or Award ID: | | | 00095987 | | | | Atlas Primary Output Project ID: | | 00100006 | | | |
| Atlas Proposal or Award Title: | | | Minamata Initial Assessment | | | | | | | | | |
| Atlas Business Unit | | | SUR10 | | | | | | | | | |
| Atlas Primary Output Project Title | | | Minamata Initial Assessment | | | | | | | | | |
| UNDP-GEF PIMS No. | | | 5809 | | | | | | | | | |
| Implementing Partner | | | National Institute for Environment and Development | | | | | | | | | |
| **GEF Component /Atlas Activity** | **RespParty/ IA** | **Fund ID** | | **Donor Name** | **ATLAS Code** | **Altlas Budget Description** | | **TOTAL Amount (USD)** | | **Amount 2016**  **(USD)** | **Amount 2017**  **(USD)** | **Budget note** | |
| Component 1 | NIMOS | 62000 | | GEF | 71200 | International Consultants | | 15,000 | | 15,000 | 0 | a | |
| 71300 | Local Consultants | | 10,000 | | 10,000 | 0 | b | |
| 71600 | Travel | | 5,000 | | 5,000 | 0 | c | |
| 74200 | Audio Visual & Print Prod Costs | | 6,000 | | 6,000 | 0 | d | |
| 75700 | Training, Workshops & Conferences | | 10,000 | | 10,000 | 0 | e | |
| 74500 | Miscellaneous | | 4,000 | | 4,000 | 0 | f | |
| **GEF Subtotal Atlas Activity 1 (Comp 1)** | | | | | | | **50,000** | | **50,000** | **0** |  | |
| **TOTAL ACTIVITY 1 (Comp 1)** | | | | | | | | **50,000** | |  |  |  | |
| Component 2 | NIMOS | 62000 | | GEF | 71200 | International Consultants | | 30,000 | | 30,000 | 0 | g | |
| 71300 | Local Consultants | | 35,000 | | 24,500 | 10,500 | h | |
| 71600 | Travel | | 15,000 | | 15,000 | 0 | i | |
| 72100 | Contractual Services-Companies | | 20,000 | | 20,000 | 0 | j | |
| 74200 | Audio Visual & Print Prod Costs | | 5,000 | | 2,500 | 2,500 | k | |
| 74500 | Miscellaneous | | 5,000 | | 3,000 | 2,000 | l | |
| 75700 | Training, Workshops & Conferences | | 5,000 | | 2,000 | 3,000 | m | |
| **GEF Subtotal Atlas Activity 2 (Comp 2)** | | | | | | | **115,000** | | **97,000** | **18,000** |  | |
| **TOTAL ACTIVITY 2 (Comp 2)** | | | | | | | | **115,000** | |  |  |  | |
| Component 3 | NIMOS | 62000 | | GEF | 71300 | Local Consultants | | 10,000 | | 10,000 | 0 | n | |
| 71600 | Travel | | 4,000 | | 4,000 | 0 | o | |
| 74500 | Miscellaneous | | 1,000 | | 1,000 | 0 | p | |
| **GEF Subtotal Atlas Activity 3 (Comp 3)** | | | | | | | **15,000** | | **15,000** | **0** |  | |
| **TOTAL ACTIVITY 3 (Comp 3)** | | | | | | | | **15,000** | |  |  |  | |
| Project Management | NIMOS | 62000 | | GEF | 71800 | Contractual Services – Implementing Partner | | 10,800 | | 3,925 | 6,875 | q | |
| 74598 | Direct Project Costs | | 7,500 | | 5,100 | 2,400 | r | |
| 74100 | Audit | | 1,000 | | 0 | 1,000 | s | |
| 72500 | Supplies | | 200 | | 200 | 0 |  | |
| 75700 | Training, Workshops & Conferences | | 500 | | 0 | 500 |  | |
| **GEF Subtotal Atlas Activity 4 (Proj Mgt)** | | | | | | | **20,000** | | **9,225** | **10,775** |  | |
| **TOTAL ACTIVITY 3 (Project Management)** | | | | | | | | **20,000** | |  |  |  | |
| **SUB-TOTAL GEF** | | | | | | | | **200,000** | | **171,225** | **28,775** |  | |
| **GRAND TOTAL (Grant)** | | | | | | | | **200,000** | |  |  |  | |

**Budget notes:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a | International Consultant’s rate is calculated at 600USD per day |
| b | National Consultant’s rate is calculated at 300 USD per day |
| c | International/ National Consultant’s travel, 20 percent consultant rate allocated for travel |
| d | These costs are for communication products for public and policy makers awareness, knowledge sharing |
| e | This includes inception (kickoff) workshop and inter sectorial working groups meetings and workshops, knowledge exchanges |
| f | Miscellaneous costs |
| g | International Consultant’s rate is calculated at 600 USD per day |
| h | National Consultant’s rate is calculated at 300 USD per day |
| i | Travel for field research/data gathering/field visits, including consultant travel related to different sectors of the Minamata Initial Assessment and report |
| j | Contractual service companies costs associated with collection, analysis and dissemination of inventory data |
| k | These costs are for communication products for public awareness, knowledge sharing |
| l | Miscellaneous costs data gathering |
| m | This includes training workshops, knowledge exchanges, sensitization of vulnerable communities, and public awareness activities |
| n | Local consultant in support monitoring MIA assessment and stakeholder consultation |
| o | Travel for monitoring MIA assessment and stakeholder consultation |
| p | Miscellaneous costs |
| q | Contractual services provided by the implementing partner in the management of the project |
| r | Refer to Annex “Letter of Agreement for Direct Project Services”. As agreed with NIMOS. |
| s | Audit to be carried out by professional services once throughout project duration |

# 

# List of Mandatory Annexes

* Multi year Workplan (see template below)
* Monitoring Plan (see template below)
* GEF Tracking Tool (s) at baseline (see separate document)
* Terms of Reference for Project Board, Project Manager, Chief Technical Advisor and other positions as appropriate
* UNDP Social and Environmental and Social Screening Template (SESP)
* Any additional agreements, such as cost sharing agreements, project cooperation agreements signed with NGOs (where the NGO is designated as the “executing entity”), letters of financial commitments, GEF OFP letter, GEF PIFs and other templates for all project types, LOA with the government in case DPCs are applied should be attached.

Optional Annexes:

* List of people consulted during project development
* UNDP Project Quality Assurance Report (to be completed by UNDP Country Office)
* Results of the capacity assessment of the project implementing partner and HACT micro assessment (to be completed by UNDP Country Office)

**Multi Year Work Plan**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **EXPECTED OUTPUTS and RESULT INDICATORS** | **PLANNED ACTIVITIES** | **TIMEFRAME** | | | | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** | **PLANNED BUDGET** | | |
| Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | Y4 | Funding Source | Budget Description | Amount |
| **Output 1 - Environment for decision-making on the ratification of Minamata enabled.**  *Result indicator 1: Assessment of Hg insertion in legal framework.*  *Baseline (year): 2016*  *Target: Assessment Report prepared.* | 1.1. Establish a National Mercury Coordination /consultation Mechanism | X |  |  |  | NIMOS | GEF | Intl. Consultant  Ntl. Consultant  Travel & Mission  Contractual Services  Sundry | 15,000  10,000  5,000  16,000  4,000 |
| 1.2. Undertake an Assessment on the existing and required policy and regulatory framework | X |  |  |  | NIMOS | GEF |
| 1.3. Develop Hg awareness raising activities targeting decision makers and population groups at risk. | X |  |  |  | NIMOS | GEF |
| 1.4 National Hg priority interventions mainstreamed in national policies/plans | X | X |  |  | NIMOS | GEF |
| **Output 2 - National Mercury Profile and Mercury Initial Assessment Report developed**  *Result indicator 3: MIA report ready.*  *Baseline (year): 2016*  *Target (Y2): Final MIA document submitted to the Minamata Conv. Secretariat.* | 2.1. Build Capacity in Suriname to commence the Mercury inventory. | X |  |  |  | NIMOS | GEF | Intl. Consultant  Ntl. Consultant  Travel & Mission  Contractual Services  Sundry | 30,000  35000  15,000  30,000  5,000 |
| 2.2 Mercury Inventory conducted in Suriname. | X | X |  |  | NIMOS | GEF |
| 2.3 Prepare the National MIA Report |  | X |  |  | NIMOS | GEF |
| **Output 3 - Monitoring and Evaluation**  *Target (Y2): Project closure report* | 3.1. Undertake M&E in support of adaptive management, to provide feedback to the project coordination process | X | X |  |  | NIMOS | GEF | Ntl. Consultant  Travel & Mission  Sundry | 10,000  4,000  1000 |
| **Output 4 – Project Management**  *Target (Y2): Project completed* | 4.1. Undertake adaptive management and complete the project | X | X |  |  | NIMOS | GEF | Contractual Services  DPC  Audit  Supplies | 17,400  1,200  1,000  400 |
| **TOTAL** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **200,000** |

**Monitoring Plan:** The Project Manager will collect results data according to the following monitoring plan.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Monitoring** | **Indicators** | **Description** | **Data source/Collection Methods** | **Frequency** | **Responsible for data collection** | **Means of verification** | **Assumptions and Risks** |
| **Project objective from the results framework** | *Minamata Initial Assessment document* | *Final document of MIA approved and submitted* | *Minamanta Convention Secretariat* | Annually | *Project Coordinator* | *Consult the Minamata Conv. Secretariat* | *n/a* |
| **Project Outcome 1** | *Formalization of a centralized committee* | *Consultation committee to guide HG decision making process to be coordinated.* | Central Government | Annually | *Project Coordinator* | Various progress reports  USD 5,000 | *n/a* |
| *Over-arching awareness strategy* | *Use inputs to develop a over-arching awareness strategy* | Central Government | Annually | National Consultant | *n/a* |
| *Number of Policy and Regulations* | *Review of policies and regulations to verify current status over Hg issue.* | Central Government | Annually | National Consultant | *n/a* |
| *Matrix of Barriers* | *Develop a matrix of barriers that block Suriname to ratify the Convention* | Central Government | Annually | National Consultant | *n/a* |
| **Project Outcome 2** | *Number of people able to apply surveys and undertaken inventories* | *Create capacity in Government to undertake inventories* | Field visits | Annually | National Consultant | Various field reports  USD 6,500 | *n/a* |
| *Number of samples and locations surveyed* | *Undertake samples to create a comprehensive level 1 inventory to support decision making process.* | Field visits | Annually | National Consultant | *n/a* |
| *Final report* | *Consolidate above mentioned indicators in one final output: MIA Document* | *N/A* | Annually | National Consultant | *n/a* |
| **Project Outcome 3** | *Number of monitoring and project closure missions* | Field missions required to verify compliance | *N/A* | Quarterly | *National Consultant/ Project Coordinator* | Monitoring reports  USD 1,500 | *n/a* |
| **Final GEF Tracking Tool** | N/A | N/A | baseline GEF Tracking Tool included in Annex | Completion of project | *For example, national university; project consultant* | As relevant updated GEF tracking tool as  USD 1,500 | *n/a* |
| **Total monitoring budget** | | | | | | USD 14,500 |  |

**Terms of Reference for Key Project staff**



**UNDP Social and Environmental and Social Screening Template (SESP)**



**GEF MIA Request for Enabling Activity**



**GEF OFP letter.**

****

**Draft LOA**

****

1. [*http://www.mercuryconvention.org/Countries/tabid/3428/Default.aspx*](http://www.mercuryconvention.org/Countries/tabid/3428/Default.aspx) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Baseline, mid-term and end of project levels must be expressed in the same neutral unit of analysis as the corresponding indicator. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Risks must be outlined in the Feasibility section of this project document. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff time and travel expenses. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The costs of UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF’s participation and time are charged to the GEF Agency Fee. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Use bracketed text only when IP is an NGO/IGO [↑](#footnote-ref-7)