



GEF GOLD+: Advancing formalization and mercury-free gold in Suriname

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10615

Countries

Suriname

Project Name

GEF GOLD+: Advancing formalization and mercury-free gold in Suriname

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

4/1/2022

Review completed by PM

4/25/2022

Program Manager

Evelyn Swain

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

Project Type

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. This child project is in line with the PFD.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes, this child project is in line with the PFD including the expected outcomes and outputs in table B.

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description

of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes, co-financing is appropriate and there is significant co-financing from the private sector which is a key partner.

Agency Response
GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response
Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Please check the core indicators. Core indicator 9 should reflect the replication factor.

Will there be any co-benefits to this project, for exactly CO2 reductions? If so please list in the appropriate core indicator.

ES, 4/13/22: The core indicators have been corrected. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP answer 8 April: Core indicator 9 adjusted to include replication factor.
Additional co-benefits will be measured during implementation and reported upon PIR periods.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes the problem is well elaborated.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, the baseline is elaborated.

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, the project is well aligned with the CW strategy.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please include the mercury GEBs expected through the project and replication in the GEBs section.

ES, 4/13/22: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP answer 8 April: Core indicator 9 adjusted to include replication factor. Additional co-benefits will be measured during implementation and reported upon PIR periods.

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, these aspects are elaborated.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, this project is well aligned with the program and had well articulated the links, including with the global communications project.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, stakeholder engagement is provided and adequate.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, a gender analysis is provided.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, the private sector is a key partner.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, risks including climate and COVID risks have been addressed.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, the institutional arrangements and coordination with other projects is included.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, this project is aligned with the Minamata MIA and NAP.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Some work on the Council comments is needed.

ES, 4/13/22: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP answer 8 April: Document has been re-worked.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Comments received on April 25

1. On project information: Given the 4 week circulation please request the agency to change the expected implementation start to a future date.

UNDP Response April 25: amended.

2. Status of PPG utilization: as requested in the template, please provide details on expenditure categories for this PPG report.

UNDP Response April 25: UNDP Response April 25: Below is the PPG budget and Budget notes.

GEF Outcome/Atlas Activity	Responsible Party	Fund ID	Donor Name	Atlas Budgetary Account Code	ATLAS Budget Description	Amount 2020	Amount 2021	Total	Budget Notes
Project preparation grant to finalize the UNDP-GEF project document for project <i>Global Opportunities for Long-term Development of ASGM Sector Plus - GEF GOLD + in Suriname</i>	UNDP	62000	GEF TRUSTEE	71200	International Consultants	50,000.00	10,500.00	60,500.00	A1-A5
				71300	Local Consultants	27,500.00	7,500.00	35,000.00	B1-B3
				71600	Travel	19,000.00	14,000.00	33,000.00	C

				74200	74200 Audio Visual&Pri nt Prod Costs	2,000.00	3,000.0 0	5,000.00	D
				74500	Miscellane ous Expenses	1,000.00	1,000.0 0	2,000.00	E
				75700	Training, Workshops and Confer	8,500.00	6,000.0 0	14,500.0 0	F
					PROJEC T TOTAL	108,000. 00	42,000. 00	150,000. 00	

Budget Note	Items	Total estimated person weeks	Budget	Budget Note
			US\$	
A1	71200 - International Consultants	14	28,000.00	International Expert to provide overall guidance on project preparation to National Consultants engaged by the project and preparation of the UNDP-GEF Project Document, the GEF CEO Endorsement, the SESP, the GEF Tracking Tools). Costs of the International Project Development Specialist (GEF PPG Team Leader) are estimated to USD\$ 28,000.00 and includes one (5) day mission (travel and DSA).
A2	71200 - International Consultants	10	20,000.00	International ASGM Specialist to provide key expertise and technical inputs on ASGM issues required to assess the baseline situation and support the design and preparation of the GEF/UNDP project and other supporting documents to the National ASGM Expert engaged by the project.. Costs of the International ASGM Expert are estimated to USD\$ 20,000.00 and includes one (5) day mission (travel and DSA).

A3	71200 - International Consultants	4	5,000.00	International Expert to provide overall guidance on project preparation to National Consultants engaged by the project and preparation of the UNDP-GEF Project Document, the GEF CEO Endorsement, the SESP, the GEF Tracking Tools). Costs of the International Gender Specialist for ASGM are estimated to USD\$ 5,000.00. No travel is foreseen for this consultancy.
A4	71200 - International Consultants	4	2,500.00	International Expert to provide overall guidance on project preparation to National Consultants engaged by the project and preparation of the UNDP-GEF Project Document, the GEF CEO Endorsement, the SESP, the GEF Tracking Tools). Costs of the International Safeguards Specialist for ASGM are estimated to USD\$ 2,500.00. No travel is foreseen for this consultancy.
A5	71200 - International Consultants	4	5,000.00	International Expert to provide overall guidance on project preparation to National Consultants engaged by the project and preparation of the UNDP-GEF Project Document, the GEF CEO Endorsement, the SESP, the GEF Tracking Tools). Costs of the International Financial Expert are estimated to USD\$ 5,000.00 . No travel is foreseen for this consultancy.
B1	71300 - National Consultants	10	15,000.00	National Consultant for the oversight and coordination of the PPG process throughout its entire duration and be responsible for the overall coordination of processes and consultations needed for project development and the preparation of the UNDP-GEF Project Document and the GEF CEO Endorsement Form, in direct collaboration with the international coordinator and national/international consultants. Costs of the National PPG Coordinator, institutional and policy Expert are estimated to USD\$15,000.00. Travel costs related to travel for fieldwork and exchange of experiences.

B2	71300 - National Consultants	10	15,000.00	National Consultant for the oversight and coordination of the PPG process throughout its entire duration and be responsible for the overall coordination of processes and consultations needed for project development and the preparation of the UNDP-GEF Project Document and the GEF CEO Endorsement Form, in direct collaboration with the international coordinator and national/international consultants. Costs of the National ASGM Expert are estimated to USD\$15,000.00.
B3	71300 - National Consultants	4	5,000.00	National Consultant for the oversight and coordination of the PPG process throughout its entire duration and be responsible for the overall coordination of processes and consultations needed for project development and the preparation of the UNDP-GEF Project Document and the GEF CEO Endorsement Form, in direct collaboration with the international coordinator and national/international consultants. Costs of the National Gender Specialist are estimated to USD\$5,000.00
C	71600 - Travel	N/A	33,000.00	Travel costs related to travel for fieldwork and exchange of experiences
D	74200 - Translation costs	N/A	5,000.00	Includes the translation relevant documents (PRODOC, SES?) from English to Dutch to facilitate consultation and validation process
E	74500 - Miscellaneous Expenses	N/A	2,000.00	Coffee breaks, PPE for COVID protection during fieldwork.
F	75700 - Trainings, workshops	N/A	14,500.00	Includes the organization of the two Workshops (PPG Inception Workshop and Project Document Validation Workshop), training of national experts on establishing the project's baseline as well as four working meetings with national stakeholders.

3. On co-financing: please request the agency to describe how all the co-financing categorized as "investment mobilized" was identified in the paragraph below table C. As is stands, the description does not include information relevant to the specific the co-financing categorized as Investment Mobilized (UNDP, Ministry of Finance, Conservation X labs and ARGOR-HERAEUS).

UNDP Response April 25: Investment mobilized will provide assistance for the implementation of Component 3 of the project, mainly through the upgrade/Retrofit of existing ASGM production plants to eliminate Hg from production processes.

Furthermore, Investment mobilized Co-financing will support the improvement of existing Gold Supply chains to promote Hg-free Gold; by allowing formalized ASGM miners fully engaged by this FSP selling their mercury-free gold through formal markets, at fair price and in accordance with Surinamese export laws.

4. On core-indicators: the target for core indicator 9.2 Quantity of mercury reduced (metric tons) is not aligned with the target reported in the results framework in the annex A. Agency is reporting 8 tons of Hg avoided by the project in the results framework but in core indicator table indicated 32.

UNDP Response April 25: Expected GEB for the Suriname planetGOLD+ child project is 8 ton of Hg avoided during the 5 years of implementation of the project. The replication factor for the subsequent 10 years is 24 ton of avoided Hg. The total GEB (project implementation plus replication) is 32 ton avoided Hg (8 ton + 24 ton). As requested by the GEFSEC on February 22, Core indicator 9.2 includes GEB with replication factor, that is, 32 ton of Hg.

PRF indicator refers to the 8 ton of Hg avoided during the project implementation. The footnote on PRF includes details on calculation of expected GEBs with replication factor (Footnote: *The GEF GOLD+ mercury reduction target for Suriname is 8 t over five years. Components on formalization, financial inclusion and knowledge sharing are measures to ensure results are sustained, resulting in 24 t of mercury avoidance 10 years after project. In Suriname, for every Kg of gold produced, an estimated 3 Kg of mercury is emitted into the environment (NAP). To reach the GEF reduction target an estimated 2.6 t of mercury free gold would need to be produced during the project life span.*

ES, 4/28/22: PPO has the following comments.

Project to be returned to the Agency because most of the comments were addressed excepting one that is easy to fix (see below):

2. Status of PPG utilization ? not addressed. Still there is no detailed information on the activities that were funded through the PPG. Please request the agency to provide details on how the \$150,000 budgeted was spent and committed (please do so specifying the expenditures that are financed such as consultants, workshops, etc. instead of per outputs such as stakeholder engagement plan, preparation of ProDoc, etc.) We need to assess whether the expenditures are eligible per Guidelines.

Please add this information into the portal.

UNDP Response April 28: detail added into the portal. Information on initial budgeting and expenditures have been added and all follow GEF and UNDP Guidelines. Please note that ?BUDGET NOTES? include details on Account description and nature of the tasks that have been agreed upon with the EA upon initiation of the PPG.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The Council comments and responses are hard to follow. Please make it very clear which are the comments and from who. Also the list bounces from Council then STAP and back to Council comments. Please better organize this section.

ES, 4/13/22: Council comments are now clear. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP answer 8 April: Document has been re-worked.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request STAP comments have been addressed.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed.

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request An update on PPG utilization is provided.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response
Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Not at this time. Some issues remain.

ES, 4/13/22: The core indicator table description needs to be corrected.

ES, 4/14/22: Issues have been addressed. CEO Endorsement is recommended.

ES, 4/25/22: PPO has the following comments:

Child project to be returned to the Agency due to:

1. On project information: Given the 4 week circulation please request the agency to change the expected implementation start to a future date.
2. Status of PPG utilization: as requested in the template, please provide details on expenditure categories for this PPG report.
3. On co-financing: please request the agency to describe how all the co-financing categorized as ?investment mobilized? was identified in the paragraph below table C. As is stands, the description does not include information relevant to the specific the co-financing categorized as Investment Mobilized (UNDP, Ministry of Finance, Conservation X labs and ARGOR-HERAEUS).
4. On core-indicators: the target for core indicator 9.2 Quantity of mercury reduced (metric tons) is not aligned with the target reported in the results framework in the annex A. Agency is reporting 8 tons of Hg avoided by the project in the results framework but in core indicator table indicated 32.

ES, 4/28/22: PPO has the following comments.

Project to be returned to the Agency because most of the comments were addressed excepting one that is easy to fix (see below):

2. Status of PPG utilization ? not addressed. Still there is no detailed information on the activities that where funded through the PPG. Please request the agency to provide details on how the \$150,000 budgeted where spent and committed (please do so specifying the expenditures that are financed such as consultants, workshops, etc. instead of per outputs such as stakeholder engagement plan, preparation of ProDoc, etc.) We need to assess whether the expenditures are eligible per Guidelines.

Please add this information into the portal.

ES, 4/28/22: PPO's comments have been addressed. CEO Endorsement is recommended.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	4/8/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/13/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/14/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/28/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

This project supports Suriname joining the planetGOLD program umbrella. The objective of the program is to reduce the use of mercury in the ASGM sector in the participating countries through a holistic, multisectoral integrated formalization approach, and increasing access to finance leading to adoption of sustainable mercury free technologies and access to traceable gold supply chains. The planetGOLD program works in partnership with governments, the private sector, and ASGM communities in countries to significantly improve the production practices and work environment of artisanal and small-scale miners. By working to close the financing gap, supporting formalization, raising awareness, and connecting mining communities with mercury-free technology and formal markets, the program aims to demonstrate a pathway to cleaner and more efficient small-scale gold mining practices that benefit everyone, from mine to market. GEBs from the project will contribute to 32 Metric Tons of mercury reduced.