

Global Opportunities for the Long-Term Development of the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining Sector in Mozambique ? planetGOLD Mozambique

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
12368
Countries
Mozambique
Project Name
Global Opportunities for the Long-Term Development of the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining Sector in Mozambique ? planetGOLD Mozambique
Agencies
UNEP
Date received by PM
6/9/2026
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Jewel Batchasingh
Focal Area
Chemicals and Waste
Project Type
MSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes, the Mozambique project is part of the Planet GOLD programme. Good to see the nomenclature is consistent with the programme - Planet GOLD Mozambique.

Agency's Comments

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments Yes and the GEBS are identified and the summary references the global programme.

Agency's Comments

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

The project objective is concise. There could be a reference to the Global Programme in this narrative.

Component 1 states ***Formalization*** - can the agency embellish this component title - suggest enhancing the formalisation of the ASGM sector or along those lines.

Component 4 appears incomplete as it just states *KM and...* Please amend.

The components do no reference gender and youth which was identified as a concern to this industry in Mozambique.

Agency's Comments

June 15, 2026:

Thank you for the comment. The project objective and summary narrative were revised to provide a clearer reference to the planetGOLD programme.

Component 1 was renamed throughout the document as 'Enhancing the Formalization of the ASGM Sector.'

Component 4 name was fixed.

Gender and youth inclusion were strengthened across the components.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments In reviewing the components there was not a clear reference to gender. There is however reference to miners and mining communities.

Agency's Comments

June 15, 2026:

Thank you for the comment. The component narratives and activities were revised to better reflect gender dimensions, including women's participation, leadership, access to finance, inclusive training, communication, and sex-disaggregated tracking where feasible.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes the components are adequately funded. The PMC is at 205,000 and there is allocation for M&E. The M&E budget is currently 5.23% of the GEF project subtotal - it can be reduced in line with the portfolio average of 5% for projects of this size.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)						
M&E	Technical Assistance	Outcome 5: Project implementation and decision-making are strengthened through monitoring, evaluation and adaptive management.	Output 5.1: The project is monitored and evaluated through baseline development, regular tracking, reporting and review.	GET	225,000.00	1,545,687.00
Sub Total (\$)					4,295,000.00	29,505,440.00

Agency's Comments

June 15, 2026:

Thank you for the comment. The budget was revised to maintain the M&E allocation at 5%.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

The current situation is well described in Mozambique. Suggest a better elaboration of the global impacts of ASGM.

The barriers are well defined in the description.

Agency's Comments

June 15, 2026:

Thank you for the comment. The Project Rationale was reviewed and the global framing of mercury impacts was further clarified, including reference to ASGM as the largest global anthropogenic source of mercury emissions to air, the transboundary movement and transformation of mercury, and downstream human and environmental exposure through food chains and aquatic systems.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes and there is a description of how the project will build on previous GEF investments.

Stakeholders are described and attached in annex.

Agency's Comments

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments The ToC is comprehensive and shows the assumptions and the barriers.

Agency's Comments

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes it is provided. Please correct the name of the GEF.

In the section "Institutional Arrangements", UNEP is included in the Project Steering Committee (PSC). Pursuant to the letter sent by the CEO to all GEF Executive Coordinators on March 20th 2026, we request Agency to explicitly state that if participating in the PSC, the GEF Implementing Agency will not exercise voting rights. This declaration does not preclude their participation in the PSC, neither the implementation oversight function that the GEF Implementing Agency has because all decisions coming from the PSC will ultimately be subject to the no-objection decision that the Agency must provide for each and every project activity and expenditure.

Agency's Comments

June 15, 2026:

Thank you for the comment. The GEF name was corrected.

The Institutional Arrangements section was revised to clearly state that UNEP serves on the PSC in an advisory and non-voting capacity.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments Yes the Core indicators are calculated using the methodology as per guidelines.

Agency's Comments

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments The SRIF is included.

Agency's Comments

5.7 Qualitative assessment

- a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?
- b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?
- c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments Yes the project is designed to facilitate sustainability for this sector.

Agency's Comments

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments Yes the project is aligned with the focal are as it is one of the child projects under Planet GOLD.

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments Yes this project is in alignment with country priorities and strongly linked to the Minamata Convention obligations.

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments Please include relevant targets for GBF.

Agency's Comments

June 15, 2026:

Thank you for the comment. The alignment section was updated to identify and explain the project's expected contribution to relevant KM-GBF targets, notably Targets 7, 10, 11, 22 and 23, including the links to pollution reduction, improved environmental practices, protection of ecosystem services, inclusive participation and gender equality.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments Yes this is complete.

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments The stakeholder engagement plan was attached at annex 3. The list of stakeholders and dates that they were consulted are included.

Agency's Comments

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country's(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments Yes the project has been endorsed by the GEF OFP and signed letter included at annex B.

Agency's Comments

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments Yes the OFP letter is attached.

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments The additional cofinancing letters are not included at this stage.

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments Yes the map is clear and the table is included with the coordinates.

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments Yes and they are attached as annexes.

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments Consideration should be given to BD indicators.

Agency's Comments

June 15, 2026:

Thank you for the comment. The Rio Marker for BD has been revised to 1.

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments Yes the taxonomy sheet is attached with the relevant key words.
Note: the fonts vary in this table.

Agency's Comments

June 15, 2026:

Thank you for the comment. The font has been streamlined.

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	6/12/2026	6/15/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		