



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

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11585

Countries

Costa Rica

Project Name

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

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

3/27/2024

Review completed by PM

4/26/2024

Program Manager

Evelyn Swain

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

The general project information table lists needs the region which is currently listed as the country name.

ES, 5/7/24: In the portal is it still not correct.

Agency's Comments

Response 07 May2024

We feel, the project being a country specific project, the portal selection is correct. i.e.,



* Global Regional Country

Costa Rica x

If we select the Region option, this will denote it's a regional project.

Global
 Regional
 Country

Latin America and Caribbean x Costa Rica x

Please we stand to be corrected and advised.

esponse07/05/2024

This a National project in the Latin America and Caribbean. The document general project information section requests for Region and Country information which we have updated and uploaded the document.

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title:	Global Opportunities for the Long-Term Development of the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining Sector in Costa Rica - planetGOLD Costa Rica		
Region:	Latin America and the Caribbean	GEF Project ID:	TBC
Country(ies):	Costa Rica	Type of Project	2 STEP MSP
GEF Agency(ies):	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	TBC

However, in the GEF Portal, the general project information section does not allow selecting both the region and the country at the same time. ?

One can only select Region option and list the countries if the project is a regional project.

Other GEF Agencies Agency Project ID ⓘ

+ Add Other Agency

Global
 Regional
 Country

Costa Rica x

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, the project summary is well articulated.

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 Yes, the components, outcomes and theory of change are well developed. The theory of change also includes the underlining assumptions.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

On Gender: Please ensure that the policies and plans developed are gender responsive (e.g., Output 1.2), and in all activities engaging stakeholders, please ensure that gender experts are engaged. Under M&E, ensure the gender dimensions are reported and monitored on and the GAP developed and budgeted.

ES, 5/7/24: Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

Response 07/05/2024

These elements had been captured in Appendix 2 ? Gender Equality and Women Empowerment Strategy. However, specific phrasing has been included in the PIF to ensure these important elements are observed and followed.

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.

Agency's Comments

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 Yes, the situation is well articulated.

Agency's Comments

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 The project is well justified.

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 There is a clear theory of change for the project.

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

There is clear implementation arrangements.

This project will coordinate with the planetGOLD Program and other GOLD countries.

Agency's Comments

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 Core indicators are adequate.

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 Yes, risks have been assessed. At the time of CEO Endorsement please use the new Council approve risk table.

Agency's Comments

Response 07/05/2024

The new Council approved risk table has been used at this time and will be consistently updated throughout CEO endorsement, implementation, mid-term review and terminal evaluation.?

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, this project will transform the ASGM sector and will have the potential for scale.

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, this project is aligned with the GEF-8 CW strategy, Minamata Convention, and national priorities under the ASGM NAP.

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 aligned with Minamata Convention and national priorities under the ASGM NAP.

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 NA

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

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 NA

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments Yes from the CW Focal Area.

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments NA

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? (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.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

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 Yes.

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 CommentsYes.

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 CommentsYes.

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 CommentsYes.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's CommentsYes.

Agency's Comments

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

There is a comment on gender that needs to be addressed.

ES, 5/7/24: There is a remining issue with the project information table.

ES, 5/9/24: PIF and PPG are recommended for technical clearance.

Agency's CommentsThe comment on gender is noted and has been addressed above and in the PIF.?

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	4/26/2024	5/3/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/7/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/9/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Review

Agency Response

Additional Review (as necessary)