

# Development of National Action Plan for the Artisanal and Small Scale Gold Mining in Costa Rica

**Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation**

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10423

**Countries**

Costa Rica

**Project Name**

Development of National Action Plan for the Artisanal and Small Scale Gold Mining in Costa Rica

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

10/28/2019

**Review completed by PM**

11/15/2019

**Program Manager**

Yuki Shiga

**Focal Area**

Chemicals and Waste

**Project Type**

EA

## **Expedited Enabling Activity req (CEO)**

### **Part 1: Project Information**

#### **Focal area elements**

**Is the enabling activity aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes. This is an enabling activity for the Minamata Convention.

**Agency Response**

Project description summary

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes

**Agency Response**

Co-financing

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

No co-financing is required for this EA.

**Agency Response**

GEF Resource Availability

Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes

**Agency Response**

**Are they within the resources available from:  
The STAR allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**The focal area allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes. It is within the recommended budget of \$500,000.

**Agency Response**

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**Focal area set-aside?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

#### **Agency Response**

**Is the financing presented adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes. To ensure cost effectiveness, infrastructure and human resources available within the national stakeholders and the executing agency will be wisely utilized. Most project activities will be carried out by national experts. This will foster an increase in local and national capacity to manage mercury and will contribute to the cost effectiveness of the project through reduced consultancy fees and travel expenses.

#### **Agency Response**

**Part 2: Enabling Activity Justification**

**Background and Context.**

**Are the achievements of previously implemented enabling activities cited since the country(ies) became a party to the Convention?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

This is the first National Action Plan for ASGM.

#### **Agency Response**

**Goals, Objectives, and Activities.**

**Is the project framework sufficiently described?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

12/02/2020

Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed.

---

Please provide further information on how this project will be executed. One paragraph states "...executed by MINAE with the support of the BCCC-SCRC" while another states "MINAE will co-execute the project". Please clarify whether the project will be co-executed by two agencies or by one agency with support from other institution.

### **Agency Response**

**27/01/2020**

Clarification has been provided in Part I and in the project stakeholders section

**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes

### **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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

12/02/2020

Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed.

---

Please provide some additional general statements on gender, drawing on existing national relevant gender disaggregated data/information.

### **Agency Response**

27/01/2020

Additional text specific to Costa Rica has been added at the end of Section A

Additionally, the following gender aspects have been strengthened:

- Available national information has been added at the end of section A
- Additional activities have been added in components 1 and 2
- Gender section has been extended to provide additional reference material

#### **Monitoring and Evaluation.**

**Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

12/02/2020

Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed.

---

The M&E budget includes \$10,000 independent financial audit. Please charge this to PMC.

[https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/EN\\_GEF.C.52.Inf\\_.06.Rev\\_.01\\_Guidelines\\_on\\_the\\_Project\\_and\\_Program\\_Cycle\\_Policy\\_0.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/EN_GEF.C.52.Inf_.06.Rev_.01_Guidelines_on_the_Project_and_Program_Cycle_Policy_0.pdf)

### **Agency Response**

27/01/2020

Costs of independent auditing have been included in project management

#### **Cost Effectiveness.**

**Is the project cost effective?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes

**Agency Response**

Cost Ranges

If there was a deviation in the cost range, was this explained?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

No deviation.

**Agency Response**

Part III. Endorsement/ Approval by OFP

Country endorsement

Has the project been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF database?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes

**Agency Response**

Response to Comments

Are all the comments adequately responded to? (only as applicable)



**GEF Secretariat Comment**

**Agency Response**

Other Agencies comments?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Council comments

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

STAP Comments

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Convention Secretariat comments

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

CSOs comments

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

GEFSEC DECISION

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is CEO Endorsement/approval recommended?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

12/02/2020

This PIF is recommended for technical clearance

---

Not yet. Please address GEFSEC comments on below:

- Goals, Objectives, and Activities
- M&E Plan
- Gender equality and women's empowerment

**Review Dates**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**Response to Secretariat comments**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**Response to Secretariat comments**

<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

Style