

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

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10422

**Countries**

Mexico

**Project Name**

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

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

10/28/2019

**Review completed by PM**

**Program Manager**

Evelyn Swain

**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 a ASGM National Action Plan.

#### **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, this includes what is expected in this type of EA.

**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 ASGM NAPs.

**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.

**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.

**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** Yes. The country has already done a Minamata Initial Assessment.

**Agency Response**

**Goals, Objectives, and Activities.**

Is the project framework sufficiently described?

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

**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion** Yes, the project has included stakeholder engagement.

**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** Gender aspects are included in the project design.

**Agency Response**

27/01/2020

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

In line with other NAP projects under review and as agreed with the Gender focal point at GEFSEC, the 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** Yes.

## **Agency Response**

Cost Effectiveness.

Is the project cost effective?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** The costs and outcomes are what is expected for this kind of EA.

## **Agency Response**

Cost Ranges

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

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

## **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**

The OFP has changed a new Endorsement Letter signed by the current OFP is required.

ES, 6/1/20: A new letter of endorsement is provided.

### **Agency Response**

New endorsement letter provided. Please note that the older one could not be removed from the portal (the delete button doesn't appear for this document).

### **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**

Not at this time, an Endorsement Letter signed by the current OFP is required.

ES, 6/1/20: CEO Endorsement is recommended.

**Review Dates**

**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**

The Minamata Convention on Mercury controls the use of mercury. Article 7 of the Convention controls the use of mercury in the artisanal and small-scale gold mining sector. Parties to the Convention that have artisanal and small-scale gold mining in their territories that uses mercury, on determining that there is a more than insignificant use of mercury in the sector can notify the Convention of this use. Once a Party notifies such use it is required to undertake the development of a national action plan which sets out the action plan the Party will implement to phase out of mercury in the sector. These national action plans are enabling activities under the Convention and are a requirement for the financial mechanism to fund.

The Government of Mexico has ratified the convention and made a notification under Article 7; therefore, it is eligible for funding for the development of a national action plan for the ASGM sector.

This project has been reviewed and follows GEF policy and is consistent with the requirements set out in the Minamata Convention and the GEF 7 CW programming directions. The project on completion will both allow the Government to fulfill its obligations as a Party to the Minamata Convention and to act to reduce and eventually eliminate the use of mercury in its ASGM sector.