



Global Opportunities for Long-term Development of ASGM in Zambia

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10837

Countries

Zambia

Project Name

Global Opportunities for Long-term Development of ASGM in Zambia

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

9/14/2023

Review completed by PM

11/15/2023

Program Manager

Anil Sookdeo

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

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

Please clarify output 3.2 and its contribution to the project's objective.

Agency Response Output 3.2 (Improved waste and tailings management implemented in selected sites) will contribute to the project's objective by upgrading the knowledge and capacity of ASGM mine operators in the management of tailings contaminated with mercury, discharged during the operations. The output will also reduce the negative impacts of ASGM activities in Zambia towards both, the environment and the local communities nearby.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

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

Agency Response One new co-financing institution (Artisanal Gold Council) has been added to the CEO Endorsement package.

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 Core indicator 4 was increased. The core indicator estimates are realistic for this project.

Agency Response

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

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

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

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

Yes

Agency Response

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yes

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

September 28, 2023:

PPO comments:

1. Core indicators: GEF Core Indicators and their targets need to be explicitly mentioned in the Results Framework in Annex A. Please consider including the core indicators 4 and 11 and their targets in the annex A.

2. Geographic location data: in Annex D on Project Map and Coordinates, please consider inserting the geographic location of the site directly under the dedicated data entry field 'GEO LOCATION INFORMATION'? it is left blank.

3. Knowledge Management: The project document includes a set of knowledge management and communications activities, especially in Component 4, including knowledge and communications products to share key messages, lessons and experiences, trainings, workshops, knowledge sharing platform and dissemination of lessons learned and good practice. The project document refers to a communication strategy and includes a set of outreach and dissemination activities, including in connection with the global planetGOLD knowledge platform. The project's results framework lists targeted KM and communications deliverables. However, while a number of line items in the overall budget are related to KM (meetings, trainings, KM officer, etc.), a clear budget and timeline for the implementation of KM&L and communications activities have not been provided.

The agency is requested to clarify the budget and timeline for the implementation of key KM&L and communications activities, as part of Component 4 and beyond. This info can be presented in a simple table in the KM section of project document.

4. Gender: The project activities under Outputs 1.2 and 2.1 seem to generate some socio-economic benefits that benefit women. If this is the case (and intention of the project), please respond Yes to the corresponding gender tag.

5. On the proportionality of the PMC: the co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportionate compared with the GEF contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$20,400,000 (even if all in-kind), the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$1,020,000 instead of \$500,000 (which is 2.5%). As the costs associated with the project management must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please ask the Agency to amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion:

6. Status of utilization of PPG: please ask the agency to clarify:

(i) What ?professional services? entail;

(ii) What other direct costs entail;

(iii) The sum of Totals in columns amount spent to date + amount committed is \$84,437 instead of \$100,000. The un-spent balance of \$15,563 must be returned to the GEFTF via the Trustee in accordance with the signed FPA between Trustee and Agency

7. Budget table:

(i) The expenditure category the Administrative and financial support cannot be covered by GEF Funds please cover this costs (\$40,188) with co-financing and redistribute among other expenditures/activities.

(ii) Computers, office equipment and operating costs should generally be charged to PMC but not to project components

October 24, 2023 - Sending to PPO for review of the responses.

November 6, 2023 - Please see unresolved comments:

On PPG: the Agency responded:

o (i) "Professional services" entail consulting services provided by the Executing Agency of the PPG phase.

o (ii) "Other direct costs" entail administrative support.

On this, please ask the Agency to: (i) include details presented in the answer (entail consulting services provided by the Executing Agency of the PPG phase) in the table, but adding the object of these services; and (ii) Administrative support is not an eligible activity under PPG, so these funds (\$3,287) need also to be returned to the Trustee.

Additionally, the table has not been amended as it still shows the wrong calculations: the difference between the budgeted amount (\$100,000) and the amount spent (\$77,747) minus

the amount committed (\$6,690) is \$15,563 which should be shown as the amount to be returned to the Trustee (adding the above mentioned \$3,287). Please ask the Agency to amend accordingly.

- On budget: The expenditure category the "Administrative and financial support" cannot be covered by GEF Funds " please cover this costs (\$40,188) with co-financing and redistribute among other expenditures/activities. The Agency responded:

(i) Based on previous GEF7 approvals for planetGOLD child projects: 10618, 10619, 10844 and 10845, admin/financial support were covered by PMC. Please, let us know if rules have changed for GEF-7 projects.

We reviewed our reviews on the projects mentioned by the Agency and found the following:

On 10618: Yes, admin support " a Finance Officer was charged to the PMC for 40k. Also Computers charged to components.

On 10619: Yes, admin support (finance officer and technical contract officer) charged to PMC. No computers charged to this project.

On 10844: Yes, admin support (Finance, Admin, HR Support) charged to PMC. Also Computers charged to components.

On 10845: Yes, admin support (Finance, Admin, HR Support) charged to PMC. No computers charged to this project.

The GEF requirements have not changed: aligned with what we have in Guidelines, we have normally requested Agencies to use PMC cover positions associated with the project's execution (i.e. Finance Officer " Administrative Assistant) instead of a generic budget line named "Administrative support". While we have been doing our best to consistently provide the same guidance, it is evident that sometimes we have failed in doing so. That said, when we detect that there is an inconsistency (like in this case), we need to point it out accordingly. Therefore, please include the name of the position that will carry out the "Administrative support" (as it was done for ID 10618), otherwise, it will be understood as an overhead covered by the Executing Partner.

November 15, 2023 - Sending to PPO for review of agency response.

November 19, 2023 - The responses to the comments does not appear to have been saved in the portal. Please revise and save again.

November 21, 2023 - Sending to PPO for review of agency response.

Agency Response

Response 18/10/2023

1. Core Indicators: GEF Core Indicators 4 and 11 have been added to Annex A.
2. Geographic location data: This information has been updated in ?Annex E Maps & Coordinates?.
3. Knowledge Management: A table detailing the requested info has been added to the Knowledge Management section.
4. Gender: This has been modified in the corresponding sections.
5. On the proportionality of PMC: The co-financing of PMC has been updated to reflect proportionality with GEF?s contribution to the project. In addition, a new co-financing source (Artisanal Gold Council) has been added.
6. Status of utilization of PPG:
 - (i) "Professional services" entail consulting services provided by the Executing Agency of the PPG phase.
 - (ii) "Other direct costs" entail administrative support.
 - (iii) Conservation International, as Implementing Agency during the PPG phase retained the balance of the PPG funds, therefore, CI will be responsible to return the un-spent balance to the GEF TF.
7. Budget table:
 - (i) Based on previous GEF7 approvals for planetGOLD child projects: 10618, 10619, 10844 and 10845, admin/financial support were covered by PMC. Please, let us know if rules have changed for GEF-7 projects.

(ii) Based on previous GEF7 approvals for planetGOLD child projects 10618, 10619, 10844 and 10845, computers, office equipment and operating costs were charged to project components. Please, let us know if rules have changed for GEF-7 projects.

Response 20/11/2023

The updated missing information from the previous review has been inserted in the corresponding sections of the portal

Response 07/11/2023

On PPG:

The information requested has been added.

UNEP has informed Conservation International (PPG's Implementing Agency) about the non-eligibility of certain costs and extended the request to return the funds to the Trustee.

Conservation International has provided an updated version of the PPG funds status as of November 2023.

2) On Budget:

The budget line description has been amended to reflect the information as per approved project 10618

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Council comments have been addressed

Agency Response

STAP comments

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

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Provided

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Provided

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
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

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

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Sept 20, 2023 - Technical review completed - minor comments to be addressed. Project being sent for PPO screen.

September 28, 2023 - Please sent PPO comments.

October 24, 2023 - Sending responses for PPO's review.

November 6, 2023 - Please see unresolved comments.

November 15, 2023 - Sending for PPO to review agency responses.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	9/20/2023	10/17/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/24/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/6/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/15/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/19/2023	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations