

Global Opportunities for the Long-term Development of ASGM (GOLD+) in Uganda

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10618

Countries

Uganda

Project Name

Global Opportunities for the Long-term Development of ASGM (GOLD+) in Uganda

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

12/2/2021

Review completed by PM

2/16/2022

Program Manager

Anil Sookdeo

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

Project Type

FSP

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 Yes

Agency Response

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, however please correct the spelling of Argor in the co-financing table.

Dec 17, 2021 - Comment addressed

Agency Response

3 December 2021

Spelling of Argor has been corrected.

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 The core indicators remain realistic.

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, core indicators on improved landscapes has been provided in Yrd

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

All risks including Covid and Climate have been accounted for an appropriate mitigation measures have been proposed.

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. The project is fully aligned with the planetGOLD KM framework.

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 Project Results

Framework is provided and well presented.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please replace figures that appear pixellated in the submission.

Dec 17, 2021 - comment addressed.

PPO Comments:

1. Agency Fee is above 9.0% (at PPG request was correctly calculated at \$495,000 ? at CEO Endorsement the Agency is requesting \$552,500, which means they calculated it at 9.5%) ? please amend.

2. The expected completion date is incorrect. Please change to 4/30/2027 if the project duration is expected to be 60 months.

3. There is no proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$12,746,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$637,300 instead of \$270,000 (which is 2.1%). As the costs associated with the project management have to 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 amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

4. Core Indicators: Please include GEF Core Indicators and appropriate targets in Annex A ?Project Results Framework?. So far only indicator 9 (reduced chemicals) is included, but still missing 4 (landscapes) and 11 (beneficiaries). If these indicators are not being used please remove.

5. On the Budget:

i. Office costs for equipment and furniture, audit costs, small equipment should be charged to the PMC.

ii. Unspecific professional fees cannot be charged to the GEF Portion of PMC ? please remove it.

iii. HR Procurement and administration officer is part of the project?s staff ? as such, it has to be charged to bot portions of PMC (GEF portion and co-financing portion). With the increase requested in point 3 above, there will be enough funds to cover this personnel from the co-financing portion allocated to PMC.

6. The budgeted M&E plan in section 9 totals \$165,000 while in the Budget in Annex E I n Portal totals \$135,000. Please have all the figures consistent across all the budgets.

Feb 23, 2022 - All comments except the following has been addressed:

5. Comment on budget: while i. and ii. were addressed, iii. was not. The explanation provided by the Agency says ?Project components 1,2, and 3 will require many national and international contracts and component 4 will have substantial organisation of national workshop/meetings, therefore, the Technical Contract Officer have been charged against outputs. The Finance Officer is charged to the PMC to report on these expenditures?. This means that the HR Procurement and administration officer (which was the subject of comment iii.) was transformed into two positions: Finance Officer and Technical Contract Officer, with the later being charged to PMC. However, the tasks are administrative in nature, which means they are part of the project?s execution . The argument of ?components 1, 2, and 3 requiring national and international contracts? confirm the administrative scope ? hence this has to be covered by PMC (with the increase of the co-financing portion allocated to PMC, this might be doable).

One additional issue: as it is, the budget line ?Project Management Support? does not qualify to be covered by GEF funds as this is not a concrete activity ? please review.

March 7, 2022 - Comments addressed.

Agency Response

23 December 2021

Pixellated figures have been replaced.

26 January 2022

1. Agency fee figure has been adjusted on project document and in Portal.
2. The expected completion date has been adjusted on project document and in Portal from February 2022 to February 2027 (duration 60 months).
3. Co-financing contribution across components and PMC have been adjusted to show appropriate proportionality (Please refer to Appendix 3).
4. Indicators 4 and 11 targets have been included in Project Results Framework (Please refer to Annex A).
5. On the budget (Please refer to Appendix 2):
 1. Descriptions related to equipment support for project sites have been adjusted.
 2. Unspecified professional fees have been removed.
 3. Project components 1,2 and 3 will require many national and international contracts and component 4 will have substantial organization of national workshops/meetings. Therefore, the Technical Contract Officer is charged against components as they perform technical management of project activities. The Finance Officer is charged against PMC to report on these expenditures. This is noted on the bottom of the budget table.
 6. M&E total at \$135,000 as per the proposed budget table. The M&E (Table 6) in the project document includes \$30,000 which is relate to final audit costs. This cost is charged against PMC and noted in the Table.

24 February 2022:

-The Contracts Officer position has been removed from the administrative support staff list. This position will be supported by the co-financing provided by the EA of the project.

-The title ?Project Management Support? has been revised to Project Manager.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Council comments
addressed

Agency Response
STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request STAP comments
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 PPG utilisation has been
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

Please address comments in the review.

Jan 12, 2022 - Please address the PPO comments.

Feb 23, 2022 - Please address outstanding comments.

March 7, 2022 - Comments addressed and project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/2/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/17/2021	

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)	1/12/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/23/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/7/2022

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations