

Global Opportunities for Long-term Development of ASGM in Cote d'Ivoire

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10845

Countries

Cote d'Ivoire

Project Name

Global Opportunities for Long-term Development of ASGM in Cote d'Ivoire

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

7/29/2022

Review completed by PM

10/5/2022

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 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

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

The co-financing identified from Argor Heraeus is indicated as investment mobilized but is tagged as in-kind. Please clarify.

October 5, 2022 - Comments cleared

Agency Response

23 September 2022

Argor Heraeus co-financing has been amended.

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

Please clarify why land degradation core indicators are not included in this project.

October 5, 2022 - comment cleared.

Agency Response

23 September 2022

An explanation related to GEF Core Indicator 4 has been added. Due to lack of accurate information, land degradation targets can only be assessed upon completion of site selection.

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

Please see comment on question 7 in part I above.

October 5, 2022 - comment cleared.

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, coordinates have been provided.

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, however please provide a comment on how risks from cross border miners would be addressed.

October 5, 2022 - Comment cleared.

Agency Response

23 September 2022

Additional explanation and potential mitigation measures related to cross border mining have been added to the risk mitigation plan. The project will also engage with other planetGOLD country projects in the West Africa region (Sierra Leone, Guinea, Burkina Faso, Mali, Ghana and Nigeria) in order to better understand the movement of ASGM workforce in the region and to boost collaboration among national administrators to reduce migratory flows when possible and improve working conditions of foreign ASGM miners.

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

Please clarify how alignment and coordination by two distinct executing agencies will be achieved.

October 5, 2022 - Comment cleared

Agency Response

23 September 2022

The Institutional Arrangements Section has been modified to clarify the co-executing arrangements as requested by the government.

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 KM is fully aligned with the overall KM of the planetGOLD program.

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 Provided

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please see comments from PPO:

Child Project to be returned to the Agency due to:

1. On co-financing: SODEMI in-kind co-financing: unable to locate English translated co-financing letter. Please note that submission of English translation of co-financing letters in other language is a requirement by GEF Co-financing Policy.

2. On Gender:

- The Gender Analysis and Action Plan (Appendix 6) is in French. Please upload the English version.

- Please reflect that knowledge products and tools developed through the project (Output 4.2) are gender-responsive, for example, by specifying a target number for women's engagement and participation in related activities such as Annual Stakeholder Workshop and national and regional knowledge sharing opportunities and events; and reflecting in Activities 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 that knowledge products and other communications tools produced are gender-responsive.

- Please provide data disaggregated by sex in Activity 2.2.1, activity 1.1.4 (with reference to women having opportunity to be part of decision-making apparatus and increase their access to mine sites. Also for Activity 3.1.2: ?The project will deliver a trainings? that will target between 25-35 people [How many women?]

3. On project information: given the 4 week circulation for this child project please update the expected start date for a more realistic date

4. On the PMC Proportionality: there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5.0%, for a co-financing of \$12,971,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$648,550 instead of \$480,000, which is 3.7%. 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.

5. On the utilization of PPG: please provide some level of details on what the item International Consultants include. We kindly request agencies to provide detailed funding amount of PPG activities.

6. On the budget:

- The budget table misses the column of the responsible entity ? please include it.

- Per guidelines Financial specialist should be charged to the PMC portion of the budget. Please review and correct considering that with the expected increase of co-financing resources to PMC (see point 4 above) up to 650 K, and 10 million of the co-financing represented in grants, there is room for covering the \$40,000 of the Finance Specialist from PMC.

- There is already a Finance Specialist (see point above). Finance, Admin, HR Support is not an activity that can be financed by GEF resources as it is an unspecified expenditure ? please remove it (perhaps using this to cover the costs of the Finance Specialist above).

November 2, 2022 - Comments addressed

Agency Response

1. On co-financing: Agency Response: A translation to English has been attached to the co-financing letter from SODEMI.

2. On Gender:

Agency Response: The Gender Action plan is provided in French as it was designed with the national project counterparts and will be used by them during the execution phase.

Agency Response: As suggested, the alternative scenario section has been amended to emphasize that all activities related to Output 4.2. are gender sensitive.

Agency Response: As per request, the project will provide sex-disaggregated data on the participation of beneficiaries in activities 2.2.1 and 3.1.2. The percentage on women participation in these activities will be agreed with the project steering committee and gender expert who will provide services to the project

3. On start Date: Agency Response: The expected start date has been modified to 1st February 2023.

4. On PMC proportionality: Agency Response: The portion of co-financing to PMC has been modified to match the standards required by the GEF. The current expected co-financing contribution is \$680,000.

5. On PPG funds: Agency Response: A more detailed information has been added to Annex C: PPG funds utilisation.

6. On Budget:

Agency Response: The column of the responsible entity has been added to the budget file.

Agency Response: The Financial Specialist who will work under component 2 "Access to Finance" supporting the mining communities in their process to obtain finance from commercial banks. He/she will work on topics related to accounting, due diligence processes, export of gold, etc for the mining communities.

Admin, finance and HR support is allocated to the portion of PMC, as per GEF rules.

Agency Response: Please, see above.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Responded

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please note that the text in the budget table is too small to be read easily.

October 5, 2022 - Comment cleared

Agency Response

23 September 2022

The budget table has been revised based on the co-executing arrangement and a new version is uploaded to the portal.

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

Please respond to the comments in the review sheet, revise and resubmit for further consideration.

Oct 5, 2022 - All technical comments have been addressed. The project is being sent for PPO review.

October 18, 2022 - Please see comments from PPO.

November 2, 2022 - Comments have been addressed and the project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	8/3/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/5/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/18/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/2/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations