

## **Global Opportunities for Long-term Development of artisanal and small-scale gold mining ASGM) Sector Plus - GEF GOLD + (addendum)**

GEF Secretariat Review for Program Framework Document (PFD) entry – GEF - 7

### **Basic Information**

**GEF ID**

10802

**Countries**

Global (Cote d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Guinea, Mali, Nicaragua, Sierra Leone, Zambia)

**Project Title**

Global Opportunities for Long-term Development of artisanal and small-scale gold mining ASGM) Sector Plus - GEF GOLD + (addendum)

**GEF Agency(ies)**

CI, UNEP, UNDP, UNIDO

**Agency ID**

**GEF Focal Area(s)**

Chemicals and Waste

**Program Manager**

Evelyn Swain

# PIF

Part I – Project Information

## Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

### Agency Response

Comment from PPO: Under Project Information section, Agency should tick Yes for Other programs. Corrected in the portal

## Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

### Agency Response

04/21

There is an error in the program outcomes of component 1 with an extra "1" that should be removed. The extra 1 was removed from Component 1

M and E costs are higher than what was approved in the original GOLD+ program. Please explain. The overall M&E for the whole program is about 2% of the total budget which is in line with the GEF Guidelines for projects and programs above \$10 million. During the ProDoc preparation all individual projects will revise their budgets to assure that they are in line with the GEF Guidelines of staying below 5% for projects that are up to \$5 million, 3% for projects that are between \$5million- \$10 million and 2% for projects that are more than 10 million. The GEF amounts should be redistributed with more funding going towards financing and less towards technologies.

The GEF amounts should be redistributed with more funding going towards financing and less towards technologies. GEF amounts have been redistributed with more funding going towards financing and less towards technologies.

## Co-financing

**3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

#### Agency Response

Questions from PPO:

The co-financing table needs significant work and overall needs to be checked and corrected, including checking the tagging, for example, recurrent expenditures cannot be tagged as grant.

Significant amounts of co-financing are listed as TBD private sector and "refinery", more information is needed on these.

GEF funded projects cannot be co-financing. It is not clear if that NAP implementation project listed as co-financing is the GEF funded NAP.

The description of investment mobilized is missing.

CI-GEF 04/21:

04/21

The co-financing table needs significant work and overall needs to be checked and corrected, including checking the tagging, for example, recurrent expenditures cannot be tagged as grant. Co-financing table revised. On tags, co-financing from USDoS and Switzerland labeled as

Investment expenditures cannot be tagged as grant or financing since neither category, co-financing from GEF or co-financing from others is Donor Agency while co-financing from foundations labeled as Others.

GEF funded projects cannot be co-financing. It is not clear if that NAP implementation project listed as co-financing is the GEF funded NAP. Sierra Leone co-financing updated and reference to co-financing from the NAP was removed.

Significant amounts of co-financing are listed as TBD private sector and "refinery", more information is needed on these. More information included for co-financing from the private sector and refineries.

The description of investment mobilized is missing. Investment mobilized definition included.

## **GEF Resource Availability**

**4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

**The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

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

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table E calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines?

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines: (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

#### Agency Response

Question from PPO: 3. Core Indicators (comments provided by Minna): please provide explanation on how indicative targets were estimated

04/17/2021:

Please see explanation of how core indicators were devised under the core indicators table in the portal.

04/21/2021:

Description under core indicators table in portal further revised. See text below:

The sum of mercury use reductions that will be achieved in the participating countries during the 5-year program implementation phase amounts to 59.1 metric tons. While the countries have a very specific ASGM related context, they also have in common a widespread distribution of ASGM sites over their territories. In line with the program's theory of change that is designed to remove barriers to access to finance and adoption of mercury-free technologies, to enhance formalization, and to share knowledge and lessons learned at the national and global level, mercury use reduction will be replicated after the program is finalized. A replication by a factor 3 is expected over the 10 years following completion of the program. This represents an additional 177.4 metric tons of mercury use reductions. At this time, co-benefits do not have enough data to be listed as core indicators.

While co-benefits are being considered, data is not yet available. For example, land degradation, and deforestation related implications cannot be accurately assessed until site selection has been confirmed. All potential co-benefits will be investigated during the PPG phase.

#### Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

## Agency Response

### Part II – Project Justification

#### 1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

## Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

## Agency Response

Questions and Responses 4/21

Explanation of targets is missing. Explanation included in revised justification section.

The justification needs to be improved, please include concise technical language to strengthen the rationale for the addendum.  
Justification revised

The section “New Countries added to the Program” needs to be organized and logical. It starts out listing the original GOLD+ countries and does not make a logical transition into the new countries. The country paragraphs should be clear and separated. The countries should be listed alphabetically, regionally, or in some other logical sequence. Countries listed alphabetically.

The average funding per country from GOLD+ in the program justification is not relevant to this document. The GEF considers the cost effectiveness, not averages of previously funded programs or projects. Average funding removed.

The GEBs per country should be added, either in the write up of each country or in the later section on Program Targets. Targets have been added to country specific paragraphs in the justification memo. A Table has also been included in the justification memo under ‘Revised program targets.’

The project amount for Ecuador is too high considering the past GEF investment in this country from both the GEF-6 CW UNDP project and the GEF-7 World Bank Putumayo project that includes ASGM components in Ecuador. This project should build off of those two existing projects. Project costs for Ecuador were reduced to 4,000,000. Text explaining previous planetGOLD engagement has been included in the justification memo, concept note and Minamata response document.

For Nicaragua it is not clear if the numbers for mercury are coming from the NAP. Please clarify. NAP from Nicaragua not available, data from Global Mercury Assessment 2018 was used and referenced in concept note.



The program justification and concept note has the incorrect total number of countries. The total for GOLD (8), GOLD+ (8), and GOLD+ addendum (7) is 23 countries. Number of countries corrected.

The justification includes the following sentence which is not clear. Where does the 82% figure come from? Please clarify. "Addressing the mercury use issues of these additional countries will increase the target indicator for metric tons of mercury reduced by 82%." The sentence has been removed.

In the section "Revised Program Targets", where does 512 MT mercury come from? If it is the total for the GOLD, GOLD+, and GOLD+ addendum it should be separated out so that is it clear what this addendum will contribute. Also, the GEBs per country for this addendum should be listed. The revised program targets have been updated. A table explaining totals has been included in the justification memo.

The justification and other documents should use consistent units. Corrected throughout PFD

Please include information about stakeholder engagement, including private sector, CSOs, and gender dimensions. Added to the relevant sections of the portal and justification memo.

## **2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**

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

**Agency Response**

## **3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?**

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

**Agency Response**

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in the project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

## Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

## Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

## Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

## Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?  
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

## Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

## Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

## Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**Agency Response** Safeguard screenings uploaded for all projects.

## art III – Country Endorsements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response 4/21: Letters of endorsement included for all countries.

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Comment from PPO: 4. Annex A – list of child projects, grant amount for Guinea is wrongly entered (one additional zero). Annex A updated.

Other comments:

ESS is missing for Zambia and Sierra Leone.

Response: included in resubmission.

The endorsement letters are included for Zambia and Sierra Leone. Please submit the missing endorsement letters for the other countries.

Response: All letters have now been received and uploaded to the portal.

All country NAPs should be final by the time of CEO Endorsement.

Response: Noted.

Program map and coordinates is missing.

Response: included in resubmission.

Comments on the concept note:

Cote d'Ivoire and Guinea list CI and UNEP as the agency. Please correct this if it should be UNEP.

Response: Corrected.

Mali: mercury to gold ratio of 1,44:1 does not make sense. Please clarify.

Response: Mercury to gold ratio (1.44:1) taken from the approved NAP. Concept note has been updated.

Nicaragua: it is not clear if the mercury data comes from the NAP. Please clarify

Response: NAP Nicaragua not available, data from Global Mercury Assessment 2018 was used. Stated in concept.

Ecuador: Theory of Change section should include the GOLD+ components, similar to all of the other country project write ups. Also, the UNDP audit checklist is missing and should be uploaded into the portal.

Response: Check list has been submitted via portal.

Global project:

The description of the activities doesn't adequately reflect some critical coordination elements that are in the current planetGOLD, namely efforts to create the planetGOLD community of practice and the ongoing effort to get countries to document and share work, so that evidence of what works and what doesn't is collected. Please reach out to the global child executing partner to ensure that this addendum adequately reflects the scope of the global project that is planned to continue.

Related to the above comment, the country project descriptions of their interactions with the global project need to reflect a stronger relationship, for example some (not all) of the projects talk about sharing the results of the project and lessons learned with the global project, but only at end-of-project, this needs to be a constant stream of information being transferred to the global project. All projects should have an expectation that they need to share with the planetGOLD family on an ongoing basis, not just end of project.

Please include the opportunity to use the global platform to facilitate strong regional cooperation, country projects in the same region could create horizontal connections. Some regions may be intertwined, in terms of mercury trade, gold trade, migration of miners, flow of technologies, etc, so it may make sense to try to emphasize regional sharing.

Please clarify that the global project will also continue to support the global forum.

Response: planetGOLD EA was consulted to update global concept note, and IA's were instructed to emphasize interactions with global project in individual concept notes. Global platform and transboundary/ regional opportunities were highlighted. Global forum has also been referenced.

-----



## EFSEC DECISION

## RECOMMENDATION

**Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**

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

Not at this time, some issues need to be clarified.

This is an addendum to the GOLD+ program 10569 and follows the PFD for that program.

The following GPU comments on the program addendum and justification need to be addressed:

Table B:

There is an error in the program outcomes of component 1 with an extra "1" that should be removed.

M and E costs are higher than what was approved in the original GOLD+ program. Please explain.

The GEF amounts should be redistributed with more funding going towards financing and less towards technologies.

Co-financing:

The co-financing table needs significant work and overall needs to be checked and corrected, including checking the tagging, for example, recurrent expenditures cannot be tagged as grant.

Significant amounts of co-financing are listed as TBD private sector and "refinery", more information is needed on these.

GEF funded projects cannot be co-financing. It is not clear if that NAP implementation project listed as co-financing is the GEF funded NAP.

The description of investment mobilized is missing.

Core Indicators:

Core indicator 9 and 11 are included and adequate, however this project should include other GEB's related to other co-benefits achieved from the program, for example land degradation, the Zambia project mentions land degradation several times in the project description.

Any land degradation, biodiversity, CCM, or other co-benefits that the program will achieve should be added in Table F.

Explanation of targets is missing.

Justification:

The justification needs to be improved, please include concise technical language to strengthen the rationale for the addendum.

The section “New Countries added to the Program” needs to be organized and logical. It starts out listing the original GOLD+ countries and does not make a logical transition into the new countries. The country paragraphs should be clear and separated. The countries should be listed alphabetically, regionally, or in some other logical sequence.

The average funding per country from GOLD+ in the program justification is not relevant to this document. The GEF considers the cost effectiveness, not averages of previously funded programs or projects.

The GEBs per country should be added, either in the write up of each country or in the later section on Program Targets.

The project amount for Ecuador is too high considering the past GEF investment in this country from both the GEF-6 CW UNDP project and the GEF-7 World Bank Putumayo project that includes ASGM components in Ecuador. This project should build off of those two existing projects.

For Nicaragua it is not clear if the numbers for mercury are coming from the NAP. Please clarify.

The program justification and concept note has the incorrect total number of countries. The total for GOLD (8), GOLD+ (8), and GOLD+ addendum (7) is 23 countries.

The justification includes the following sentence which is not clear. Where does the 82% figure come from? Please clarify. “Addressing the mercury use issues of these additional countries will increase the target indicator for metric tons of mercury reduced by 82%.”

In the section “Revised Program Targets”, where does 512 MT mercury come from? If it is the total for the GOLD, GOLD+, and GOLD+ addendum it should be separated out so that is it clear what this addendum will contribute. Also, the GEBs per country for this addendum should be listed here or in the individual country paragraphs.

The justification and other documents should use consistent units.

There is no mention of COVID. Please include information about COVID impacts, risks, and opportunities.

Please include information about stakeholder engagement, including private sector, CSOs, and gender dimensions.

Other comments:

ESS is missing for Zambia and Sierra Leone.

The endorsement letters are included for Zambia and Sierra Leone. Please submit the missing endorsement letters for the other countries.

All country NAPs should be final by the time of CEO Endorsement.

Program map and coordinates is missing.

Comments on the concept note:

Cote d'Ivoire and Guinea list CI and UNEP as the agency. Please correct this if it should be UNEP.

Mali: mercury to gold ratio of 1,44:1 does not make sense. Please clarify.

Nicaragua: it is not clear if the mercury data comes from the NAP. Please clarify

Ecuador: Theory of Change section should include the GOLD+ components, similar to all of the other country project write ups. Also, the UNDP audit checklist is missing and should be uploaded into the portal.

Global project:

The description of the activities doesn't adequately reflect some critical coordination elements that are in the current planetGOLD, namely efforts to create the planetGOLD community of practice and the ongoing effort to get countries to document and share work, so that evidence of what works and what doesn't is collected. Please reach out to the global child executing partner to ensure that this addendum adequately reflects the scope of the global project that is planned to continue.

Related to the above comment, the country project descriptions of their interactions with the global project need to reflect a stronger relationship, for example some (not all) of the projects talk about sharing the results of the project and lessons learned with the global project, but only at end-of-project, this needs to be a constant stream of information being transferred to the global project. All projects should have an expectation that they need to share with the planetGOLD family on an ongoing basis, not just end of project.

Please include the opportunity to use the global platform to facilitate strong regional cooperation, country projects in the same region could create horizontal connections. Some regions may be intertwined, in terms of mercury trade, gold trade, migration of miners, flow of technologies, etc, so it may make sense to try to emphasize regional sharing.

Please clarify that the global project will also continue to support the global forum.

PPO has the following comments:

1. Under Project Information section, Agency should tick Yes for Other programs:

2. Co-financing (comment provided by Minna):

(i) Co-financing from bilateral donor (USDoS, Switzerland) should be labeled as "donor Agency".

(ii) A project is not a co-financier (Piloting National Action Plan (NAP) Implementation in Sierra Leone). Please use the name of the organization that provides the funding

(iii) For foundations, please use “other” rather than “donor” source.

(iv) Please also provide indicative information on the Investment Mobilized, how it was identified?

3. Core Indicators (comments provided by Minna): please provide explanation on how indicative targets were estimated (Core Indicators 9 and 11)

4. Annex A – list of child projects, grant amount for Guinea is wrongly entered (one additional zero)

ES, 4/22/21: PPO has the following comment:

PPO reviewed the resubmission of ID 10802- Global (Unification Pilot). All comments were addressed excepting comment 4: Annex A still lists child project for Guinea with \$5,302,500 grant amount, while table D only \$5,302,000, thus a difference of **\$500**.

ES, 4/22/21: The remaining issue has been addressed. PFD is recommended for technical clearance.

## **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

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

All country NAPs should be final by the time of CEO Endorsement.

### **Review Dates**

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	3/31/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/22/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

## PIF Recommendation to CEO

### Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

This addendum updates the information provided in the GEF GOLD+ Program Framework Document (PFD) approved by the GEF Council in June 2020 (GEF ID 10569). The supplemental PFD is requesting approval for seven additional Child Projects in Latin America and Africa including – Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea, Mali, Nicaragua, Sierra Leone, Ecuador, and Zambia. The addendum reflects the increase in GEF-7 resources to be programmed and reports on incremental information (financial and core indicator targets) in the context of the new participating countries. Additional resources are also being requested for the Global Child project. The design, component structure, and the objective of GOLD+ in this addendum remains the same as that of the approved PFD. The objective is “to reduce the use of mercury in the ASGM sector in the participating countries through a holistic, multisectoral integrated formalization approach, and increasing access to finance leading to adoption of sustainable mercury free technologies and access to traceable gold supply chains.” This addendum will result in global environmental benefits of 237 metric tons of mercury reduced.