



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5846		
Country/Region:	Guyana		
Project Title:	Enhancing Biodiversity Protection through Strengthened Monitoring, Enforcement and Uptake of Environmental Regulations in Guyana's Gold Mining Sector		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5384 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$803,653
Co-financing:	\$3,538,617	Total Project Cost:	\$4,342,270
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Lyes Ferroukhi

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?		5/15/2014 Guyana ratified the CBD in 1994.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?		5/15/2014 Yes. The OFP endorsed the project for \$880,000 on April 7, 2014.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the STAR allocation? 		5/15/2014 Yes.

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 		5/15/2014 Yes. They are using their marginal flexibility to use money from LD and BD together.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>		5/15/2014 Yes. This project identifies the Aichi Targets it will help achieve.
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?		5/15/2014 Yes. This project is consistent with national strategies including the NBSAP.
	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?		5/15/2014 Yes. This project describes very well the problems caused by mining in Guyana and how they will seek to address them.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?		5/15/2014 Yes.
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?		5/15/2014 Yes. This project focuses on one of the greatest threats to Guyana's biodiversity - mining. Beyond the footprint of the mining itself in the intact forests of Guyana, poor and illegal mining practices are especially detrimental to Guyana's rich freshwater biodiversity. These practices also lead to land degradation and the release of mercury into the environment. Yes. Through a small investment, this project will help direct ongoing and growing efforts towards reducing threats towards biodiversity.
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		5/15/2014 No. This project does not mention gender. It is unclear women's participation in mining activities and, if they are participants, how their involvement in these activities will be provided for. June 3, 2014 Gender issues now addressed adequately.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their		5/15/2014 Yes. This project provides for the participation of CSOs and indigenous

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	engagement explained?		peoples.
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		5/15/2014 Yes.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	5/15/2014 Yes. It would be good to learn lessons across UNDP's portfolio of mining projects.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 		5/15/2014 This project provides a targeted intervention of an important challenge - gold mining. Despite including extractive industries in the GEF strategy for mainstreaming biodiversity, we have had very few projects in this area. This project seeks to engage with the Mining School to educate miners about better practices incorporating biodiversity considerations while increasing enforcement. The project will work to mainstream biodiversity in the Mining School and mining enforcement institutions, which should provide for the long term sustainability of these efforts. These institutions are self-sustaining and by training teachers the impacts will be long term.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			As previously mentioned, the GEF has very few projects in this area. With the Minamata Convention coming on-line, mining is a natural area of cooperation between BD, LD, and Mercury. This MSP without a PPF phase provides a good opportunity to learn about strategies to integrate biodiversity into mining practices through the combination of capacity building and enforcement. The lessons learned from this project and a related UNDP project in Colombia also targeting gold mining can help guide our investments in this sector.
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		N/A
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		5/15/2014 Yes. This relatively small project could have significant impact.
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		5/15/2014 Yes.
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-		5/15/2014 No. Co-financing letters from the Ministry of Finance and WWF are missing. June 3, 2014

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	financing been confirmed?		Cofinancing letters now included.
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?		5/15/2014 No. Project management costs should be 9.5% of the grant. June 3, 2014 Management costs adjusted correctly.
	19. <u>At PIE</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?		June 3, 2014 NA
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		June 3, 2014 NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		5/15/2014 No. No tracking tool was submitted. June 3, 2014 Tracking tool submitted.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		5/15/2014 Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? • The Council? • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?		
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		5/15/2014 No. While the project is sound, please submit the tracking tool and 2 missing co-finance letters. In addition, please include information about the gender implications of this project. June 3, 2014 Yes.
	First review*		May 16, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)		June 03, 2014
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**