



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9697		
Country/Region:	Global (Burkina Faso, Colombia, Guyana, Indonesia, Kenya, Mongolia, Peru, Philippines)		
Project Title:	Global Knowledge Management and Exchange of Child Project Results Through Networking and Outreach Activities for the GEF GOLD Program		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Chemicals and Waste
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CW-2 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$8,000,000
Co-financing:	\$17,767,604	Total Project Cost:	\$25,967,604
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Anil Sookdeo	Agency Contact Person:	Ludovic Beraudat

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹		
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?		
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,		

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response	
	market transformation, scaling, and innovation?			
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?			
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?			
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?			
	Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
		• The STAR allocation?		
• The focal area allocation?				
• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access				
• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?				
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	PPG clearance is recommended by the program manager.		
	Review Date			
	Review	December 20, 2016		
	Additional Review (as necessary)			
	Additional Review (as necessary)			

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	N/A	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>1. Did the project in the investigation of financial/investment models explore the use of national commercial funding institutions such as commercial banks, credits union, mining associations, SME development schemes? If so, what was the conclusion on these funding sources. It is of importance that GOLD be able to help to unlock these national funding sources, particularly as countries strive to formalize the sector these national sources of funding would be crucial to the long term sustainability in the sector. As such and we would like to see it included in the financial instruments/vehicles/mechanisms etc.</p> <p>2. The project is missing how it plans to treat with national sources of financing. An important part of the knowledge platform is to bring information to the child projects to support the choice of interventions. A number of countries in the GOLD program will be working with commercial banks at the national</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>level. In this regard it would be expected that the global knowledge platform look into the best practices in this approach in order to support these projects better. Please include these elements into the global project.</p> <p>3. Gender:</p> <p>The program has done a good job addressing gender dimensions. Bringing gender issues to the forefront of this program is key since women, men, boys and girls are exposed to harmful substances in different ways and to varying degrees depending on where they work and live, and have different needs and opportunities to benefit from as well as to contribute to the reduction of global mercury emissions. It is really encouraging to see that the project has identified key entry points to address gender in important areas such as gap analysis and consultations (output 1.1) and that the project is planning to develop guidance based on gender related data to inform investors about mercury health issues. It is also good that the project has identified awareness raising on gender as a key component (output 2.3) to ensure that learning</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>opportunities are available and effective for both men and women and also embedding gender considerations in materials/best practices.</p> <p>Having that said, there are three areas that we seek further clarification on, or that we need more detail.</p> <p>a. It seems that they much sex-disaggregated information has not been collected at this stage. Considering that gender-disaggregated data on chemicals and waste is thin, the project might have underestimated the effort/work that needs to go into analysis and effective awareness raising on these issues. Can this be clarified.</p> <p>b. It is indicated that the country level projects will include sex-disaggregated indicators, but were there any efforts to identifying at least one common gender or disaggregated indicator that could be aggregated across the projects.</p> <p>c. There does not seem to be any mentioning about ensuring greater participation of women in consultative processes (e.g. the platform for information exchange between the GOLD country projects and dialogues between participating</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>investors and miners. There might be an opportunity here to making this a more intentional effort in the project moving forward.</p> <p>Mar 19, 2018 (AS) - Comments cleared</p>	
	<p>3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?</p>	<p>Budget. It is unclear what the role of the ASGM supply chain expert is and it seems to duplicate the roles in the project management unit. Please revise the budget lines on the ASGM supply chain expert. Our analysis indicates that the majority of the funds in this budget line would better be placed in the funding that is going towards the coordinating project management unit which will be working on the finance components etc. Also for outreach to the private sector etc this would be better placed in the communications piece with technical input from a private sector specialist. Additionally the role of ASGM supply chain expert should be put out for international tender.</p> <p>Communications. A key component of the GEF GOLD program is clear communications within and outside of the ASGM sector. This is critical for the program to be able to meet its objectives. In this regard the</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>resources should be increased for communications.</p> <p>Mar 19, 2018 (AS) - Please revise the budget to keep the PMU costs for the executing agency within the budget in table B for project management. As this global child is intended to coordinate the overall program there should be a coordination budget line included that will cover meetings of the child projects etc.</p> <p>May 14, 2018 (AS) - the budget has been revised - comment cleared.</p>	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	<p>In the risk analysis the section on "Prevailing cultural norms and practices (negative views on outsiders, resistance to change), prevent project activities" should be strengthened by the consideration of getting the support of local NGO's, CSO's or other such community groups that can help to bridge the executing partners with the mining communities.</p> <p>Mar 19 2018 (AS) - comment cleared</p>	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	<p>Co-financing from UNIDO and RJC are blank in the document. Will these two organizations provide co-financing?</p> <p>May 19, 2018 (AS) - Comment cleared</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	Yes	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	N/A	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	Yes	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	Yes	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	<p>Overall, the proposal covers the key KM aspects. But there is some room for improvement as follows:</p> <p>Among the three proposed project components, the one that focuses on outreach to financial services and investment sector (component one) refers to a "fund" in Output 1.2. This section could use some clarification as to what this fund hopes to achieve, how it supports KM within the context of the project, what types of initiatives it will fund (clarify: "testing mechanisms"), proposed range for funding size, types of envisioned recipients, etc.?</p> <p>We do not see a clear analysis of the existing status of GOLD relevant knowledge and learning in each</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>proposed country and how the project will link to each country's existing NAP (or other national plans/programs) and the existing policy, outreach and learning structures/process within each country.</p> <p>The knowledge platform is a great idea to create and facilitate a community of practice for GOLD. The GEF has invested heavily in a similar community of practice in international waters: IW-LEARN (\$20 million in the past 15 years) and there is much to learn from IW-LEARN in how to create and manage a knowledge platform (website, etc.) to facilitate a community of practice. This project should takes lessons from IW:LEARN into consideration. Thus, it would be great for the project document to talk about how it is learning from IW:LEARN – a successful GEF investment in knowledge sharing, networking, etc. How will the project report results and measure impact? What are the KM performance indicators that will be used to track performance for each component and per activity/target audience? These should be clearly identified, tracked against baselines and included in performance reporting for the project. These</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>indicators should be SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and Time-bound). The website structure on page 33 seems to lack the creation and maintenance of a "global/regional/national GOLD experts roster" which would be very helpful.</p> <p>It is important to develop the platform in a way that enables it to link to other national, global or agency knowledge platforms for data sharing, transfer, on-line collaboration, etc.</p> <p>Budget breakdown per country and per component has not been provided. A link to latest science on this issue should be highlighted and the proposed knowledge platform should link to relevant scientific organizations and knowledge bases.</p> <p>Explain connection to the GEF's overall KM approach and knowledge sharing/learning efforts across the partnership, especially with an eye towards integration, mainstreaming, replication and scale-up, leveraging public and private investments.</p> <p>It will be important to put together a management team that is qualified and experienced in KM and outreach, and knowledgeable of each country's specifics, especially in the context of GOLD. Team member ToRs should</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>clearly reflect these requirements.</p> <p>May 18, 2018 (AS) - Comment cleared, however in the knowledge component please allow it to be sufficiently flexible to take on emerging areas of work relevant to the ASGM sector including block chain technology.</p>	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	<p>Overall this is a good proposal however there is some room for strengthening and clarifying. Please see comments in the review that needs to be addressed before a final determination can be made. Please pay attention to the need to strengthen the KM, Communications and gender aspects of the project as these are key elements to the overall GEF GOLD Program.</p> <p>Also the title of the project does not indicate that is part of the GEF GOLD program so this would need to</p>	

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>be included as for example "Global Knowledge Management and Exchange of Programme Project Results Through Networking and Outreach Activities for the GEF GOLD Program"</p> <p>March 19, 2018 (AS) - Not at this time. Please address the comments.</p> <p>May 14, 2018 (AS) - All comments have been addressed. The project is being recommended for CEO endorsement.</p>	
Review Date	Review	December 14, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 14, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		