



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

GEF ID:	9276		
Country/Region:	Regional (Burundi, Central African Republic, Congo, Kenya, Swaziland, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe)		
Project Title:	Regional Project on the Development of National Action Plans for the Artisanal and Small Scale Gold Mining in Africa		
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-1 Program 2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$4,000,000
Co-financing:	\$50,000	Total Project Cost:	\$4,050,000
PIF Approval:	March 14, 2016	Council Approval/Expected:	April 19, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ogawa Masako	Agency Contact Person:	Kevin Helps,

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	MO August 7 2015 The GEF acknowledges that INC6 discussed the guideline for the preparation of national action plans required the Article 7. Currently the GEF initial guideline is only available, and the project should be aligned with this guideline. Please see box 5. Please explain the effectiveness and efficiency to implement ASGM NAP	A regional approach is considered the most efficient effective mechanism to implement enabling activities such as the ASGM NAP. The approach allows for the identification of common areas of work, opportunities for cooperation, and the use of the same pool of resources as consultants in the region. Ultimately the regional approach will support cost sharing and the exchange of information and knowledge on the ASGM in the

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)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>project as regional project. Please clarify if Uganda has notified the Minamata Secretariat that ASGM is more than insignificant in its territory according to the Article 7 paragraph 3 of the Convention.</p> <p>MO August 14, 2015 Comment cleared.</p>	<p>participating countries. In addition, ASGM can be considered as having significant trans-boundary implications that can only be identified and tackled through regional cooperation. Uganda has also notified the Minamata Convention that ASGM emissions are more than insignificant in the country. The notification letter is attached to this re-submission for reference.</p>
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>MO August 7 2015 Please see box 1 regarding ASGM in Uganda. Remaining 7 participating countries has already notified.</p> <p>MO August 14, 2015 Comment cleared.</p>	<p>Uganda has also notified the Minamata Convention that ASGM emissions are more than insignificant in the country. The notification letter is attached to this re-submission for reference.</p>
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>MO August 14 2015 Yes. This is enabling activity for the Minamata Convention on Mercury.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>MO August 14 2015 Yes. This is enabling activity for the Minamata Convention on Mercury.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>MO August 7 2015 Based on the current initial guidelines, the following activities are not eligible.</p> <p>Component 3; - Economics, such as earnings per</p>	<p>The project content followed the guidance developed by the Global Mercury Partnership that was submitted for consideration to the Parties during INC 6 and will be re-submitted for adoption during INC 7. As such it is considered as consistent with the requirements set out</p>

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>capita, mercury supply, use and demand, information on gold trade and export, cost of living, and access to finance for miners. The project will search in particular for information about gender and children aspects of the ASGM economics;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information about access to basic education and other services in mining communities; - Known information about the influence of ASGM practices and policies in neighboring countries. <p>Component 4;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluation mechanism for the NAP; <p>Activity 4.3: Final regional workshop to identify lessons learned and opportunities for future cooperation in the NAP implementation</p> <p>MO August 14 2015 The submission by the contact group on financial issues in INC6 (UNEP(DTIE)Hg/INC.6/CRP.8) is as follows;</p> <p>4. Request the Global Environment Facility to consider the following activities when providing financial resources to developing countries and countries with economies in transition:</p>	<p>Article 7 of the Minamata Convention</p> <p>Information related to « earnings per capita, cost of living and access to finance » can be considered as part of the requirement to complete an « analysis and characterization of the ASGM sector, including the main mining areas, the miners/private sector involved with the relevant stakeholders and the level of formalization », which is eligible according to the GEF guidelines, as part of Annex C of the Minamata Convention. This will be developed in project component 4 . This information is considered as highly relevant to the development of any alternative strategy to the use of mercury in the ASGM sector;</p> <p>« Mercury supply, use and demand » can be considered part of the development of « baseline consumption of mercury », which is eligible according to the GEF guidelines, as part of Annex C of the Minamata Convention and will also be developed under project component 4;</p> <p>Known information about the influence of ASGM practices and policies in neighbouring countries are considered as necessary to develop « Strategies for managing trade and preventing the diversion of mercury compounds from both foreign and domestic sources to use</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>(a) Enabling activities as outlined in the Initial Guidelines for Enabling Activities for the Minamata Convention on Mercury of the Global Environment Facility, particularly Minamata Convention initial assessment activities and national action plans for artisanal and small-scale gold mining, to facilitate ratification.</p> <p>Accordingly, the GEF follows the Initial Guidelines to support ASGM NAP. Based on the response from the Agency, the information on mercury supply, use and demand in ASGM, and the information about gender and children aspect can be eligible. Comments on other activities are the same as above.</p> <p>The regional workshop should be implemented as a part of Component 1.</p>	<p>in ASGM and processing \hat{A}», which is also eligible according to the GEF guidelines, as part of Annex C of the Minamata Convention and will be developed under project component 4.</p> <p>Information about gender and children aspects were included to further valuate the gender dimensions of the activity and its impact over vulnerable populations, which is required in all GEF projects. Moreover it will contribute to the development of strategies to prevent the exposure of vulnerable populations, particularly children and women of child-bearing age, which is requested in GEF projects. This is further explained in page 19 of the project document.</p> <p>UNEP therefore considers these elements as eligible for support under the NAP and request that these activities be approved as part of this submission.</p> <p>The evaluation mechanism for the NAP has been removed from the project. The activity 4.3 : is part of the strategy to improve the project sustainability and potential for scaling up. This is further explained in page 14 of the project document. Therefore we kindly request that this activity is maintained.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>(additional response to the comments on August 14)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information on mercury supply, use and demand in ASGM, and the information about gender and children aspect were maintained since the GEF Sec considered these activities eligible in comment of August 14. - The evaluation mechanism for the NAP had already been removed addressing the Secretariat's comment of August 7. - The following activities have been removed from the project document addressing the GEF Sec comments of August 14: <p>Component 3:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Economics such as earnings per capita, information on gold trade and export, cost of living and access to finance for miners; 2) Information about access to basic education and other services in mining communities; 3) Known information about the influence of ASGM practices and policies in neighboring countries. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As suggested by the GEF Se comments of August 14, the following activity has been incorporated to project component 1: Component 4, 4) Activity 4.3
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MO August 7 2015 Yes.	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Availability of Resources	7. 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? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	<p>MO August 7, 2015 PMC is up to 5% of the subtotal. If the total project cost is \$4,000,000, 5% of subtotal should be less than \$190,476. (e.g. When the subtotal is \$3,809,523, 5% of this subtotal is \$190,476, and total project cost becomes \$4 million).</p> <p>MO August 7 2015 Table A indicates co-financing of \$50,000, but it is not included in Table C. Please clarify.</p> <p>MO August 14 2015 Comments cleared.</p>	<p>The PMC has been revised according to the guidance and is now \$190,400.</p> <p>Although cofinancing is not mandatory for enabling activities, the Republic of Congo has volunteered to provide cofinance of \$50,000. Table C and other budget tables have been revised accordingly.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 	NA	
	Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>MO August 7, 2015 Not at this time. Please address comments in box 1- 5, 7, 8 and 10.</p> <p>MO August 14, 2015 Not at this time. Please address comments in box 5.</p>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		MO September 1 2015 All comments cleared. Program manager recommends for clearance.	
Review Date	Review	August 07, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 14, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 01, 2015	

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?	MO August 1, 2016 Yes. The PIF has been revised and justifications are provided. (1) Cameroon withdraw from the project, and Burundi will participate in the project by submitting the endorsement letter and the notification under Article 7 of the Convention. (2) The PIF has been revised to respond the comments from the Council. Please see the below box 11.	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	MO August 1, 2016 Yes.	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	MO August 1, 2016 Yes.	
	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)	MO August 1, 2016 Yes.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	MO August 1, 2016 Yes. The Republic of Congo submitted the letter to provide co-financing.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	MO August 1, 2016 Yes.	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	MO August 1, 2016 Yes. The project will coordinate with the ongoing MIA implementations and the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	MO August 1, 2016 Yes.	
	10. Does the project have	MO August 1, 2016	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	Yes.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEFSEC 	MO August 1, 2016 Yes. The responses are summarized in a matrix, and the PIF includes stakeholder mapping (page 10).	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council 	MO August 1, 2016 Yes. The responses are summarized in a matrix. - Responses to Japan comment; Agency clarified how the national and local government will engage in the project (response matrix). - Responses to US comments; GEF financing for the component 4 is increased (Table B), and the EA will use the NAP guidance document in collaboration with the Interim Secretariat of the Convention (page 10). - Responses to Germany comments; The PIF strengthened knowledge management (page 10 and 22) and clarified the role of the African Institute to disseminate the results of the project (page 22 - 23).	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat 		

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
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	MO August 1, 2016 Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement.	
Review Date	Review	August 01, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		