



GEF-6 GEF Secretariat Review For Enabling Activity Proposal

GEF ID:	9547		
Country/Region:	Regional (Guinea, Niger)		
Project Title:	Development of National Action Plan for Artisanal and Small Scale Gold Mining Guinea and Niger		
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):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$1,000,000
Co-financing:		Total Project Cost:	\$1,000,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ogawa Masako	Agency Contact Person:	Kevin Helps

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	MO July 11, 2016 Yes. Guinea ratified the convention in October 2014, and Niger signed the convention in October 2014. Both countries notified under Article 7.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	MO July 11, 2016 Yes.	
Project Consistency	3. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?	MO July 11, 2016 Yes. This is an enabling activity for an ASGM National Action Plan.	
	4. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MO July 11, 2016 Yes.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Design	5. Are the components in Table A sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	MO July 11, 2016 Please provide justification to request \$500,000 (maximum amount for ASGM NAP project) of GEF financing for each country, as both countries use only 0.5 ton of mercury per year in ASGM (page 7). MO July 27, 2016 Comment cleared.	Updated information received from a regional expert for Guinea and from CASE in Niger with newly collected data. Information has been added on pages 4 and 7. The amount of mercury used in ASGM in Guinea (close to 80 tonnes) justifies the \$500,000 while in Niger, although the amount is lower (6 tonnes), the reported combined use of cyanide leaching requires specific work as it is one of the worst practices to be banned. Therefore, the maximum amount will be needed as well.
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MO July 11, 2016 Yes.	
	7. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	MO July 11, 2016 Yes.	
	8. Is indicated cofinancing appropriate for an enabling activity?	MO July 11, 2016 Co-financing is not required for EA.	
Other Comments	9. Comments related to adequacy of information submitted by country for the financial management and procurement assessment ¹ .	MO July 11 2016 Adequate information are provided.	
Resource Availability	10. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?		
	• The focal area allocation?	MO July 11, 2016 Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or		

¹ Question 9 is applicable only to direct access proposal while question 10 (on fees) is not applicable to direct access proposal.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Technology Transfer)?		
	• The focal area set-aside?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation	11. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?	MO July 11, 2016 Not at this time. Please address the comment in box 5. MO July 27, 2016 All comment cleared. Program Manager recommend CEO approval.	
Review Date (s)	First review*	July 11, 2016	
	Additional review (as necessary)	July 27, 2016	
	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.**