



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

GEF ID:	9565		
Country/Region:	Guyana		
Project Title:	Strengthening the Enabling Framework for Biodiversity Mainstreaming and Mercury Reduction in Small and Medium-scale Gold Mining Operations		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5763 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-4 Program 9; CW-2 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$136,986	Project Grant:	\$4,543,352
Co-financing:	\$29,662,745	Total Project Cost:	\$34,206,097
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Lyes Ferroukhi

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	<p>July 26, 2016</p> <p>This project is aligned with CW Program 4. Table D and and Table E should be revised to indicate that mercury funds from Program 4 will be accessed for the CW components.</p> <p>ES, 8/8/16: The table has been updated. -Comment cleared.</p>	

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
		The project is aligned with BD 4, Program Nine.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>July 26, 2016</p> <p>Article 7 of the Minamata Convention covers mercury use in artisanal and small scale gold mining (ASGM). Notification of ASGM in the territory is required under Article 7 to access funding. It is not clear if Guyana has provided this notification to the Secretariat. Please confirm that notification has been made.</p> <p>ES, 8/8/16: Article 7 Notification has been confirmed. -Comment cleared</p> <p>Article 7 covers artisanal and small scale mining, but does not cover medium and large scale mining. Therefore GEF mercury funds should not be used for medium and large scale mining. Please confirm that CW funds will only be used in ASGM.</p> <p>ES, 8/8/16: It has been confirmed that GEF funds will only be used for ASGM. -Comment cleared</p> <p>Project is supportive and consistent with NBSAP prioritization of BD mainstreaming.</p>	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	July 26, 2016	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	PIF provides comprehensive treatment of all of these issues.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	July 26, 2016 Yes, incremental reasoning is sound and aided by a full description of the baseline.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	July 26, 2016 Yes. By the time of CEO endorsement and during the PPG phase, the project should closely coordinate with the CI project in Guyana that has been proposed as part of the proposed GEF GOLD program, including on Output 1.3 on the establishment of a mercury free mining fund. The knowledge management component should also coordinate with GEF GOLD where a global knowledge sharing platform will be established.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	July 26, 2016 Yes, quite thorough for PIF stage.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	July 26, 2016 Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	July 26, 2016 Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	July 26, 2016 NA.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	July 26, 2016 NA.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	July 26, 2016 NA.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	July 26, 2016 There are pending comments that need to be addressed. Please revise and resubmit. 8/8/16: All pending issues have been addressed. PIF and PPG clearance is recommended by the program manager.	
Review Date	Review	July 26, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 08, 2016	
	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?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	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)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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.