



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

GEF ID:	4799		
Country/Region:	Regional (Ecuador, Peru)		
Project Title:	Implementing Integrated Measures for Minimizing Mercury Releases from Artisanal gold Mining		
GEF Agency:	UNIDO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CHEM-3; IW-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$999,900
Co-financing:	\$2,676,764	Total Project Cost:	\$3,676,664
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ibrahima Sow	Agency Contact Person:	Heinz Leuenberger

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?		The two countries are eligible.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	The GEF Operational Focal Point of Ecuador has submitted the letter of endorsement. The OFP from Peru has not submitted its letter. 02/29/12 MAB Comment cleared. The GEF OFP from Peru has submitted its letter which is included in the resubmission.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?		UNIDO is the lead Agency for the UN system for ASGM projects under the Global mercury partnership with previous experiences in a GEF global

*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			project covering six countries (Brazil, Laos, Indonesia, Sudan, Tanzania and Zimbabwe).
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		NA
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes.	Yes
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		NA
	• the focal area allocation?		Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?		CHEM Yes. The identified project objectives are consistent with the GEF strategy for mercury programming in the fifth replenishment. IW The MSP is in line with GEF 5 IW Objective 1
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and		CHEM Yes. Participating countries have already initiated some work on ASGM

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?		and started a process of stakeholders consultation. Ecuador is in the process of establishing a Training Center for artisanal miners with the support of the University of British Colombia (Canada) and Peru has passed a law in 2002 to integrate ASGM into the existing mining law.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?		CHEM Yes, through the development of programs to promote the use of financial tools for miners, policy and the formalization of the ASGM sector.
Project Design	11. 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?		CHEM Baseline project is well described.
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		Please include a section on the project cost-effectiveness in the proposal. 02/29/12 MAB Comment cleared. Sufficient discussion on project cost-effectiveness added to section B.2.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?		CHEM Incremental activities will introduce innovative ASGM practices that will minimize environmental and health hazards posed by mercury use locally and reduce impacts at the regional and global level.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?		Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?		CHEM Yes, an estimation of the total amount of mercury that would be reduced is provided.
	16. 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?		Yes, the description of the socio-economic benefits to be delivered, focussing on the impacts that the project would have on women and children is appropriate.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?		
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)		Yes.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		Yes, in particular with UNEP (Global partnership), the US Department of State (ASGM project in Peru) and the UBC Norman B Keevil Institute of Mining Engineering Institute, as executing partner for this project.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?		Yes.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
	23. Is funding level for project		PMC is within guideline.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	management cost appropriate?		
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		<p>This section needs further elaboration. UNIDO is requested to provide a detailed budget table for activities and project components funded by GEF and by co-financing as well. Please also clarify how much (in total) comes from IW and how much from CHEM;</p> <p>02/29/12 MAB Comment cleared. UNIDO has provided in its resubmission a detailed budget table through Annex H which delineates the amounts being requested from IW and CHEM as well as co-financing amounts per activity and project components.</p>
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.		<p>The proposal does not show a contribution to the project from Peru, which is not acceptable. UNIDO is requested to work with the GoP and make sure the country contributes to the project.</p> <p>02/29/12 MAB Comment cleared. Resubmission includes a letter of commitment for co-financing from the GoP/Ministry of Environment.</p>
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		UNIDO will contribute \$ 50,000 in cash as o-financing for this project.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		IW Commitment to use GEF IW consolidated Tracking Tool in reporting project results is missing; 02/29/12 MAB Comment cleared. Section H contains commitment by UNIDO to use GEF IW tracking tool for reporting of results.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		None received.
	• Council comments?		None received.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		None received.
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?		
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		Not at this time. UNIDO is requested to provide a revised proposal addressing the concerns raised in this review, in particular - The OFP from Peru needs to submit the letter of endorsement - The project cost effectiveness should be addressed in the proposal - Provide a detailed budget table for activities and project components funded by GEF and by co-financing as

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			well; - Work on the contribution from Peru. 02/29/12 MAB Comment cleared. Resubmission addresses all points outlined above. CEO approval is recommended.
Review Date (s)	First review*	January 03, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.