



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

GEF ID:	<b>4569</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Global (Burkina Faso, Mali, Senegal)</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Improve the Health and Environment of Artisanal and Small Scale Gold Mining (ASGM) Communities by Reducing Mercury Emissions and Promoting Sound Chemical Management</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNIDO</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>POPs</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF	Objective (s):	<b>CHEM-3; Project Mana;</b>	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$990,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$2,450,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$3,440,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ibrahima Sow</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Mr Igor Volodin</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?		All countries are eligible.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. Endorsement letters have been submitted by GEF Operational Focal points.	
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 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		NA.

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	capable of managing it?		
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?		
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)?		
	• focal area set-aside?		NA
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?		
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?		Yes. The identified project objectives are consistent with the GEF strategy for mercury programming in the fifth replenishment.
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?		Yes. Participating countries have already initiated some work on ASGM and started a process of stakeholders consultation to develop national strategies for mercury reduction in the ASGM sector.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?		Yes, through the development and implementation of national strategic action plans in each participating country to promote sound management of mercury in ASGM.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	11. Is the description of the baseline project/ scenario – what is happening in the project area without GEF project – reliable?		Yes, the baseline projects are well described.
	12. If GEF does not provide funding, is the rest of the project funded by other partners viable?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?		Incremental activities will help reduce the use of Hg in the ASGM sector. Furthermore, the project will contribute to the dissemination of good practices, fostering replication in other areas within and outside the subregion.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?		
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?		Yes. 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 indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?		Yes.
	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)		Well addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		Yes, in particular with UNEP, Balcksmith Institute and bilateral initiatives (USEPA) to promote sound management of mercury in ASGM.
	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?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?		Project management cost is appropriate.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		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.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.		All co-financing contributions have been confirmed.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?		Co-financing seems appropriate and much of it is in cash. However, I would expect a direct contribution from UNIDO (not only through SAICM QSP Mali).
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		NA
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		None received.
	• Convention Secretariat?		None received.
	• Council comments?		None received.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		None received.
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>		
	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?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		Not at this time. UNIDO is requested to provide a revised proposal addressing the concerns raised in this review, in particular - Direct contribution expected from UNIDO; - Describe the project cost effectiveness - Provide a detailed budget table for activities and project components funded by GEF and by co-financing as well.
Review Date (s)	First review*		July 14, 2011
	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	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	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.