



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

GEF ID:	4985		
Country/Region:	Kyrgyz Republic		
Project Title:	Reducing global and local environmental risks from primary mercury mining in Khaidarkan the Kyrgyz Republic		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	POPs
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF	Objective (s):	CHEM-3; Project Mana;	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,000,000
Co-financing:	\$2,267,000	Total Project Cost:	\$3,267,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Anil Sookdeo	Agency Contact Person:	Jorge OCAÑA CORREA

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?		Yes
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?		
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?		UNEP has been working on Mercury Issues through its work on the Global Assessment on Mercury and on the Global Partnership to reduce mercury. UNEP has the comparative ability to implement this project.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		No

*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)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?		Yes. UNEP has been working with other partner agencies in Kyrgyzstan.
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		NA
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		NA
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?		NA
	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?		Yes
	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
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?		Yes. The project proposes to identify and implement a number of alternative livelihoods to mercury mining within the local community around the mercury mine.
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on		Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	sound data and assumptions?		
	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?		<p>The components on awareness raising can be reduced as there will be opportunities to raise awareness through the development of the alternative livelihoods.</p> <p>Components 1 and 2 can also be reduced. These activities have no investment and can be completed with less funding from the GEF.</p> <p>In this regard please reduce the project amount by \$ 300,000.</p>
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?		Yes
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?		Yes
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?		Yes
	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
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?		Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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
	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?		NA
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?		Yes
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		See Comment 12 above.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.		Yes
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?		Yes
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes

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?		Yes
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	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?		NA
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		Pending agency response on the level of financing.
Review Date (s)	First review*		May 10, 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?	NA
	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.