Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2018

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		4569	
GEF Agency project ID		100336	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNIDO	
Project name		Improve the Health and Environment of Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining (ASGM) Communities by Reducing Mercury Emissions and Promoting Sound Chemical Management	
Country/Countries		Burkina Faso, Mali and Senegal	
Region		West Africa	
Focal area		Persistent Organic Pollutants	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		CHEM-3	
Executing agencies involved		Blacksmith Institute	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Artisanal Gold Council	
Private sector involvement		None	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		08/16/2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		01/16/2012	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		01/01/2015	
Actual date of project completion		06/30/2017	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	-	
	Co-financing	-	
GEF Project Grant		0.99	0.94
Co-financing	IA own	0.25	0.25
	Government	0.63	UA[1]
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	1.57	1.08
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		0.99	0.94
Total Co-financing		2.45	-
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		3.44	-
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		December, 2017	
Author of TE		Dr. Nee Sun Choong Kwet Yive and Ms. Marie Clémence Ndour	
TER completion date		February, 2019	
TER prepared by		Ritu Kanotra	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Cody Parker	

[1] This amount is not available in the documents

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S	S		UA
Sustainability of Outcomes		ML		ML
M&E Design		MS		MS
M&E Implementation		MS		S
Quality of Implementation		S		S
Quality of Execution		NA		MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report				MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As per the information in the CEO endorsement request, the Global Environmental Objective of the project is to 'reduce the impacts of mercury on human health and the environment of artisanal gold mining communities in Burkina Faso, Mali and Senegal…This will also contribute to reducing global use and emissions from the ASGM sector, currently the world's largest demand for mercury' (CEO endorsement request document, Pg 1).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As per the CEO endorsement request, the Development Objective of the project was to 'Strengthen local and national capacity to effectively manage and reduce mercury use, emissions and exposure in Artisanal Small-scale Gold Mining (ASGM) communities in Burkina Faso, Mali and Senegal' (CEO Endorsement request document, Pg 15). The project had the following three outcomes:

Outcome 1: Developing National Strategy Action Plans for changes in policy framework in Burkina Faso, Mali, and Senegal.

Outcome 2: Implementing pilot projects (technology transfer) and training on health education and low mercury/mercury free programs to reduce mercury use and emissions.

Outcome 3: Building capacity to manage and monitor mercury increased through fair trade and new regulations.

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

There were no changes in the Global Environmental or Development Objectives of the project.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 **Relevance**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

This TER agrees with the rating assigned by the TE to the relevance of the project as 'satisfactory'. The project was relevant as Artisanal and Small-scale Gold Mining (ASGM) is particularly common in West Africa including the three participating countries, where more than 650,000 people from the three countries are estimated to be involved in this sector for livelihood. ASGM is the most significant source of mercury release into the environment in the developing world, and, according to the artisanal gold council, accounts for about 15% of the world's annual gold production. Mercury is often used in ASGM to help separate gold from sediments using rudimentary processing methods and is released into the air, where is directly inhaled by workers and their families and is particularly threatening to children, pregnant women, and women of childbearing age. The emissions from ASGM can travel long distances around the globe, contributing to global mercury pollution and contaminating the world's fisheries. This project was a request from the government of the three countries at the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) Global Mercury Partnerships Sub-Regional Workshops on gold mining in Bamako, Mali in 2009 and was designed to reduce mercury use in the ASGM sector and protect the miners and their families from mercury exposure. It also sought to assist the three countries to fulfill their obligations towards international treaties, agreements and conventions such as the Basel Convention, Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM), Stockholm Convention, Minamata Convention and others.

The project was also in line with the GEF 5 Focal Area Strategy for the Chemicals focal area 'to promote the sound management of chemicals throughout their lifecycle in ways that lead to the minimization of significant adverse effects on human health and the environment,' in particular Objective 3 to 'pilot sound chemicals management and mercury reduction.' It also aligns with Outcome 3.1 'country capacity built to effectively manage mercury in priority sectors' and Outcome 3.2 to 'contribute to the overall objective of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) of achieving sound management of chemicals throughout their lifecycle in ways that lead to the minimization of significant adverse effects on human health and the environment.'

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: **Unable to assess**

The TE assesses the effectiveness of the project as 'moderately satisfactory'. However, there is not enough evidence in the available documents for this TER to assess and provide a rating for effectiveness. The evaluation covers only the activities supported by GEF[2] and not those financed by USDOS[3] and

[2] GEF funds were used for part of component 1 and component 2

[3] USDOS funds were used for technology transfer in Burkina Faso (part of Component 2)

FGEF[4], which were integral to the completion of various outcomes listed in the project document. The project activities in Mali were not carried out due to political unrest since early 2012.

Against the results/benefits expected through GEF funding listed in the project document (Pg 9), the project was successful in producing detailed information on the sector, with a mapping of Artisanal and Small-scale Gold Mining sites, number of miners and techniques used in two countries. The project also made appropriate and relevant recommendations, but the outcome of a national action plan for the sound management of mercury in artisanal and small-scale gold mining sector was still not developed in either country. The project was successful in imparting trainings related to technology transfer and health education, but the impact of the health education trainings could not be ascertained during the evaluation. The project facilitated trainings on mercury free technology including the retort method of gold extraction, which was supposedly a clear and more efficient method, but was found to be of limited use by the miners consulted during evaluation. The TE doesn't report if the project facilitated access to the fair-trade markets for gold. The target of introducing mercury reduction/elimination processing method in at least 1 pilot site in each country was met in Senegal and reported to improve the livelihood of the miners involved at the site. The TE does not report on the pilot site in Burkina Faso, since it was financed by the United States Department of States (USDOS) and not included in the current evaluation. The TE does not report on the achievements under outcome 3, since this outcome was reportedly funded by French Global Environment Facility (FGEF), due to which this TER is unable to assess the overall effectiveness of the project.

Outcome 1: National Strategy Action Plans are utilized for developing policy framework in Burkina Faso, Mali, and Senegal

The first output of scope of Artisanal and Small-scale Gold Mining (ASGM) evaluated was achieved satisfactorily in Burkina Faso and Senegal. The project inventoried 16 corridors designated for gold panning and approximately 75 informal gold mining sites in Senegal and 243 legal gold mining concessions and several informal gold mining sites in Burkina Faso to provide estimates as per the expectation under this component. A series of recommendations were also developed by AGC to assist the government of Burkina Faso and Senegal in the establishment and implementation of a National Action Plan (NAP) on the use of mercury in gold panning. However, despite recommendations made by the project, the outcome of NAPs used to develop policy framework was not fully achieved during the project. It is anticipated that these recommendations would be considered in future as both the countries secured additional funding from GEF to develop the NAPs further.

Outcome 2: Pilot projects are replicable and knowledge gained from health and technology trainings can be adopted and behavior changed

The first output of imparting the health education training program was completed satisfactorily in Senegal and Burkino Faso. But, despite awareness of the main stakeholder (in particular the miners), the TE notes that 'it appears that there have been no or very little behavioral change regarding the use of mercury' (TE, Pg17). The training on free mercury technology (retort method) linked to the second output under this outcome was completed satisfactorily. However, the retort method was found too complicated and tedious by the miners to put to practice. As a result, this method was not used by the

[4] FGEF funds were used for part of Component 1 and whole of Component 3.

miners at the project sites in both the countries. The project also completed the second output related to implementation of the pilot project using a mercury-free processing system in Senegal. Mercury was still reported to be used towards the end stage of gold extraction, although to a much lesser quantity. But, overall, 'the installation of the gold processing system greatly improved their livelihood. The system is much more efficient, allowing to process up to 25 bags of ores daily (against barely one bag weekly if processed manually), thereby increasing their income significantly' (TE Pg 18). The TE didn't evaluate this output as implemented in Burkino Faso since it was financed by United States Department of State (USDOS) and not included in the current evaluation.

Outcome 3: Capacity to manage and monitor mercury increased through fair trade certification and new regulations

The TE does not report on achievements under outcome since this component was financed by French Global Environment Fund. Therefore, there is insufficient information available for this TER to assess its effectiveness.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Moderately satisfactory**

This TER concurs with the rating assigned to the efficiency of the project by the TE as 'moderately satisfactory'. The project experienced delays in both the countries. In Burkina Faso, the project faced delays during the startup phase due to various administrative reasons, political unrest and closure of mines due to heavy rains, which was beyond the control of the project. The delays experienced in Senegal were mainly due to external factors such as closure of mines for almost one year through a presidential decree and slow administrative procedures to deliver the mining permit. The project was granted a no-cost extension and was closed in June 2017 as against the original date of closure of January 2015. However, these delays did not impact the achievement of outputs during the project.

The TE reports on the utilization of GEF funds and provides only a limited information on the co-financing realized from various other contributors. The project received total co-financing of $940,395 against the original amount of $990,000 from GEF contribution. Activities were not carried out in Mali due to political reasons but the corresponding budget of $261,670 (taken as 1/3rd of the cost of each component) was used for activities in the other two countries. It is difficult to ascertain the components where the additional or remaining funds were utilized. Also, there is no evidence that the availability of additional funds helped in achieving more than what was expected to be covered under the project in two countries.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Moderately likely**

This TER agrees with the assessment of the TE regarding the likelihood of sustainability of GEF supported activities and initiatives taken under the project in Senegal and Burkina Faso as 'moderately likely'. The gold processing system installed in Senegal is likely to be financed and maintained through the fees collected by the miners using the system. The recommendations made by the project are also likely to be adopted for developing national action plans as both the countries secured additional GEF funds to finalize the plans. The project generated awareness amongst miners and health professionals and provided training to technicians and miners in both the countries on mercury free processing, which is likely to provide an enabling environment to sustain the initiatives taken under the project. However, the TE notes a lack of political will amongst government officials in Senegal that also impacted the progress of the project, which could hinder the developments made under the project in future.

Financial sustainability: Likely

This TER agrees with the rating assigned to the likelihood of sustainability due to financial risks as 'likely'. Despite recommendations made by the project, the National Action Plans were still not developed in Burkina Faso and Senegal. However, both the countries secured financial assistance from GEF for their development in future. The gold processing system installed at Bantaco in Senegal was also being used by the miners, which is also likely to be sustainable in future through the fees collected to operate the system.

Socio-political sustainability: Moderately unlikely

The TE assigns a rating to the likelihood of sustainability due to socio-political risks as 'moderately likely' However, based on the narrative in the TE and other available documents, this TER assigns it an overall rating of 'moderately unlikely'. The political context in Burkina Faso was favorable for the sustainability of the project interventions and 'expanding positive changes in the ASGM sector' (TE, Pg 22). The Ministry of Mines of Burkina Faso was also reportedly revising its mining code implemented via a decree that manages provision of mining titles and permits for artisanal, small-scale and industrial mining. However, the TE indicates that the project didn't get the full support from the Ministry of Mines in Senegal, which was reported to be missing at most meetings organized during the project. So, while the socio-political environment can be predicted to be favorable in case of Burkina Faso, the project is less likely to get support from the Government of Senegal, with situation unpredictable in Mali, due to which the likelihood of sustainability consolidated as a result of socio-political milieu and associated risks in the three countries is rated as 'moderately unlikely'.

Institutional framework and governance sustainability: Moderately likely

This TER agrees with the rating assigned by the TE to the likelihood of sustainability due to risks associated with the institutional and governance framework as 'moderately likely'. The health education training program was well received in Burkina Faso by the health authorities, who agreed to integrate Artisanal and Small-scale Gold Mining specific data for health surveillance. But, reportedly, the authorities in Senegal had little interest in integrating Artisanal and Small-scale Gold Mining into the regular monitoring system for health surveillance. Moreover, despite relevant and appropriate recommendations made by the project, a national action plan for the sound management of mercury in the artisanal gold mining sector was not developed for either Burkina Faso or Senegal. But according to the TE, both the countries secured additional funding from GEF to prepare the national action plans. Although it is anticipated that national action plans will be developed in future, more awareness and capacity enhancement would be required to sustain the initiatives taken under the project.

Environmental sustainability: Likely

There are no apparent environmental risks that can influence or jeopardize the project outcomes and future flow of project benefits.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

According to the TE, the cash co-financing of the project materialized as per the original plan. For example, the contributions from USDOS/USEPA ($ 318,000) and FGEF ($ 1,085,000) were used for the pilot project in Burkina Faso and component 3 respectively. The co-financing from UNIDO ($ 30,000) also materialized (e.g. full-time administrative support at UNIDO HQ and country visits) which contributed to the management and supervision of the project. But TE does not provide details pertaining to other sources of co-financing such as the European Commission and National Governments.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project experienced delays mainly due to closure of mines for almost one year through a presidential decree and slow administrative procedures to deliver the mining permit in Senegal, and political unrest and closure of mines due to heavy rain in Burkina Faso. But, according to the TE, these delays did not impact the effectiveness of the project. The project was granted a no cost extension and was closed in June 2017 as against the original date of closure of January 2015.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The project had a mixed level of support from the respective governments. The project was hosted by the Ministry of Environment and was supported by the Ministry of Mines in both countries (Burkina Faso and Senegal), who cooperated through providing data and information to the project for the component 1. The project had involvement from representatives of other government departments (Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Labour) through their membership in national Project Steering Committee, which was not a mandatory requirement under the project, indicating their support to the project. It seems that the project had more support from the government in Burkina Faso than in Senegal. For instance, In Senegal, the delays encountered during project implementation were partly due to the lack of support from the Ministry of Mines to rapidly deliver the mining license required to run the pilot project. But the project had active involvement from the local authorities that included the mayor of the province, local representatives, the village chief and the head of miners' communities. The TE does not report on the co-financing materialized from the national governments.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 **M&E Design at entry**	Rating: **Moderately satisfactory**

The TE assigns a combined rating to monitoring and evaluation design and its implementation as 'moderately satisfactory'. Based on the evidence in the TE, this TER assesses the design of the M&E as 'moderately satisfactory'. The project document details the main elements, such as baseline, targets and SMART indicators to meet the monitoring and reporting requirements. TE notes that the roles and responsibilities for conducting M&E were not clearly defined, which caused confusion. For instance, Blacksmith Institute, the main executing partner, was assigned responsibility for day to day management of the project, with the requirement to report regularly to UNIDO. The project document also mentions that the Project Manager would also monitor project activities on a weekly basis. But it is not clear if the position of Project Manager was based at Blacksmith Institute or was going to be recruited separately. Further, the role of different national stakeholders in monitoring was also not clearly spelt out in the project document, although it is not clear exactly how this affected M&E implementation. Finally, the project document failed to make provisions for an inception workshop and lacked a detailed M&E budget.

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The TE assigns a combined rating to the M&E design and implementation of the project as 'moderately satisfactory'. Based on the evidence in the TE, this TER assesses it to be 'satisfactory'. The project led to the establishment of the Project Steering Committee at both the national and regional level, with participation from all the relevant stakeholders, which was otherwise not included in the project document. The project steering committee meetings provided a platform to review and monitor the progress of the project. The recommendations during these meetings formed the basis of corrective action to improve the progress of the project. The other reports such as annual reports from the executing agency and the Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) were prepared and submitted on time due to which the M&E implementation is rated as 'satisfactory'.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 **Quality of Project Implementation**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

This TER agrees with the rating assigned to the quality of project implementation by the TE as 'satisfactory'. UNIDO was responsible for overall project implementation, monitoring and reporting of the project. A project manager nominated from the Department of Environment, UNIDO Headquarters, Vienna, was assisted by a full-time supporting staff to manage the project. The change of the project manager during the implementation due to staff movement did not seem to affect the project.

According to the information available, the two project managers adequately supervised the project and their guidance was highly appreciated by national counterparts and project partners. They attended all the regional Project Steering Committee meetings, during which they provided adequate and timely guidance on project implementation. The financial management (disbursements, procurement of services and equipment, sub-contracting etc.,) of the project by UNIDO was also carried out satisfactorily.

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	Rating: **Moderately satisfactory**

The TE does not provide a rating to the quality of the project execution. Based on the narrative in the TE and other available documents, this TER rates it as 'moderately satisfactory'. As per the project document, Blacksmith Institute, an NGO, was the main executing agency for the project. However, the participating countries decided during the inception workshop that, as the Artisanal Gold Council (AGC) and the Alliance for Responsible Mining (ARM) were responsible to execute the different components of the project, the technical support of Blacksmith Institute was no longer required. All the participating countries attending the inception workshop decided not to involve the Blacksmith Institute, since its involvement was not perceived to add value to project implementation. The project document highlights the advantage of involving Blacksmith Institute, with its history of working on similar projects with UNIDO in other parts of the world. The TE, however, does not discuss the implications, if any, for not involving Blacksmith Institute as the Executing Agency.

The countries' respective Ministries of Environment hosted the project team. Although not included in the design of the project, a national Project Steering Committee was established through a decree issued by the Ministry of Environment in both the countries. A National Project Coordinator nominated within the Ministry of Environment served as a focal point of the project in both the countries. A National Technical Expert was also recruited to provide assistance during execution of the pilot project. The TE notes that in Senegal, other than the late delivery of the mining permit for the pilot project, there was no major problem during the implementation of the project. The National Project Coordinator worked in good collaboration with Artisanal Gold Council. However, in Burkina Faso, while the outputs were satisfactorily delivered, the evaluators indicate a lack of communication between the National Project Coordinator and other stakeholders (e.g. representative of the Ministry of Mines) as well as with Artisanal Gold Council. But no information is available on how this lack of communication impacted project implementation.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE does not report on the environmental changes brought about by the project other than that at the pilot site in Senegal, where amount of mercury used in processing was reduced at least to half of previous levels (TE Pg 17).

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The pilot project of mercury-free processing system implemented at a site in Senegal enabled the processing of 25 bags of ores daily which would have otherwise required about 1 man-week of work to process one bag of ore. Reportedly, around 5000 miners in the vicinity of the project area were getting their ores processed at the facility for a fee of CFA 7,500 per bag (TE, Pg 17).

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

The TE does not report on any notable changes brought about by the project.

b) Governance

The TE does not report on any changes in the governance brought about by the project. The project made recommendations to develop the National Action Plans for safe management of mercury, which were not completed by both the countries. However, the TE notes that both the countries secured additional funds from GEF to work on the National Action Plans, which is anticipated to be completed in future.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

The TE does not report any unintended impacts brought about by the project.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been

established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

While the mercury free processing system was successful at the two pilot project sites and had scope for replication, the TE highlights some of the issues that need to be factored in for its replication at other sites. According to the discussions held by the evaluators in the field, the initial relatively high investment cost for setting up processing units would require some kind of financial system to support the miners to have such a system. Moreover, the artisanal and small-scale gold mining sector also needs to be formalized with full support from the authorities, especially with regards to the timely delivery of mining permits.

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The main lessons listed in the TE are as follows:

1. The miners at the project site in Senegal were initially reluctant to participate in the project. However, with the right approach and adequate communication, Artisanal Gold Council was able to convince the Foukhaba GIE to participate in the pilot project. The lesson that can be learned is that good and early communication contribute to gain trust of partners / beneficiaries and secure their engagement in projects.
2. The delays encountered in Senegal during project implementation were partly due to the lack of support from the Ministry of Mines to rapidly deliver the mining license required to run the pilot project. Securing early full support of all key stakeholders would avoid delays in project execution.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The main lessons listed in the TE are as follows:

1. To ensure that mercury is no longer used at the project site in Senegal, it is recommended that the operators of the system is trained to use the mercury free method for gold extraction.
2. It is recommended that a financial mechanism be set up to assist the miners at other sites to purchase the gold processing system due to its relatively high initial investment cost.
3. The recommendations made through the project should be considered for development of national action plans for sound management of mercury in artisanal gold mining sector in future.
4. To ensure good visibility and replication, the project outcomes and results could be summarized and disseminated to other small-scale miners' communities of other areas/regions of the country.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	**GEF IEO comments**	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The evaluation covered only the activities covered through the funds from GEF and not the ones covered by other co-financers.	**MS**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent and the evidence more or less complete, except in few places. For instance, the TE does not discuss the quality of project executing agency in detail.	**MS**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report assesses sustainability in an adequate manner.	**S**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are supported by the evidence presented in the main body of the report	**S**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report does not provide specific details on various co-financing components. For instance, it does not mention if the co-financing from the national counterpart materialized or not. It also does not provide the exact amount of co-financing materialized from various sources.	**MU**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report assesses various aspect of M&E. But while it touches upon few issues related to M&E design, it does not provide details to understand its implications. For instance, it highlights few weaknesses in the design related to confusion in the roles of entities responsible for M&E. But it does not discuss how this confusion impacted the M&E implementation, failing to provide a complete argument and evidence.	**MS**
Overall TE Rating		**MS**

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).

This TER did not use any other source of information.