

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10569
Project Title	Global Opportunities for Long-term Development of artisanal and small-scale gold mining ASGM) Sector Plus - GEF GOLD +
Date of Screening	21 May 2020
STAP member screener	Jamidu Katima
STAP secretariat screener	Sunday Leonard
STAP Rating	Minor issues to be considered during project design
STAP Overall Assessment of the project proposal	<p>STAP welcomes the project " Global Opportunities for Long-term Development of artisanal and small-scale gold mining ASGM) Sector Plus - GEF GOLD +. " The project aims to reduce the use of Hg in ASGM through the holistic formalization of ASGM. The project will be implemented in nine countries participating countries and has a global component.</p> <p>STAP has the following comments on the proposed project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This project will involve the convening multi-stakeholders with the associated challenges (see World Bank, 2014, page 5-7 for examples of these challenges – https://www.wiltonpark.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/WP1314-Report1.pdf). For example, the proposed landscape/jurisdiction approach will involve engaging different actors, such as governments, communities, the private sector, and civil societies. STAP wishes to refer the project proponent to its latest publication on "multi-stakeholder dialogue for transformational change" (https://stapgef.org/publications), which presents principles of multi-stakeholder dialogue (MSD), analyses the context of MSD, and highlights the process of designing an effective MSD. • STAP welcomes the theory of change presented in Figure 1 that covers key components of a functional theory of change. • Section B of the PIF indicates that the project will have six components. However, Section 3 of the PIF (the proposed alternative scenario) only presents four components. The components on "monitoring and evaluation of country-level child projects" and that on "global coordination, knowledge management, and outreach" are not described. These are essential parts of the project and should be fully presented. • The project will adopt the jurisdictional approach (JA) as a framework for structuring interventions. The second paragraph on page 28, however, highlights some of the challenges associated with the JA, including unrealistic expectations, political turnover, limited public sector capacity, and lack of broader support and incentives. Yet, the PIF is silent on how the project will overcome these challenges to ensure success. STAP recommends that this should be done. • Component 4 will support capacity building, knowledge sharing, and communication, including "using online education and digital marketing tools to support the traditional participatory

	<p>workshop and training model to help institutionalize sustainable mining methods at the community level." It is, however, unclear how online education and digital marketing tools will be used given the remoteness of ASGM operations (as noted in the last paragraph of page 19). Does this project intend to provide digital access to ASGM miners? The details of how this component will be achieved need to be elaborated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As rightly noted in the risk section of the PIF, the introduction of new technologies or ensuring mercury-free gold mining may inadvertently result in loss of livelihood. In such cases, alternative livelihood strategies may be required to achieve the project objectives. This is particularly important because mercury-based ASGM may be more profitable than other alternative sources of livelihoods in the targeted communities. Hence, a well-considered strategy may be needed to wean miners from their current practices. The proposal, however, seems not to put enough emphasis on interventions for addressing this issue. • Further clarification is needed on replication estimates of the global environmental benefits. A reduction of 70 metric tons in mercury use is expected in the participating countries. Another 210 metric tons is expected via replication. It is, however, unclear if the replication will occur in the participating countries or whether it will occur indirectly through the transfer of knowledge from this project to other countries (given the global nature of the project). This needs to be clarified. Also, how was the replication factor of 3 determined? • It is good that the PIF acknowledged that the project would contribute to other GEF core indicators, including the area of land restored, area of landscapes under improved practices, and greenhouse gas emission reduction. The PIF did not, however, present clearly how the interventions will lead to these benefits. We encourage that the project proponent elaborates further on this and provide a detailed estimation of all expected GEBs at the PPG stage (as promised in the PIF). • For a project that will depend on significant multi-stakeholder engagement for its success, the stakeholder section of the PIF is inadequate. Please provide a detailed analysis of stakeholders expected to be engaged in the project in the participating countries. Please, also highlight how they will be engaged, their expected role in the project, and whether they have been engaged already or if this is ongoing. • It is good that the PIF acknowledges the potential impacts of projected climate change, for example, desertification on achieving project objectives. The effects of climate change may also influence decisions on ASGM sites? We recommend that a detailed analysis of climate risk and management strategy should be presented for the project. 				
Part I: Project Information B. Indicative Project Description Summary	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="512 1247 1142 1349">What STAP looks for</th><th data-bbox="1142 1247 1768 1349">Response</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="512 1349 1142 1421">Project Objective</td><td data-bbox="1142 1349 1768 1421">Yes</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	What STAP looks for	Response	Project Objective	Yes
What STAP looks for	Response				
Project Objective	Yes				
Project Objective	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="512 1349 1142 1421">Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?</td><td data-bbox="1142 1349 1768 1421">Yes</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes		
Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes				

Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits?	Yes (though not presented in terms of short-term effects) Yes
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes
Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project. Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?	Yes Yes
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	This is well captured and presented. A good theory of change was presented.
1. Project description. Briefly describe: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)	Is the problem statement well-defined?	Yes
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	The barriers are described.
	For multiple focal area projects: does the problem statement and analysis identify the drivers of environmental degradation which need to be addressed through multiple focal areas; and is the objective well-defined, and can it only be supported by integrating two, or more focal areas objectives or programs?	Not defined as a multifocal area project but project is expected to generate benefits across other focal areas apart from chemicals and waste.
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Yes
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Yes
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Yes
	For multiple focal area projects:	NA

	are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators;	
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	Reduction of mercury use in ASGM through holistic formalization
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhancing formalisation of ASGM • Enhance access to financing • Enhancing Hg-Free technologies • Knowledge sharing and capacity building
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Yes.
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	None
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing	GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?	Yes
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	NA
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits, and are they measurable?	Yes. See STAP overall assessment for detailed comments of GEBs

	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Yes
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	No
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	This is not discussed
7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up	Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?	
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Scaling up is discussed.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	None
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		A map is not provided. This is may be attributed to spread of the project in different countries
2. Stakeholders. Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities. If none of the above, please explain why. In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders,	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Yes. Not detailed especially considering that the project success is highly dependent on a multi-stakeholder approach.

including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.		
	What are the stakeholders' roles, and how will their combined roles contribute to robust project design, to achieving global environmental outcomes, and to lessons learned and knowledge?	A stakeholder engagement plan will be developed during project preparation.
3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis). Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? Yes/no/ tbd. If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality: access to and control over resources; participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services. Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	Yes
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	No
5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from	Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?	The risks are discussed Yes

being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design	<p>Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?</p> <p>For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately? • Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed? • Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with? • What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures? 	<p>Yes –</p> <p>See STAP overall assessment for comments on climate risk</p>
6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives	Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?	Yes
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Yes
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	Yes
	Is there an adequate mechanism to feed the lessons learned from earlier projects into this project, and to share lessons learned from it into future projects?	Not discussed
8. Knowledge management. Outline the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, and how it will contribute to the project's overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.	What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?	Knowledge management indicators and metrics are not shown

	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	Through a knowledge management strategy
--	--	---

Notes

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
1. Concur	STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. The proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
	* In cases where the STAP acknowledges the project has merit on scientific and technical grounds, the STAP will recognize this in the screen by stating that <i>"STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal and encourages the proponent to develop it with same rigor. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design."</i>
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:
	(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;
	(ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.
	The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.

3. Major issues to be considered during project design	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p>
	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required. The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>