

REVISED STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE, OCTOBER 2022

GEF ID	11048
Project title	Global Opportunities for Long-term development of the Artisanal and Small-scale Gold Mining Sector in Zimbabwe – GEF planetGOLD Zimbabwe
Date of screen	7 November 2022
STAP Panel Member	Miriam Diamond
STAP Secretariat	Sunday Leonard

1. Summary of STAP's views of the project

The project aims to “reduce the negative environmental and health effects caused by the intensive use of mercury by the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining (ASGM) sector in Zimbabwe” through the following actions:

1. promote formalizing ASGM
2. reduce barriers to accessing finance and markets for ASGM miners
3. promote Hg-free Au processing tech
4. knowledge sharing for upscaling at national & international levels

The proposal appropriately presents the drivers of Hg use in ASGM in Zimbabwe and provides a logic for addressing the root causes, although this needs to be strengthened. Some strengths of the project include alignment with the “Mineral Responsible Supply Chain model” from the OECD due diligence approach, the training the trainer approach, which can enhance durability, and attention to gender dimensions, including women’s vulnerability in the sector. Weaknesses include a lack of clarity of project components and how they will be scaled and a poor theory of change.

Overall, STAP believes this is a viable project, but some aspects of the proposal need to be further developed and improved, including the theory of change and specifics of some of the project components, to ensure that it achieves its expected outcomes and impacts. Please see the next section for more information.

Note to STAP screeners: a summary of STAP's view of the project (not of the project itself), covering both strengths and weaknesses.

STAP's assessment*

- ☐ Concur - STAP acknowledges that the concept has scientific and technical merit
- ☒ Minor - STAP has identified some scientific and technical points to be addressed in project design
- ☐ Major - STAP has identified significant concerns to be addressed in project design

Please contact the STAP Secretariat if you would like to discuss.

2. Project rationale, and project description – are they sound?

See annex on STAP's screening guidelines.

- The proposal explained the problem and issues, articulating the drivers of Hg use in ASGM. The drivers cover a broad systems view identifying the socioeconomic dimensions, including poverty, informal and unregulated mining, lack of knowledge, and limited access to finance. The gender dimension of Hg use in ASGM, including the vulnerability of women, was also well presented. However, the interactions between the drivers from a systems perspective was not described.

- Although how the futures of the identified drivers could unfold was not specifically analyzed, uncertain futures was considered to some extent in the risk analysis, e.g., the impact of climate change and the impact of political and governance situation.
- The baseline problem was sufficiently explained and fits well within planetGOLD and other initiatives.
- A theory of change (ToC) diagram was provided with some narratives although not specifically for the ToC. The ToC diagram seems incomplete as it does not include the set of activities (the project components) that will lead to the expected outputs and outcomes. It only shows the assumptions, output, outcomes, and impacts. Further, there seems to be a mix up in the definition of drivers in the ToC. The items labelled as drivers are actually another set of assumptions. Drivers are the social, demographic, and economic factors driving the issue that the project seeks to address. For example, for this project, an important driver could be economic (e.g., price of gold, poverty, etc.), demography (e.g., increased population), and environmental (e.g., climate change can displace jobs and push people into alternative employment in ASGM). Some of such drivers were already identified in the project description. This aspect need to be addressed.
- The project components were not sufficiently described to understand how the activities would lead to the desired change. For example:
 - Component 1 on formalization is unclear on the role of government regulation and policies in achieving formalization. Are there intentions to develop new policies and regulations? Are there existing policies or regulations that can be built upon or those that can be antagonistic to the objectives of this component? What is the importance of policy coherence to achieving the component's aim?
 - For component 2, the activities for the finance component are vague. The specific set of activities to promote savings mechanisms for ASGM organizations is not explicit. Even if the financing model's specifics are not yet firmed up, the PIF should mention examples of financing models that could be considered and the appropriate logic and justification, including how it will be better than the current financing mechanism of informal lenders.
 - Also, component 3 needs to be elaborated about which potential technologies would be considered and what would be necessary for their uptake.
- Further, the project components (as well as the ToC) do not appear to consider the unintended consequences that are likely to arise as illegal trade is thwarted – what will happen to the “unemployed” illegal Hg brokers?
- Activities such as “training the trainers” and capacity building of financial institutions and government agencies were included and could help ensure that the expected outcomes are enduring. So, it is good that they have been included.
- Stakeholders are numerous and use existing networks. Good to see the inclusion of private and institutional sectors (that are now barriers) to promote the longevity of outcomes.
- Component 4 of the proposal focuses on knowledge management and communication and knowledge. This will include developing knowledge-sharing tools and linkage with the GEF global planetGOLD program. This will presumably enable the implementation of a similar program in other countries with a comparable situation.

Note: provide a general appraisal, asking whether relevant screening guideline questions have been addressed adequately – not all the questions will be relevant to all proposals; no need to comment on every question, only those needing more attention, noting any done very well, but ensure that all are considered. Comments should be helpful, evaluative, and qualitative, rather than yes/no.

3. Specific points to be addressed, and suggestions

Based on the issues raised in section 2 above, STAP recommends that the following should be addressed:

1. Carry out a more rigorous analysis of the drivers of Hg use in ASGM, including their interactions and how this can influence the interventions, as well as a complete consideration of threats to successfully implementing the four component's objectives.
2. The theory of change should be redone to include the elements of a good theory of change, including the drivers, expected interventions and activities, outputs, outcomes, impacts, and the assumptions underlying

the pathway toward achieving the overarching objectives. In this regard, the project proponent should delineate between drivers and assumptions using the appropriate definitions of these terms. To guide, we refer the proponent to [STAP's theory of change primer](#). We encourage the proponent to support the ToC with a straightforward narrative of how the project objectives would be achieved.

3. Provide more information on the project components:
 - a. For component 1, clearly highlight the role of policy and regulations to support the proposed formalization and how the issue of policy coherence will be addressed.
 - b. For component 2, the proponent should be more explicit about the potential financing model and specific set of activities that will facilitate the objective of this component and how this will lead to the expected output and outcome.
 - c. Component 3 on promoting non-Hg mining and processing alternatives should be better developed to address the potential technologies that would be considered and what would be needed for their uptake. It should also address whether the proposed technologies would be more vulnerable to “supply chain” issues than the current Hg method for amalgamation and how the vulnerabilities would be addressed.
4. In revising the proposal, the proponent should consider the “unintended consequences” of reducing the use of Hg; for example, what happens to those involved in selling Hg? Can those sellers be brought in to service non-Hg options?

Note: number key points clearly and provide useful information or suggestions, including key literature where relevant. Completed screens should be no more than two or three pages in length.

*categories under review, subject to future revision

ANNEX: STAP'S SCREENING GUIDELINES

1. How well does the proposal explain the problem and issues to be addressed in the context of the **system** within which the problem sits and its drivers (e.g. population growth, economic development, climate change, sociocultural and political factors, and technological changes), including how the various components of the system interact?
2. Does the project indicate how **uncertain futures** could unfold (e.g. using simple **narratives**), based on an understanding of the trends and interactions between the key elements of the system and its drivers?
3. Does the project describe the **baseline** problem and how it may evolve in the future in the absence of the project; and then identify the outcomes that the project seeks to achieve, how these outcomes will change the baseline, and what the key **barriers** and **enablers** are to achieving those outcomes?
4. Are the project's **objectives** well formulated and justified in relation to this system context? Is there a convincing explanation as to **why this particular project** has been selected in preference to other options, in the light of how the future may unfold?
5. How well does the **theory of change** provide an "explicit account of how and why the proposed interventions would achieve their intended outcomes and goal, based on outlining a set of key causal pathways arising from the activities and outputs of the interventions and the assumptions underlying these causal connections".
 - Does the project logic show how the project would ensure that expected outcomes are **enduring** and resilient to possible future changes identified in question 2 above, and to the effects of any conflicting policies (see question 9 below).
 - Is the theory of change grounded on a solid scientific foundation, and is it aligned with current scientific knowledge?
 - Does it explicitly consider how any necessary **institutional and behavioral** changes are to be achieved?
 - Does the theory of change diagram convincingly show the overall project logic, including causal pathways and outcomes?
6. Are the project **components** (interventions and activities) identified in the theory of change each described in sufficient detail to discern the main thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they address the problem, their justification as a robust solution, and the critical assumptions and risks to achieving them?
7. How likely is the project to generate global environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF project (**additionality**)?
8. Does the project convincingly identify the relevant **stakeholders**, and their anticipated roles and responsibilities? is there an adequate explanation of how stakeholders will contribute to the

development and implementation of the project, and how they will benefit from the project to ensure enduring global environmental benefits, e.g. through co-benefits?

9. Does the description adequately explain:

- how the project will build on prior investments and complement current investments, both GEF and non-GEF,
- how the project incorporates **lessons learned** from previous projects in the country and region, and more widely from projects addressing similar issues elsewhere; and
- how country policies that are contradictory to the intended outcomes of the project (identified in section C) will be addressed (**policy coherence**)?

10. How adequate is the project's approach to generating, managing and exchanging **knowledge**, and how will lessons learned be captured for adaptive management and for the benefit of future projects?

11. Innovation and transformation:

- If the project is intended to be **innovative**: to what degree is it innovative, how will this ambition be achieved, how will barriers and enablers be addressed, and how might scaling be achieved?
- If the project is intended to be **transformative**: how well do the project's objectives contribute to transformative change, and are they sufficient to contribute to enduring, transformational change at a sufficient scale to deliver a step improvement in one or more GEBs? Is the proposed logic to achieve the goal credible, addressing necessary changes in institutions, social or cultural norms? Are barriers and enablers to scaling be addressed? And how will enduring scaling be achieved?

12. Have **risks** to the project design and implementation been identified appropriately in the risk table in section B, and have suitable mitigation measures been incorporated? (NB: risks to the durability of project outcomes from future changes in drivers should have been reflected in the theory of change and in project design, not in this table.)