

Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility
(Version 5)

STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: September 20, 2016
Screener: Christine Wellington-Moore
Panel member validation by: Ricardo Orlando Barra Rios
Consultant(s):

I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

FULL-SIZED PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9602
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Global (Burkina Faso, Colombia, Guyana, Indonesia, Kenya, Mongolia, Peru, Philippines)
PROJECT TITLE:	Global Opportunities for Long-term Development of ASGM Sector - GEF GOLD
GEF AGENCIES:	UNEP, CI and UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	National Governments, AGC, NRDC
GEF FOCAL AREA:	Chemicals and Waste

II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):
Concur

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the programme "Global Opportunities for Long term Development of the ASGM Sector-GEF Gold". This programme is well designed, with a clear objective, incremental argument and theory of change. The child projects are well designed and clearly aligned with the programmatic framework. In particular the following elements are to be applauded:-

- a) Good inter-organisational coordination for addressing complex issues of markets, informality and information needs
- b) The intention to apply geological and cultural criteria to inform the selection of mercury avoidance technologies.
- c) A particularly well thought through knowledge management component and related global child project which embeds a post project sustainability information exchange element (through creation of a platform and use of the UNEP Mercury Partnership and UNEP Live). The country child projects also have clear modalities for information exchange.
- d) The investment promotion elements are welcome and build well on ongoing initiatives.
- e) Clear recognition of the need for incentives to environmentally friendly behaviors by both the miners and the consumers of gold products.
- f) A clear road map of stakeholders and policy needs by both at programmatic and child level projects
- g) The attention to detail such as quality assurance modalities for knowledge products, the intention to conduct gender analyses, and attention to child labour issues.

STAP recognizes that at this early stage risks and mitigation strategies are nascent, but hopes that careful attention is paid to developing the risk tables as the CEO endorsement package preparation and implementation phases are worked through. Overall this program is very well designed and the Panel looks forward to the publication of future results from this initiative and ensuring that knowledge and lessons generated inform future investments in this and similar areas.

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 proponents are invited to approach STAP to consult on the design.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Concur	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple “Concur” response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	<p>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:</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, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</p> <p>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>
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.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP’s concerns.</p> <p>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>