

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: March 02, 2016
Screener: Christine Wellington-Moore
Panel member validation by: Ricardo Orlando Barra Rios
Consultant(s):

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

ENABLING ACTIVITY	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9276
PROJECT DURATION:	2
COUNTRIES:	Regional (Central African Republic, Congo, Cameroon, Kenya, Swaziland, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe)
PROJECT TITLE:	Regional project on the Development of National Action Plans for the Artisanal and Small Scale Gold Mining in Africa
GEF AGENCIES:	UNEP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	The Africa Institute, UNEP Chemicals and Ministries of Environment of participating countries
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 proposed project which seeks the Development of National Action Plans to reduce the use of mercury and mercury compounds in, and the emissions and releases to the environment of mercury from, artisanal and small-scale gold mining and processing is facilitated by the use of scientific and technical knowledge and tools by national stakeholders in participating countries. Several of the countries are already engaged in MIA activities, and the project overall will follow the ASGM National Strategic Plan development guidance, step 1 of which is to make representative working groups at national level. Particularly in those countries with less experience in cross sectoral organisation, STAP suggests reinforcing Step 1 of the process regarding stakeholder mapping to be undertaken to capture not only groups with overlapping mandates, but those who can help coordinate the small players in ASGM.

A second point is that it would be good if the sections to describe national situations be backed with hard data. There are references in some areas of the PIF, where references are made to emissions monitoring having been done highlighting hotspots etc. The reader, however, is not given any notion of the extent of emissions, and the associated risk and need for intervention (e.g., page 7, "Kenya" refers to monitoring of hotspots using Lumex mercury monitoring, but no numbers are provided to give a snapshot of the scale of the problem). Further, on Page 9, "Zimbabwe" speaks to there having been a country diagnostic report, but no data is provided to give the reader a sense of the environmental presence of mercury. Table 1 on page 10 certainly gives ideas of estimates of mercury used in ASGM, which permits inference of air emissions and giving some idea of a baseline; but it would be good to juxtapose this against actual environmental measurements.

Gender dimensions are well considered (see page 19), though one might think that the risk associated with unwillingness of national stakeholders to provide data might at least be a minimum risk.

Overall, the project should also benefit from the experience of other ongoing regional projects on the issue. In general the data in the region is scarce, so there is a critical need to improve data on the current emissions, and generate the evidence base for the need for interventions in some of the critical areas. Other potential issues related to the coordination between countries and institutions, and perhaps to other relevant ongoing initiatives, should not be underestimated.

<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>