Part I: Project Information		Response
GEF ID	10349	
Project Title	**Demonstration of production phase-out of mercury-containing medical thermometers and sphygmomanometers and promoting the application of mercury-free alternatives in medical facilities in China**	
Date of Screening	2-Dec-19	
STAP member Screener	Jamidu Katima	
STAP secretariat screener	Sunday Leonard	
STAP Overall Assessment		Minor issues to be considered during project design
		The project aims to establish an enabling environment to accelerate the phase-out of the production of mercury-containing medical devices and transition to mercury-free medical devices in China. This will help phase-out deadlines under the Minamata Convention on Mercury. The project, through its interventions, will lead to the avoidance of 75 MT of Hg. The project outcomes include cross-ministerial cooperation on policy, regulations, action, and tools for the phase-out of mercury-containing medical devices and improved capacity to manage mercury-containing devices soundly. The success of this project can have a significant impact on reducing the use of mercury-containing medical devices, given that China is a major manufacturer and exporter. Tackling this issue in China would be an excellent example for other countries and can help curb the production and spread of these devices. STAP recommends the following: •Policy and regulatory barriers: the PIF provides limited information on the current status of legislation, policy, and regulatory framework on mercury use in medical devices in China. This information needs to be detailed, because it is essential baseline information for assessing project success.
		•The information presented in the PIF indicates that the project will lead to an avoidance of Hg use and well as the destruction of existing Hg. It is essential to clearly present information on the GEBs expected from mercury use avoidance and that expected from the destruction of existing mercury-containing devices. This is important for monitoring and evaluation. •The methodology for the monitoring and evaluation should be articulated becuase this will be needed for evaluating the success of the project. •The IEO's terminal evaluation study of projects under chemicals and waste focal area revealed that there is little evidence that GEF's chemicals and waste projects have been successful in putting in place sustainable strategies and financial mechanisms to scale up achieved results or to ensure continued engagement of private sector actors (http://www.gefieo.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/files/cw-study-2017_0.pdf). For this project, a green finance mechanism has been proposed as a strategy without elaboration on how it will be resourced and how it will function. There is a danger of this project replicating the same problem identified by the IEO. STAP recommends that more thought should be provided on the specifics of green finance, and how it will deliver expected results. Although not specific to mercury projects, ideas on finance models may be obtained from the report: financing model of contaminated soils by the Norwegian Institute for Water Research (https://www.iisd.org/sites/default/files/publications/green-finance-soil-remediation-international.pdf). •Scaling up and replication is vital to the durability of project outputs. The PIF states that the demonstration projects will facilitate scale-up. However, it does not provide information on how this will happen. There is a need to provide more clarity on this. STAP recommends that the project proponents refer to relevant publications on scaling-up, such as the nine steps for developing a scaling-up strategy (https://www.who.int/immunization/hpv/deliver/nine_steps_for_developing_a_scalingup_strategy_who_2010.pdf) and WHO's document "developing national strategies for phasing out mercury-containing thermometers and sphygmomanometers in health care, including in the context of the Minamata Convention on Mercury (http://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0006/295611/Phasing-Out-Mercury-containing-thermometers-sphygmomanometers-HC-en.pdf). The following publications may be useful too: "scaling up in development cooperation by GIZ (https://www.shareweb.ch/site/Learning-and-Networking/sdc_km_tools/Documents/GIZ-Scaling-up-in-development-cooperation.pdf). •The current PIF presents limited information on project stakeholders. It will be useful to provide a detailed analysis of project stakeholders, their expected roles, how they will be affected by the project, and a stakeholder engagement strategy. •The risk analysis needs to be more rigorous. There are more risks associated with this project than presented in the PIF, including financial, and institutional risks (working to develop policy and regulations which is dependent on government cooperation). Overall, a more detailed risk assessment and management plan need to be developed. •Climate risks: the proposal does not consider the potential risk from climate change on the success of the proposed interventions. How will projected climate change impacts affect the planned interventions? How will the effect of climate change influence the decision on contaminated site
Part I: Project Information	**What STAP looks for**	**Response**
B. Indicative Project Description Summary		
Project Objective	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.	Yes

	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	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
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
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?	Some improvements needed. Please, see STAP overall assessment above
	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?	N/A
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?	
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	
	For multiple focal area projects:	
	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?	Introduction of mercury-free medical devises i.e. thermometers and sphygmomanometers Improved policy and regulatory framework; Implementation of demonstration projects; development of guidance tool for sound management of obsolete mercury containing devices, creation of a platform for knowledge sharing and exchange Yes, however the underlying assumption are not explicit
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	
	· 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?	
	· Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	
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 - – considering the fact that China is the biggest producer and consumer of mercury containing medical devices. The majority of medical devices produced are exported
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	

6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?	Yes. See STAP overall assessment for further comments
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	
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?	green financing mechanism, green procurement standards, government/private banks, developing of policies that will support these initiatives are proposed. More detail information required
	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 expected not detailed in the PIF. Please see STAP overall assessment for more comments
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		
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	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Please see STAP overall assessment for more comments
	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?	
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	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	
5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design	Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?	
	Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?	
	For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:	
	· 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?	
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?	

	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	
	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?	
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?	
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	
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 ***"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."***	
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	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:	
	(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.	