

## STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10686
Project Title	Reduction of POPs and UPOPs through integrated sound management of chemicals
Date of Screening	13 November 2020
STAP member screener	Jamidu Katima
STAP secretariat screener	Sunday Leonard
STAP Rating	<i>Minor issues to be considered during project design</i>
<b>STAP Overall Assessment of the project proposal</b>	<p>The project intends to minimize POPs, uPOPs, and greenhouse gas emissions by implementing green chemistry solutions in key manufacturing sectors in the Philippines. It is estimated that the project will reduce 182.5 MT of perfluorooctane sulfonic acid, its salts, and perfluorooctane sulfonyl fluoride and 10 MT short-chain chlorinated paraffin. The project is innovative because it will apply green chemistry principles to important manufacturing sectors.</p> <p>STAP has the following comments to be considered as the project is further developed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The PIF is well-prepared and provides relevant background information on drivers, problems, and baseline situation.</li> <li>2. We would like to refer the project proponents to the following publications that can help in developing the project further, including providing a broadened definition of green chemistry that incorporates the concept of functionality, performance, and sustainability, and examples of green chemistry alternatives for POPs:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ STAP, 2020. Delivering Multiple Benefits through the Sound Management of Chemicals and Waste. Background report (<a href="https://stapgef.org/publications">https://stapgef.org/publications</a>)</li> <li>○ Designing for a green chemistry future (<a href="https://science.sciencemag.org/content/367/6476/397">https://science.sciencemag.org/content/367/6476/397</a>)</li> <li>○ STAP, 2020. Delivering Multiple Benefits through the Sound Management of Chemicals and Waste. STAP Advisory Report (<a href="https://stapgef.org/publications">https://stapgef.org/publications</a>)</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. We encourage the project proponents to liaise and collaborate with the ongoing GEF project (ID: 10353 – The Global Greenchem Innovation and Network Programme), the objective of which is to scale up green chemistry for POPs, mercury and microplastics replacement through capacity building and innovation, and the creation of a global unifying green chemistry network for implementation and uptake.</li> <li>4. STAP is encouraged to note that a well-articulated theory change showing the causal chain leading to desired outcomes was presented. A description or inclusion of alternative pathways (plan B) as an option if the proposed pathway is not feasible would further strengthen the current theory of change.</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. It is encouraging to note that the project will develop a green financing framework (FREEME-Financing the Roadmap for the Environmental Enhancement of Manufacturing Enterprises). The proposed financing framework has several components. It is not clear what the risks are to the overall project design and implementation if one or more of the financing framework components is not realized. We suggest that a risk analysis and mitigation measures should be carried out on the green financing framework.</li> <li>6. Apart from chemicals and waste benefits, green chemistry can deliver other environmental gains, including climate change and resource use conservation, especially when coupled with renewable energy and clean production technology (see, for example, Steinfeld JI, 2009. Green chemistry, climate, and energy Green Chemistry Research Trends. 1-5 and Christol 2019. <a href="https://www.greenbiz.com/article/why-caring-about-climate-change-means-caring-about-chemicals-concern">https://www.greenbiz.com/article/why-caring-about-climate-change-means-caring-about-chemicals-concern</a>). We recommend that the project proponents should analyze, capture, and report on these other benefits.</li> <li>7. The IEO Terminal Evaluation of Chemicals and Waste projects<sup>1</sup> revealed that there is limited evidence that GEF's chemicals and waste projects successfully put in place sustainable strategies and financial mechanisms for scaling up. The section on the potential for scaling up in the PIF does not provide details on how this will be achieved. Hence, there is a danger that this project might fall into the same trap identified by the IEO. STAP recommends that more thought should be given to scaling up.</li> <li>8. Climate risk: The proposal presents a good preliminary analysis of the Philippines' climate change profile with information on the historical climate trends up to 2050. The environmental and social safeguards screening template, which is attached as an annex to the proposal, also recognized the potential impact of climate change on the planned interventions. Mitigation measures for identified climate risks will be prepared during the PPG stage. Given the Philippines' high climate vulnerability, including sea-level rise, increased frequency of extreme weather events, and rising temperatures,<sup>2</sup> we encourage that the development of climate risk mitigation measures should be prioritized.</li> <li>9. It is noted that a good initial consultation with relevant stakeholders has taken place. We recommend continuous engagement with project stakeholders throughout project design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.</li> </ol>	
<b>Part I: Project Information</b> <b>B. Indicative Project Description</b> <b>Summary</b>	<b>What STAP looks for</b>	<b>Response</b>

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/files/cw-study-2017\\_0.pdf](http://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/files/cw-study-2017_0.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.climatelinks.org/resources/climate-change-risk-profile-philippines>

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. Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits?	Application a Green Chemistry Approach in key manufacturing sectors in the Philippines which will lead into of reduction of 182.5 MT of Perfluorooctane sulfonic acid, its salts and perfluorooctane sulfonyl fluoride ; 10 MT Short-chain chlorinated parafins (SCCPs).
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	The PIF states that the core indicators will be assessed during PPG.
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
<b>Part II: Project justification</b>	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	The narrative project's logic is provided
<b>1. Project description. Briefly describe:</b> 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?	Yes, however no data provided
	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?	NA
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;	NA
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	Yes
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	Not shown
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	Application of Green Economy Approach
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing a roadmap for greening the manufacturing sector.</li> <li>• Implementation of demonstration of Green Chemistry</li> <li>• Enhancing the chemical management and reporting of POPs countrywide</li> </ul>
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updated NIP</li> <li>• Updated inventory of POPs and UPOPs.</li> <li>• Information of the key manufacturing sector for greening</li> <li>• A Roadmap for the implementation of Green Chemistry approach</li> <li>• A self-sustaining financial mechanism</li> <li>• At least 4 (four) industries from the key manufacturing sectors implementing Green Chemistry approach</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical guidance and roadmaps for the implementation of Green Chemistry</li> <li>• Amended downstream regulation amended</li> <li>• A PRTR (Pollutant Release and Transfer Register)</li> <li>• Capacitated customs officers to prevent illegal import of POPs chemicals, POPs containing mixtures and articles increased.</li> </ul>
	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?	
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
	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?	No
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental	Yes

	benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	None
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?	Yes – green chemistry approach
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	This section requires more thoughts. Piloting of project does not automatically lead to scaling-up
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	No
<b>1b. Project Map and Coordinates.</b> Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Not provided
<b>2. Stakeholders.</b> 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, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation,	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Yes

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?	Yes
<p><b>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.</b> 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</p>	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	Yes – however gender mainstreaming will be developed during PPG
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	No
<p><b>5. Risks.</b> Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible,</p>	<p>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?</p>	Yes

propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design	<p>For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?</li> <li>• Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?</li> <li>• What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?</li> </ul>	Climate risk is not discussed
<b>6. Coordination.</b> 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?	Yes
<b>8. Knowledge management.</b> Outline the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, and how it will contribute to the project's overall impact, including plans to learn from	What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?	Yes

relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.		
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	The project will develop an integrated knowledge management system on POPs and their alternatives

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 <b><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></b>
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.

<p><b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b></p>	<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>