

REVISED STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE, May 2024

GEF ID	11534
Project title	Global Chemicals Monitoring Programme to support implementation of Stockholm and Minamata Conventions (GCMP)
Date of screen	30 May 2024
STAP Panel Member	Miriam Diamond
STAP Secretariat	Sunday Leonard

1. Summary of STAP's views of the project

This proposal aims to sustain and enhance the global monitoring of POPs and Hg. Global monitoring of POPs has proven to be highly valuable for demonstrating the effectiveness of the Stockholm Convention. Data collection and communication under Stockholm's GMP is internationally recognized for its scientific and technical excellence and for providing key information to support activities under this Convention.

The current proposal will expand the Global Monitoring Plan (GMP) to include Hg, newly listed POPs, and countries for which data are currently unavailable. This proposal extends the ongoing and well-established GMP under the Stockholm Convention and, as such, builds on a wealth of experience and knowledge.

The project is well designed by the Global Project, providing support to Regional Child Projects to build capacity, methods, training, etc, which will then flow to the global platform set up by the Global Child Projects. All these activities are then intended to feed back into the Stockholm and Minamata Conventions bodies, regional centers, and national governments. A needs assessment during the PPG will inform activities. The project will develop "knowledge products" that are sensitive to gender, youth, and Indigenous peoples. The project has a sound governance structure to bring together the regions and relevant bodies and initiatives (e.g., WHO, MEAs beyond Stockholm and Minamata). The project is following a clear process to select countries start monitoring activities.

Because of the proposal's scientific nature, it will not generate any GEBs. However, it will provide valuable baseline information that can be used by other projects to achieve GEB delivery.

The STAP compliments the proponents on assembling a well-conceived and planned proposal and suggests a few minor points to be considered to improve the project further.

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*

- X 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.

1. **Systems thinking.** The proposal, which continues and expands ongoing activities, is well framed and described within the "ecosystem" of MEAs, other relevant activities, etc.

2. **Uncertainty futures.** N/A (not applicable)

3. **Baseline, barriers, and enablers.** Adequately described and addressed.

4. Theory of Change (ToC):

Includes assumptions, drivers, and outputs leading to outcomes and then impacts along logical pathways

5. Project Components

1. Sustainable capacity for global monitoring of POPs & Hg

Guidance will be produced for country-specific labs, and plans will be developed for inter-lab comparisons. Who will decide and harmonize sampling media for Hg given the breadth of the Minamata terms of Article 22 that is broad, e.g., measuring Hg and its compounds be measured in which biotic media and which environmental media to allow for inter-country comparison and the tracking of temporal trends?

2. Generation of high-quality, comparable global data

The inclusion of inter-lab comparisons is essential for ensuring inter-country comparison and developing credible temporal trends data.

3. Knowledge management, information dissemination, and communication to strengthen broader collaboration and stakeholder engagement

3.1 is very broad. Presumably, activities under this output will include gathering data from regional and country partners, followed by careful data checking for QA/QC and curation.

6. **Additionality.** This project would not be possible without GEF funding. The proposal speaks to broadening participation to bring in private labs. In-kind co-financing from numerous countries and agencies is indicated.

7. Engaging stakeholders

The project is intended to provide more information to, for example, the SPP on Chemicals, Waste & Pollution Prevention, Global Framework on Chemicals, Global Biodiversity Framework, AMAP, IADN, etc. Stakeholders from MEAs, regions, and countries that are likely to be brought in through Child Projects have been consulted.

8. Calculations of GEBs. Adequate

8. The discussion of **policy coherence.** Not applicable

9. Analysis of **risks:** Adequate

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

The following are specific points that the STAP suggests should be addressed.

- Point raised above about who and how will the decision be made to harmonize sampling media to support the Minamata Convention decision? This decision on which media to sample and sampling methods for the Stockholm Convention took considerable effort and needs to be clarified as it pertains to the Minamata Convention.
- P 8. The proposal needs to distinguish “phase-out” as it pertains to the use of POPs and Hg vs their continued environmental abundance due to persistence and chemical cycling and re-cycling processes
- p 26. The proposal correctly states that the project will not directly contribute to reducing POPs or Hg and thus to GEBs but will benefit global environmental benefits against Core Indicator 11 and co-benefits. However, p 31 describes that M&E will “establish a common approach to quantifying and reporting on Core Indicators” of GEBs. Is there a contradiction between these two statements?
- It is commendable to develop indicators that consider the “degree of uptake of mechanisms for evidence-based policymaking by participating countries” and “level of enhancement in policy development and

enforcement and activation of public incentives,” which are likely difficult to directly attribute to activities under this project.

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? Details are missing on how such changes will 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.)