

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10673
Project Title	Green Production and Sustainable Development in Secondary Aluminum, Lead, Zinc, and Lithium Sectors in China
Date of Screening	09 November 2020
STAP member screener	Jamidu Katima
STAP secretariat screener	Sunday Leonard
STAP Rating	Minor issues to be considered during project design
STAP Overall Assessment of the project proposal	<p>This project aims to reduce dioxins and furans emissions and soundly manage plastics containing flame retardants. Demonstration activities will be undertaken at pilot plants.</p> <p>STAP has the following comments on the proposal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The project description is well referenced and provides a good scientific basis for the project. The baseline information is also adequate. 2. Although the project is entitled "green production and sustainable development in secondary aluminum, lead, zinc and lithium sectors in China," it is not very clear, overall, what green technologies will be introduced. Several green production opportunities need to be considered, such as switching to renewable energy; adopting energy efficiency measures; capturing carbon emissions; preventing air pollution; chemical pollution reduction; introducing green chemistry; and conserving natural resource during production processes, e.g., water and land; and ecosystem management and considerations. All these need to be considered in designing and implementing the project. This will ensure that the project maximizes and captures all possible GEBs while also minimizing trade-offs. 3. The project theory of change (ToC) is missing: developing and following a well-prepared ToC is essential to project success. It explains how planned activities contribute to the results chain that leads to the intended impacts. We refer the project proponents to STAP's theory of change primer (https://stapgef.org/theory-change-primer) for more information on developing ToCs. 4. Output 1.1.3 relates to the removal of barriers through the institution of economic instruments and incentives. However, it is unclear what types of economic instruments or incentives are being proposed. This needs to be made more evident in the proposal. 5. Component 2 will reduce uPOPs and BRFs release by deploying environmentally sound disposal practices at recycling entities. Details of the environmentally sound disposal practices are, however, not provided. What are the available technologies that are being considered, and

	<p>what are their benefits and drawbacks? What process and criteria would be considered in selecting the appropriate technology?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Limited information was provided on the private sector engagement strategy to be deployed in the project. 7. The core indicators section indicated that 4752.6 metric tons CO₂e would be mitigated through this project. However, the proposed interventions did not clearly show how this would be achieved or what activity will help achieve this. Also, Section F on GEBs is silent on climate benefits, although some information on greenhouse gas emissions was noted in the climate risk screening section. Indeed, this project has significant potential to deliver substantial climate benefits given that (1) recycling will prevent the carbon-intensive mining of virgin metals and (2) the application of appropriate technologies (e.g., use of renewable energy for the recycling process, deploying energy efficiency solutions, or end-of-pipe carbon capture technologies) can help mitigate greenhouse gas emission. We recommend that the proposal be elaborated further to provide a detailed analysis of how climate benefits will be ensured. 8. It is commendable that the co-benefits related to ecosystems, human health, and improved economy were recognized in paragraph 60. The targeted emissions sources also emit air pollutants, including CO, NO_x, dust, and heavy metals. The air pollution benefits and biodiversity, human health, and other socioeconomic benefits from the project should be considered. A plan to capture these benefits during project implementation, monitoring, and evaluation should be put in place. 9. Risk: A useful list of potential risks was provided with proposed mitigation measures. However, more risk factors need to be considered, including environmental, economic, financial, cultural, etc. 10. Climate risk: It is good that a description of current and projected climate scenarios in China was presented and potential climate risks were recognized. However, the information presented is broad. The proposal does not consider the potential risk of climate change on the proposed interventions. How will projected climate change affect the proposed activities? What are the associated risks, and what mitigating factors will be considered? STAP recommends that a detailed analysis of climate risks and a management strategy should be presented. For more guidance, see STAP's advice on climate risk screening, which is available at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF%20AGENCY%20RETREAT%20Mar-Apr%202020.pdf ○ https://stapgef.org/stap-guidance-climate-risk-screening 11. Scaling up and replication is critical to the sustainability and durability of project outputs. However, the section on innovation, sustainability, and the potential for scaling up is inadequate. 12. A good set of key stakeholders and their roles was presented. STAP recommends that these stakeholders should be consulted during their project preparation stage to ensure adequate
--	--

	buy-in. For more information on how to effectively engage stakeholders, please see STAP guidance on multi-stakeholder dialogue (https://stapgef.org/multi-stakeholder-dialogue).	
Part I: Project Information B. Indicative Project Description Summary	What STAP looks for	Response
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?	Yes, but the interventions are not broken down in phase, the are well described. Yes following GEB are expected Avoidance of 4752.6 MTCO2e emissions Polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDF) 8.06 MT Polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins (PCDD) 8.06 3,000.00 MT of POPs containing material Reduction of 16.13 gTQE of uPOPs
	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 Yes
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	The PIF provides a project road map which do not have characteristics of 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?	Yes

	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 Although the presented as a single focal area, it has some GEBs in other focal areas such as climate change, international waters and biodiversity. However, this is not a requirement for now to discuss them. Please see STAP overarching assessment for further details.
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	NA
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	NA
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	No theory of change was presented. But the project has the following logic to deliver solutions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green production
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthening the national policy and regulatory framework to reduce UP-POPs and BFRs releases from secondary non-ferrous industry

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction of UP-POPs and BFRs releases from unsound metal scrap recycling • Implementation of National Replication Programme (NRP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives? 	<p>Major outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced UP-POPs and BFRs releases resulting from unsound metal scrap and batteries recycling management practices through the adoption and implementation of standards/measures, policies, plans, laws, regulations and guidance • Reduced releases of UP-POPs and BFRs as a result of improved raw material (recycled metal scrap) supply chains as well as the introduction of environmentally sound disposal practices at recycling entities • Replication and Promotion of demonstration results and experience.
	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?	GEF additionality clearly identified, including data monitoring, institutional strengthening, private sector engagement and lesson sharing.
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	NA

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 – considering that China is a global leader in the production of Aluminum, Lead, Zinc and Lithium batteries
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Yes
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Yes
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	The project can reduce CO2 emissions if well designed. Please see STAP overall assessment for further information on this.
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?	The section innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up needs more elaboration
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Although in one of the outputs the project aims are to develop national replication plan, this is not discussed under this section.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	None
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Not provided
2. Stakeholders. Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase:	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Yes PIF states that further consultations will be done during PPG phase

<p>Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities.</p> <p>If none of the above, please explain why.</p> <p>In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.</p>		
	<p>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?</p>	<p>Yes More elaboration will be provided during PPG</p>
<p>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Will the project's results framework or logical framework include</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Yes</p>

gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd		
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	No
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	<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? For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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? 	Climate and other risk were noted but detail analysis still need to be undertaken. Please see STAP overall assessment for further guidance.
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?	Yes However, the provided coordination diagram is not elaborated on how it will work
	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?	The coordination mechanism that was used during implementation of the sited project

	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. The project will use the same Technical Coordination Group (TCG)
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?	The project will create the knowledge management system of green production and sustainable development
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	Using existing sharing platform for green production and sustainable development

Notes

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
<p>1. Concur</p>	<p>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.</p>
	<p>* 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 <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></p>
<p>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</p>	<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;</p>
	<p>(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>

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