

### STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
<b>GEF ID</b>	10682
<b>Project Title</b>	POPs and mercury-free solutions for environmentally sound waste management in Paraguay
<b>Date of Screening</b>	10 November 2020
<b>STAP member screener</b>	Jamidu Katima
<b>STAP secretariat screener</b>	Sunday Leonard
<b>STAP Rating</b>	<i>Minor issues to be considered during project design</i>
<b>STAP Overall Assessment of the project proposal</b>	<p>STAP welcomes the GEF chemicals and waste project on POPs and mercury-free solutions for environmentally sound waste management in Paraguay. The project aims to transform the solid waste management sector in Paraguay to manage POPs and mercury emissions.</p> <p>STAP suggests that the following issues be addressed as the project is further developed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The current objective does not seem to adequately describe the substantial work that the project seeks to accomplish. The transformation of a linear solid waste management sector cannot happen through interventions that focus only on the segregation and management of hazardous material. For transformation to occur, interventions must focus on downstream end-of-pipe waste management solutions while addressing upstream issues of products design, the type of products imported and used in Paraguay, and consumer behavior. Based on the section on the theory of change (ToC) and associated figures, the project seems to have incorporated some upstream and downstream solutions (albeit with more focus on downstream interventions). Yet, the current objective suggests that the project is mainly addressing downstream solutions (segregation and ESM of wastes). We recommend that the project objective be revised to capture adequately what the project sets out to accomplish.</li> <li>2. In line with the comment above, STAP recommends that the interventions and associated activities for this project include downstream and upstream solutions to waste management issues. For example, the business models, financing options, and private sector engagements should be considered under Component 3, and should address how to support alternatives to POPs and mercury products, and promote their adoption by consumers (upstream), and solutions for sound management of existing waste.</li> <li>3. Theory of change: a very brief description of the ToC is presented on page 22. However, the description did not include the various elements of an adequate theory of change, including the assumption, outputs, proposed and alternative (plan B) pathways, and expected short and long-term impacts. This description is necessary to explain how the proposed activities contribute to the chain of results that lead to the intended impacts. Figures 1 and 2 provided in the theory of</li> </ol>

	<p>change section on page 23 are on the right track, and can be modified to represent an adequate theory of change. STAP recommends that this should be done.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Figure 1 (life-cycle intervention for POPs and Hg-containing products) recognized that this project would deliver chemicals and waste and climate change mitigation GEBs. However, the climate change mitigation GEB was not accounted for in the core indicator or the description of GEBs. Also, as recognized in the sections on the project description, baseline, and alternative scenarios, the targeted wastes may be directly or indirectly responsible for groundwater and air pollution. This indicates that this project could deliver multiple co-benefits. Furthermore, the increased reuse and recycling to be achieved through this project will contribute to material and resource management. While it is not a GEF requirement to report on co-benefits that are not GEBs, it would be useful to account for these benefits. Doing so would provide a more holistic account of the project's impact and highlight the substantial return on investments that can be achieved. The project will also deliver health and economic benefits, which should be accounted for during implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.</li> <li>5. It was indicated in the project description that CSOs would be engaged, and one CSO was included as part of the co-financing source. However, the response on Section 2 on CSO stakeholder consultation was "No." We assume that this is a typographical error. Please correct as appropriate.</li> <li>6. The potential risk of climate change on project success was recognized, but a climate risk assessment will be carried out at the PPG stage. This is very important, and STAP recommends that this should be done.</li> <li>7. Coordination is key to project success. Currently, the PIF provides the roles and modus operandi of the Steering Committee. The PIF lacks elaboration on how other stakeholders will be coordinated.</li> <li>8. The project proponents should clearly state the lessons learned from other projects and how they have been used in the project design.</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>
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Please see comment 1 in STAP's overall assessment of the project.
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?	The interventions are not divided into short and medium term, however the planned outcomes are stated, however the expected GEB are provided
	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
<b>Part II: Project justification</b>	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	Under theory of change section, the PIF presents life-cycle intervention – this lacks some aspects of theory of change which Inputs, Activities, Outputs, Outcomes, Impact and assumptions.
<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?	Barriers are described however no data is provided and no references
	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	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?	To transform the linear, wasteful solid waste management sector in Paraguay into an environmentally sound and sustainable model
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Strengthening of policy; Capacity building; Implementation of pilot projects
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	Policies; Guidelines; Inventories; Technical manuals; improved knowledge; ESM plans; Business incubators; Pilot projects
	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?	See STAP overall assessment
	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?	Yes
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Indicators are provided – obtained through estimation The numbers to be verified during PPG
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	This to be covered during PPG
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?	Application of life cycle principles
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	The PIF states that" the up-scaling aspect of the project will be through the promotion of business and financing options for ESM activities to ensure that successful project activities are replicated and up-scaled at the national level." This statement does not explain how upscaling will be achieved
	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.		Yes

<p><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, and their respective roles and means of engagement.</p>	<p>Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?</p>	<p>Yes</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>The roles are varying some will be executing the project, some will be in Steering Committee; Some will be involved in capacity building activities, some will be involved in awareness raising other will participate in pilot projects</p>
<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</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>To be considered during PPG</p>

<p>resources; participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services.</p> <p>Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd</p>		
	<p>Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?</p>	<p>To be addressed during PPG</p>
<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, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design</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?          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>	<p>Yes          No</p> <p>Yes – particularly COVID 19 related risks</p> <p>The PIF acknowledge the importance of climate risk assessment, however the detailed climate risk assessment will be done during PPG</p>
<p><b>6. Coordination.</b> Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives</p>	<p>Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>While the role of Steering Committee and how it will be functioning are mentions, as for other stakeholders, it is not clear on how they will be coordinated apart from mentioning them in the coordination diagram</p>

	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Recognition of existence, but without mentioning on what we be derived from them
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Not explicitly
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	Not mentioned
	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?	Not mentioned
<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 relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.	What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?	Yes The metrics that will be used include: Establishment of national information management mechanism which will be supported by a web-based portal for knowledge management on sustainability; Existing national and regional platforms and networks for information and knowledge exchange and experience-sharing.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	A National Information Management Mechanism

## Notes

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
1. <b>Concur</b>	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. <b>Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	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.

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