STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10716
Project Title	Phasing out mercury measuring devices in healthcare
Date of Screening	15 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	The project aims to phase out the import, export, and manufacture of mercury thermometers and sphygmomanometers in five countries (Albania, Burkina Faso, India, Montenegro, and Uganda). The project aims to reduce 23.96 MT of Hg use in the health sector and eliminate 98.36 metric tons of mercury-containing products through its interventions. The project also intends to prevent the emission of uPOPs from poor healthcare waste management, although the expected GEBs are not estimated. STAP suggests that the following issues be addressed as the project is further developed: 1. The discussions on barriers are quite broad, and the cited examples are not related to the participating countries. Examples mentioned were from Brazil and the USA. Based on the information provided, it is impossible to know whether the identified barriers are specific to the targeted countries. It is essential to state the particular barriers in each country and how they will be overcome. 2. Policy and regulatory barriers are not mentioned. Given that the project will be implemented in five countries with different legislation, policy, and regulatory frameworks, there could be policy and regulatory issues that could hinder project implementation and success. We encourage the project proponents to review possible policy and regulatory issues and propose actions for addressing them. 3. The project is focused on mercury use and waste from the healthcare sector, but dental amalgam is conspicuously missing in the project intervention. What is the reason for this? Please explain why the project is not addressing this aspect of healthcare mercury management. 4. We encourage the project proponents to double-check the baseline data in Hg procurement, especially for India and Montenegro, to ensure that they are accurate. 5. STAP is encouraged that a well-articulated theory change has been presented. A description or inclusion of alternative pathways (plan B) if the proposed pathway is not feasible will further strengthen the current theory of change.

	6. The section on project components and outputs provides only a list of activities. A description of the proposed activities, with some specifics for each participating country, would help ascertain the project's quality and feasibility. 7. The lack of manufacturing capacity for non-Hg medical equipment was identified as a barrier. However, the only intervention addressing this is an awareness-raising campaign in India. Undertaking awareness-raising is insufficient to support a shift from the manufacturing of Hg-based medical instruments to non-Hg. A more robust intervention, such as the demonstration of alternative manufacturing methods, and creating the business case and financing model for such a shift are needed. We recommend that the project proponents consider the best set of interventions to help move manufacturers away from Hg-based medical instruments. 8. It is stated that the expected GEBs are estimated and that the estimates will be improved during the PPG phase. It is essential that this is done. Also, the methodology for monitoring and evaluation should be articulated, as this will be the only way to assess the project's success. 9. Apart from addressing mercury procurement and manufacture, the project also intends to address healthcare waste management. This will prevent the burning of waste, which will prevent the emission of uPOPs (dioxins and furans). While this was mentioned in Section 2f (description of GEBs), no value was provided for expected uPOPs emissions avoidance. The core indicator section of the PIF also did not include this uPOPs avoidance benefit. This is an essential component of the project. STAP recommends that the uPOPs avoidance benefit be assessed, and plans to capture and monitor its achievement should be incorporated into the project design and implementation. 10. The IEO Terminal Evaluation of Chemicals and Waste projects[1] revealed that there is limited evidence that GEF's chemical and waste projects successfully put in place sustainable strategies and financial mechanisms for scaling up. The proposal has not provided information on how the sustainability of the project will be ensured. There is a danger that this project will repeat the same drawback identified by the IEO. STAP recommends that more thought should be given to the sustainability and durability of the project. We recommend that the project proponents review STAP reports related to this issue, including: ○ STAP 2020. https://stapgef.org/multi-stakeholder-dialogue ○ STAP 2019. https://stapgef.org/achieving-enduring-outcomes-gef-investment 11. Scaling up and replicationare vital to the sustainability and durability of project outputs. The proposal states that "the lessons learned will potentially be widely applicable beyond the project;" however, it does not say how this will be done. We recommend that a more detailed analysis of scaling-up and replication should be provided. Useful resources in this regard include:

[1] http://www.gefieo.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/files/cw-study-2017_0.pdf

	○ WHO, 2010. https://www.who.int/immunization/hpv/deliver/nine_steps_for_developing_a_scaling up_strategy_who_2010.pdf ○ GIZ (2011). https://www.shareweb.ch/site/Learning-and-Networking/sdc_km_tools/Documents/GIZ-Scaling-up-in-development-cooperation.pdf ○ STAP 2020. https://stapgef.org/multi-stakeholder-dialogue ○ STAP 2019. https://stapgef.org/achieving-enduring-outcomes-gef-investment 12. The project noted the potential impact of climate risk on success and presented useful mitigation measures. We, however, encourage the project proponent to carry out a detailed climate risk assessment following STAP's guidance on climate risk screening, which is available at: ○ https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF%20AGENCY%20RETREAT%20Mar-Apr%202020.pdf ○ https://stapgef.org/stap-guidance-climate-risk-screening	
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 - Description of project effect as a result has been provided- the project is expected to phase out 23.96 MT of mercury
	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.	Yes
1. Project description. Briefly describe:	Is the problem statement well-defined?	Yes

1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)		
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes. See STAP overall assessment
	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;	
	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?	The design of the project is analogous to project GEF 10349 - 'Demonstration of phase-out of mercury-containing medical thermometers and sphygmomanometers and promoting the application of mercury-free alternatives in medical facilities in China'

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
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	• Development and implementation of national health-system wide strategies for phasing out the import, export and manufacture of mercury thermometers and sphygmomanometers • Implementation of national strategies to phase out manufacture, import and export in all project countries, and demonstrations of a phase out in use in at least 3 countries
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	• National strategies for phasing out mercury added thermometers and sphygmomanometers in healthcare • Phased out mercury-added thermometers and sphygmomanometers • Environmentally sound management of mercury containing medical waste • Awareness of Indian manufacturers on mercury free medical devices is raised
	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, but need improvement. 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?	Yes
	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?	This needs further elaboration
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	No
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	No
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	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Yes

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.		Their roles and engagement will be done during PPG
	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. Further engagement is envisaged during PPG
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 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.	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	Yes A gender action plan will be prepared during PPG

Will the project's results framework or logical framework include 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	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?	Yes Climate risk need more consideration
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
	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
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?	Project results will be made available nationally and shared with other countries participating in this project, and globally, through WHO, UNEP, the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership, and their networks including the International Medical Devices Regulators Forum (IMDRF) National workshops will be held
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	At the country level, the project will also develop or build on existing country-specific communication and knowledge management plans or platforms to ensure efficient cascading of information down to the healthcare facility level and to ensure sustainability of interventions

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 ***"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.