

## STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
<p>GEF ID: <b>10879</b>            Project Title: Improved Management of E-Waste and Healthcare wastes to reduce UPOP            Date of Screening: November 16, 2021            STAP member screener: Saleem Ali            STAP secretariat screener: Sunday Leonard            STAP’s overall assessment: <b>Minor issues to be considered during project design</b></p>	<p>This project does a deep dive intervention on e-wastes and healthcare wastes as part of a larger World Bank project on air pollution, and carbon emissions mitigation in Cairo initiated in 2020. In this way, the project harnesses synergies with ongoing work in one of the world’s largest urban metropolitan areas with considerable challenges in controlling a range of pollutants.</p> <p>Electronic and medical wastes have grown during the pandemic. The project is thus timely in pursuing ways of reducing or reusing some of this waste stream to prevent its combustion or improper disposal. In this regard, the project proponents should consider STAP’s guidance documents on a circular economy that addresses related topics, including plastics and electronic wastes. The plastics case study may have specific relevance to the medical waste dimension of the project.</p> <p>A good theory of change was presented to show the activities, short-term outcomes, long-term impacts, pathways, and underlying assumptions. The theory of change also identifies circular economy approaches but needs to provide more operational detail on how this would relate to specific actions on the ground. Relevant STAP publications on circular economy that may be helpful include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ali and Leonard. 2021. The Circular Economy and Climate Mitigation. <a href="https://stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/circular-economy-and-climate-mitigation">https://stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/circular-economy-and-climate-mitigation</a></li> <li>2. Katima and Leonard. 2020. Delivering Multiple Benefits through the Sound Management of Chemicals and Waste. <a href="https://stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/delivering-multiple-benefits-through-sound-management-chemicals-and">https://stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/delivering-multiple-benefits-through-sound-management-chemicals-and</a></li> <li>3. Barra and Leonard. 2018. Plastics and the circular economy. <a href="https://stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/plastics-and-circular-economy">https://stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/plastics-and-circular-economy</a></li> </ol> <p>The calculations for Global Environmental benefits from the reduction of POP emissions reference a 2014 World bank study which was updated with more recent WHO data, but no reference is provided on this. It is essential to list all such sources as the veracity and verifiability of GEB calculations need to be trackable (the same is the case with other sources cursorily mentioned in Footnote 11).</p> <p>Further on GEBs, while the project title indicates that its focus is on uPOPs, no estimate of expected uPOPs reduction/avoidance was provided in the PIF (although 7.14gTEQ was stated in PID). Only the expected 0.29 metric tons reduction in mercury was noted. We encourage the project proponent to align the information provided in PIF with those in the PID.</p> <p>Also, given that this is part of a larger project, for accountability purposes, it is essential that the benefits emanating from GEF investment vs. the parent project are delineated. For example, some parts of GEF investment could achieve climate mitigation benefits by reducing CO2 emissions</p>	

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
		<p>from avoidance of combustion and improper disposal of e-waste and healthcare waste. At the same time, the parent project will also achieve climate benefits. Benefits emanating from GEF investment should be made clear during implementation and reporting.</p> <p>The climate risk screening component of the project could also be further embellished. Egypt will be hosting COP27, and all projects commencing in this project cycle for the country will have particular profiling in the climate arena regardless of their focal sectors (which in this case is chemicals and wastes).</p> <p>More importantly, the project will involve the construction of sanitary landfills and infrastructure for hazardous/non-hazardous waste streams, recycling, etc. These activities and facilities will be susceptible to climate change impacts. Therefore, it is vital to carry out a detailed climate risk assessment to understand the potential climate impacts and develop remedial options. Consequently, we recommended that a detailed climate risk screening be carried out using available tools within the World Bank (for example, <a href="https://climatescreeningtools.worldbank.org/">https://climatescreeningtools.worldbank.org/</a>).</p> <p>The gender management plan is not provided in detail. This is important to further elaborate, particularly for Egypt, which has faced concerns about mainstreaming of employment for women in certain sectors.</p> <p>The proponents may find the following references also to be useful:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aboelnour, A., &amp; Abuelela, M. H. (2019). Increase adherence to waste management policy at healthcare facility in Egypt. <i>Bulletin of the National Research Centre</i>, 43(1), 1–11. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1186/s42269-019-0065-2">https://doi.org/10.1186/s42269-019-0065-2</a></li> <li>• Mostafa, T. M., &amp; Sarhan, D. S. (2018). Economic Feasibility Study of E-Waste Recycling Facility in Egypt. <i>Evergreen (Kasuga)</i>, 5(2), 26–35. <a href="https://doi.org/10.5109/1936214">https://doi.org/10.5109/1936214</a></li> </ul>
<p><b>Part I: Project Information</b>  <b>B. Indicative Project Description</b>  <b>Summary</b></p>		
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes – they are defined and linked to the waste origin diagnostics
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project’s objectives?	Yes
Outcomes	<p>A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.</p> <p>Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits?</p> <p>Are the global environmental benefits likely to be generated?</p>	Yes – though the citation and calculation transparency could be improved as stated in general comments.

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
Outputs	<p>A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project.</p> <p>Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?</p>	Yes, there are a series of outputs listed along with each outcome
<b>Part II: Project justification</b>	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
<p><b>1. Project description. Briefly describe:</b></p> <p>1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)</p>	<p>Is the problem statement well-defined? Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?</p> <p>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?</p>	The multiple focal areas and the linkages and synergies are also presented.
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	<p>Is the baseline identified clearly? Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits? Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?</p> <p>For multiple focal area projects: 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 how did these lessons inform the design of this project?</p>	Yes, and the outcomes are benchmarked with the baseline quite well.

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	<p>What is the theory of change?            What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project’s objectives?</li> <li>• Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?</li> <li>• Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?</li> </ul>	Theory of change document is provided in congruence with suggested STAP guidelines. The circular economy portion could be further detailed in terms of operational outcomes.
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing	<p>GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?            LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?</p>	Noted
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	<p>Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?            Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?            Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?            Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?</p>	Yes,

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
	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? Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors? Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Yes,
<b>1b. Project Map and Coordinates.</b> Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		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, and their respective roles and means of engagement.	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers? 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 – stakeholder mapping is included in project design and stakeholder satisfaction also in outcome goals.
<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	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures	Gender equity plan is not provided in detail but may be a supplement. This is important for Egypt which has faced challenges with mainstreaming of employment for women.

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
<p>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>	<p>described that would address these differences?</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><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</li> </ul>	<p>Risk management table is also included</p> <p>Climate risk screening could be further improved.</p>

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
	<p>be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?</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?  Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?  Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?  How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?  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?</p>	<p>Yes – there is listing of coordination prospects provided with public and private sector and donors.</p>
<p><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.</p>	<p>What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?  What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?</p>	<p>Yes adequately provided</p>

### STAP’s advisory response

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Concur</b>	<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 <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></p>
<b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;</li> <li>(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.</li> </ul> <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>
<b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b>	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;</li> <li>(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.</li> </ul>