

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10419
Project Title	Environmentally sound management of PCBs, Mercury and other toxic chemicals in Peru
Date of Screening	08 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>The project intends to minimize the environmental and human health impacts of POPs, mercury, and other toxic chemicals in Peru by strengthening regulatory and institutional frameworks and introducing sound management solutions. The project is expected to lead to the destruction of 600MT of materials containing PCB, 100MT of POPs pesticides, 3MT of mercury, and 10.0 gTEQ of uPOPs.</p> <p>STAP suggests that the following issues be addressed as the project is further developed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Paragraphs 1-12. This section does not adequately present the global environmental problems, root causes, and barriers. It only offers information on regulations related to POPs and mercury in Peru. There is no description of the issues of concern, the various factors leading to the problem, how they are connected, and the barriers to achieving the desired endpoint. Without an analysis of the problem, it is impossible to develop solutions that are holistic and achieve the desired change. 2. Paragraphs 13-21 present useful information on the current status and baseline of POPs management. But information on the status of mercury management (which is part of this project) is inadequate. 3. Paragraph 21 provides a list of barriers. However, some of the listed items are not barriers. More thought is needed on what constitutes a barrier and how they will be addressed. 4. Regulatory concerns related to mercury and POPs-related management are stated, including the lack of legislation regarding exports and effective control for small productive activities. However, it is not explicit in the interventions related to regulatory and institutional strengthening (Component 1) how they will be addressed. The interventions seem to focus on communication and coordination. It is important to be clear about the specific activities that will be implemented to address the regulatory and institution issues related to POPs and mercury management. 5. Paragraph 25 indicates an intention to test motivational and economic incentive for pesticide management. It is, however, unclear what these incentives are or would entail. It would be

	<p>useful to be more explicit. Examples of such incentives should be provided, including how they would be beneficial.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">6. Paragraph 27 is related to a pilot business model for managing and eliminating POPs pesticides, and other toxic chemicals. However, it is unclear from the proposal what the business model entails. Does this refer to technology to be deployed or how the various actors will be brought together to deliver sustainable solutions? This needs to be made clearer in the proposal.7. Theory of Change (ToC). A theory of change was provided in appendix D. The ToC, however, lacks relevant components of a good ToC. The ToC that was presented is a diagrammatic expression of the project objective, components, and outputs. The underlying assumptions, pathways, alternative plans, and medium- and long-term impacts needed for a complete ToC were missing. We refer the project proponent to STAP's theory of change (https://stapgef.org/theory-change-primer) for more information on developing ToCs.8. Core indicators and GEBs: Some information on how the GEBs numbers were derived, including the assumptions, would be useful. For example, indicator 11 indicates that 10 million people will benefit directly from the project interventions. What is the basis for this estimate? Information on GEBs and assumptions are important to support effective monitoring and evaluation during and after project implementation.9. Paragraph 38: It is commendable that the expected socio-economic co-benefits from the project are included. The project will also provide health co-benefits. This should be considered as the project is developed further and during implementation. Narratives on how the elimination of these chemicals can benefit other areas of GEF's work, including biodiversity, land degradation, and international waters, should also be considered.10. The IEO Terminal Evaluation of Chemicals and Waste projects¹ revealed that there is limited evidence that the GEF's chemical and waste projects successfully put in place sustainable strategies and financial mechanisms for project scale-up. The information presented in Paragraph 42 to 47 does not clearly show how the project activities will be sustained and scaled up, particularly on financing activities after the project. While capacity building and institutional strengthening would help ensure project sustainability (as indicated in Paragraph 43), a more detailed assessment of how to ensure continued delivery of global environmental and socio-economic benefits beyond its lifetime is needed. Actions to ensure that new hazardous chemicals are not introduced in the future is lacking. Also, no clear information on how financial resources to eliminate the remaining POPs and mercury beyond those targeted in the project will be achieved. While the introduction of business models was mentioned in one of the project components, the information on what such a business model would entail is not presented. With the lack of details, this project could fall into the same trap identified by the IEO. STAP recommends that more thought should be provided on the sustainability and
--	---

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

	<p>durability of the project. We encourage the project proponents to review STAP's paper on achieving enduring outcomes from GEF investments (https://stapgef.org/achieving-enduring-outcomes-gef-investment) and innovation and the GEF (https://stapgef.org/innovation-and-gef).</p> <p>11. Stakeholders: The proposal provided a list of stakeholders and their roles, but it is unclear what "other potential possessors of PCB containing transformers" means. We encourage the project proponents to present information on all relevant stakeholders and describe their roles. The project proponents should ensure Civil Society Organizations are consulted during PPG, as stated in the document.</p> <p>12. Risk: Each risk needs to be rated as either low, medium, or high. More risk factors need to be considered, including environmental, technical, economic, financial, cultural, etc.</p> <p>13. Climate risk: the proposal does not consider the potential risk of climate change impacting the success of the proposed interventions. How will projected climate change affect the proposed methodology for cleaning up and disposing of the chemicals? What are the associated risks, and what mitigating factor will be considered? A detailed analysis of climate risk and management strategy should be presented.</p> <p>14. The PIF states that the knowledge management strategy will be developed during PPG. KM is key for project sustainability and scalability. The PIF states that KM "will also benefit from the pilots tested from Component 2 of the Brazil PCB project" without elaboration. We encourage the development of a clear knowledge management strategy.</p>	
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?	No, please revised the objective to clearly indicate the project's goals
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Please refer to STAP overarching comments
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. 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
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	Yes. Please see STAP overarching comments for specific advice on improving the 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?	The document provides a list of barriers, although some do not sound like barriers e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complement elimination of POPs- and other highly toxic pesticides. • Mercury devices substitution in the Health Care Waste Management of Peru • Avoidance of UPOPs emissions from Health Care Waste Management
	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. See STAP overarching comment
	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:	

	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	Not shown
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	Not shown
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	Environmentally sound management of PCB, mercury and other toxic chemicals
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Strengthening of regulatory and institution framework and implementing pilot programmes
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	Strengthening regulatory and institutional framework; establishment of national system for environmentally sound management and elimination of POPs, Mercury and other toxic chemicals; establishment of coordination platform; piloting of POPs Pesticides Management and business model; demonstration projects for mercury waste management; creation of knowledge exchange platform
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	No assumptions are stated, but the stated activities are plausible
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	No
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline,	GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?	Yes

the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing		
	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
	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?	Some indicators are just listed without justification on they were obtained e.g. 5,000,000 male and 5,000,000 females. Methodology of estimation is presented for other indicators
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Not discussed
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 PIF states that the innovation lies in the integrated approach to manage POPs, Mercury and other toxic waste, however, these seem to be three project components executed by different players some overlapping activities e.g. coordination. In other words each component can be implemented independently
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Not elaborated
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Involvement of private change will require

<p>1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.</p>		Not provided
<p>5. Stakeholders. 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>	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Stakeholders involved are government ministries and private sector. No Civil society involvement
	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?	The roles are explained
<p>5. 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.</p>	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	To be done at PPG stage

<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 gender-sensitive indicators? Yes/no /td</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>No</p>
<p>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>	<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? 	<p>Some risks have been identified but they are not comprehensive, particularly climate risk and climate resilience are not discussed. See STAP overarching comments above</p>

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?	This is not adequately covered
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	No
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	No
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	No
	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?	No
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 specific Knowledge Management Strategy will be developed during the PPG phase
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	Through knowledge exchange platform and social media

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>