

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
		<p>GEF ID: 10798 Project Title: Reduction of unintentionally-produced persistent organic pollutants and mercury through an environmentally-sound approach on health care wastes management in the Philippines with a special focus on the pandemic Date of Screening: May 18, 2021 STAP member screener: Saleem H. Ali STAP secretariat screener: Sunday Leonard STAP's overall assessment: Minor issues to be considered during project design.</p> <p>This project has some important, timely features of responding to the sudden rise in medical wastes following the advent of the COVID 19 pandemic. It also links to international environmental agreements – the Minamata Convention and the Stockholm Convention. However, while the evidence on mercury reduction and associated Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs) is clear, this is not the case for the linkage to UPOP reduction.</p> <p>The project's focus on facemasks and its proposed linkage to UPOP reduction are not clearly made. Reviewing the scientific literature on this topic suggests that while there is a range of chemicals released by facemasks, the UPOP component is not a significant issue in terms of environmental exposure. There may be occupational exposure to the mask wearer directly of some masks (which ones also needs to be more clearly argued as there is such a wide range of materials used). If there is clear research indicating levels of UPOP release from mask burning, that should be identified so that the global environmental benefits can be noted. This is implied in the proposal, but no clear evidence is provided.</p> <p>The proponents deserve commendation for a good theory of change diagram covering global environmental benefits, risk screening, and gender mainstreaming. The theory of change could be further improved by including the underlying assumptions that will lead to desired outcomes and alternative pathways. STAP's theory of change primer (https://stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer) can be a helpful guide in this regard.</p> <p>It is not clear from the proposal how the proposed "assistance to small manufacturers of reusable non-medical fabric masks" (paragraph 48 and 58) will contribute to chemicals and waste benefits (i.e., uPOP or Hg emissions reduction). We recommend that this should be made more explicit.</p> <p>Further, given the industrial focus of the project in terms of domestic producers of PPE, the project should have a more clearly articulated private sector engagement strategy.</p> <p>Component 3 of the project (capacity building and awareness-raising) will require a change in behavior across the public and private sectors and among citizens to be successful. Therefore, we recommend that the proponent review STAP's recent advisory on behavior</p>

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
<p>change, which highlights six strategic levers for changing behavior, to provide further insight into designing this component. (https://stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/why-behavior-change-matters-gef-and-what-do-about-it).</p> <p>There are a few preliminary studies that the World Economic Forum identified around microplastics pollution and face masks, but the UPOP link is not clear: How face masks, gloves, and other coronavirus waste is polluting our ocean (https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/06/ppe-masks-gloves-coronavirus-ocean-pollution/).</p> <p>The following open access article with a focused case analysis of how medical waste in the Philippines may be converted to energy generation may provide some further innovation ideas for the project to be considered.</p> <p>Medical waste treatment and electricity generation using pyrolyzer-rankine cycle for specialty hospitals in Quezon City, Philippines – (https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1755-1315/463/1/012180).</p>		
<p>Part I: Project Information B. Indicative Project Description Summary</p>		
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 – though the connection between changes in production and use of Face Masks and its linkage to UPOPs is unclear, whereas mercury reduction is clearer from medical devices.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits? Are the global environmental benefits likely to be generated?	Yes, for the mercury aspect of the project. The UPOPs and face mask aspects need to be further clarified.
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, for the mercury aspect of the project. The UPOPs and face mask aspects need to be further clarified.
<p>Part II: Project justification</p> <p>A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.</p>		

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
<p>1. Project description. Briefly describe:</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>	<p>Yes – the mercury aspect is adequately presented. The UPOP element needs to be further clarified.</p>
<p>2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects</p>	<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>	<p>Yes, there are citations to earlier UNIDO studies and materials provided.</p>
<p>3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project</p>	<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"> • What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives? • Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well- 	<p>Yes, the theory of change is nicely presented and includes risk analysis and linkage to gender mainstreaming, which are good synergistic features of the diagram. It can be further improved by including underlying assumptions and alternative pathways.</p>

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
	<p>informed identification of the underlying assumptions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes? 	
<p>5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing</p>	<p>GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?</p> <p>LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?</p>	<p>Partially presented</p>
<p>6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)</p>	<p>Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?</p> <p>Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?</p> <p>Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?</p> <p>Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?</p> <p>What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?</p>	<p>Yes – if there is an overall reduction in UPOPs and mercury, the impacts can be global. But clear information is needed to UPOPs benefits of the project.</p>
<p>7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up</p>	<p>Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?</p> <p>Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up,</p>	<p>Moderately innovative in terms of the use of pollution prevention approaches and efforts at behavioral change regarding mask-wearing and reuse.</p>

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
	<p>for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors? Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?</p>	
<p>1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.</p>		Yes
<p>2. 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>	<p>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?</p>	Yes
<p>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</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures 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>	Gender issues are clearly noted in the theory of change as a major lens through which the project would see its objectives realized.

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
<p>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>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 	<p>Climate risk is mentioned in the risk section, but detailed risk screening still needs to be developed.</p>

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
	risks and resilience enhancement measures?	
<p>6. Coordination. 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>Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?</p> <p>Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?</p> <p>How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?</p> <p>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>Private sector engagement should have been noted more clearly given that this involves waste reduction efforts which has a direct industry nexus.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?</p> <p>What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?</p>	<p>Yes noted</p>

STAP's advisory response

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