STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10721
Project Title	Environmentally sound management of hazardous wastes containing POPs and Mercury
Date of Screening	14 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 manage waste containing POPs and mercury in Panama using environmentally sound options. It will strengthen policy and regulatory frameworks and implement pilot projects. STAP recommends the following: 1. Given that the project intends to prevent, reduce, and eliminate POPs and mercury, the proposal needs to be clearer on activities to avoid the upstream generation of targeted wastes. While it is useful to manage generated waste, effective interventions must be in place to prevent waste generation in the first place for sustainability. 2. The project intends to implement the environmentally sound management of POPs and mercury-containing wastes. We encourage the project proponents to consult the Basel Convention Environmentally sound management (ESM) toolkit (http://www.basel.int/Implementation/CountryLedInitiative/EnvironmentallySoundManagement/ESMToolkit/Overview/tabid/5839/Default.aspx), which provides guidance on environmentally sound management of hazardous and other wastes. 3. A problem tree analysis and theory of change (ToC) diagram were presented in an annex. The ToC, however, lacks some relevant components. The current ToC is a diagrammatic representation 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 proponents to STAP's theory of change (https://stapgef.org/theory-change-primer) for more information on developing ToCs. 4. It is commendable that the project recognized the achievable climate co-benefits. The core indicator section indicates that 6765.94 metric tons of CO_2e will be mitigated. However, the section on Global Environmental Benefits (page 41 of the PIF) states that 27,063.76 metric tons of CO_2e would be achieved. We understand that the 6765.94 metric tons of CO_2e emission reduction is expected per year; hence 27,063.76 metric tons of CO_2e of emission reduction is expected in the project's 5-year period (that is, recognizing that emissions reduction will only start in the second year of the project). The value of core indicator 6 should be corrected accordingly to 27,063.76 metric tons of CO_2e.

	5. As noted on page 26, the proposed intervention may benefit local and international waters. We encourage that all of these benefits should be captured to highlight the return on investment from this project. 6. 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 did not provide needed information on how the project's sustainability will be ensured, including the financial mechanisms. With the lack of details, this project could fall into the same trap identified by the IEO. STAP recommends that more thought should be given to the sustainability and 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). 7. Scaling up and replication are critical to the sustainability and durability of project outputs. According to the PIF, demonstration and pilot activities would be implemented. How would the project ensure that these pilots will be replicated elsewhere in the country? The proposal states that "the design of the project is such that the results of these projects can be replicated in other landfills and hospitals or health centers in the rest of the country to multiply the experiences gained and implement success stories." But there is no information on how this will be achieved. We recommend that a more detailed analysis of scaling-up and replication should be provided. Useful resources in this regard may include: ○ WHO, 2010. https://www.who.int/immunization/hpv/deliver/nine_steps_for_developing_a_scalingup_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 8. The proposal also presents a preliminary analysis of the potential risks to the project's success; however, the risks are not rated in terms of their potential impacts. STAP recommends that this should be done. 9. Climate risk: an environmental and social safeguards screening template was included as an annex. Although the safeguard template's response indicates that the project's potential outcomes will be sensitive or vulnerable to climate change, a climate risk assessment was not prepared. This project will involve several landfill sites, interventions in locations around coastal areas, and address chemicals (mercury and POPs) the release and emissions of which can be influenced by the changing climatic conditions such as temperature, rainfall, and extreme

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

	weather. Furthermore, Panama is considered a highly vulnerable country to climate change impacts. Panama experiences a number of extreme weather events, including intense and protracted rainfalls, windstorms, floods, droughts, wildfires, earthquakes, landslides, tropical cyclones, tsunamis, and ENSO/El Niño-La Niña events (https://climateknowledgeportal.worldbank.org/country/panama). Climate risk screening is, therefore, essential for this project. It is recommended that the project proponents carry out a detailed climate risk assessment following STAP's guidance on climate risk screening, 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 – The project will deliver: • 200 t equipment and materials containing PCB · • 330 t materials/residues containing HBCD, corresponding to 2.5 t HBCD. • 350 kg of mercury • 6 g TEQ unintentional POPs · • 27,063.76 t CO eq.
	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. Theory of change need to be improved. See STAP overall assessment
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, and data is provided
	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?	Although the project is presented as a single focal area project, it mentions that the project will minimize emission of CO2 in the tune of 33,829.71 t CO2 eq./year, which is significant additional benefit from the project.
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?	
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of	What is the theory of change?	Environmentally sound management of waste containing POPs and mercury

expected outcomes and components of the project		
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	• Strengthening legal and institutional capacities for sound management of POPs and Mercury • Prevention and reduction of POPs emission. • Prevention and Minimization of Mercury Emissions.
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	• Strengthened legal and regulatory framework for sound management and elimination of POPs and Mercury • Strengthened institutional coordination for sound management of POPs and Mercury • A programme to decrease incidence of waste burning of dump sites/landfills and of hospital's waste disposal • Two pilot projects on PCCD/Fs reduction emission through BAT/BEP in a dump site combined • A plan to eliminate PCB contaminated equipment • Two hundred (200) t of PCB equipment and waste from sensitive sites removed • A plan for reduction of use of Expanded Polystyrene (with prevention as basic concept) as building material for reduction of HBCD • Two Pilots project on final disposal of 30 t of EPS waste with HBCD in production and construction enterprises • Five pilot projects for replacement of mercury containing equipment/products and establishment of a management and temporary storage system of mercury

		waste, in large hospitals and small priority health centres. • Two pilot projects (2) in hospitals for reduction of emission of mercury through prevention and application of BAT/BEP for management and disposal of waste.
	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 overall assessment for comments on GEBs
	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?	The PIF states that "The design of the project is such that the results of these projects can be replicated in other landfills and hospitals or health centers in the rest of the country to multiply the experiences gained and implement success stories". This is not clear on how?
	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 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?	Yes
	What are the stakeholders' roles, and how will their combined roles contribute to robust project	Yes.

	design, to achieving global environmental outcomes, and to lessons learned and knowledge?	
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. Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	Yes A gender analysis and action plan will be prepared during PPG
	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	Yes. However, the risks are not ranked. Climate risk is not considered.

	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?	
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?	The PIF states that the lessons learnt from past will be used without stating how.
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	Not stated
	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 stated
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 POPs management information system will be developed • Strategy for dissemination will be developed
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	• The specific Knowledge Management Strategy will be developed during the PPG phase.

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.