

## REVISED STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE, OCTOBER 2022

GEF ID	11420
Project title	Sound management of polychlorobiphenyls in Cote d'Ivoire, Phase II – Objective 2028 of the Stockholm Convention
Date of screen	22 January, 2024
STAP Panel Member	Miriam Diamond
STAP Secretariat	Sunday Leonard

### 1. Summary of STAP's views of the project

This well-described project aims to eliminate 1000 tons of PCB-contaminated oils in transformers identified through previous inventory efforts and as reported in the country's National Implementation Plan to the Stockholm Convention. The inventory was obtained by extrapolating from a limited testing program conducted in 2012-2013 to the national level. Further, the project builds on the elimination of 248,163 tonnes of oils and contaminated transformer carcasses in 2017.

The project has five components to support the ultimate impact of protecting human and ecosystem health from releases of PCB: 1. Establish and strengthen the regulatory and institutional framework for ESM of PCBs; 2. Update the inventory of transformers that could contain PCBs; 3. Eliminate 1000 tonnes of PCB-contaminated materials; 4 increase capacity and awareness of the risks of PCBs and their best management; and 5. Monitoring and sharing lessons learned with stakeholders that can be transferred to the management of other hazardous wastes.

The project's rationale, Theory of Change, and stakeholder consultations are strong. Assumptions are clearly laid out, although an analysis of future scenarios could aid in bolstering the proposal against those assumptions that could weaken. Another strength of the proposal is that a SWOT analysis will be conducted to guide the planning of Component 3 – the ESM of PCBs, e.g., final disposal of those with high PCB concentration, decontaminate transformers with low to medium contamination, deciding on stationary vs mobile treatment units.

The proposal could be strengthened by better describing incentives to promote co-financing.

*Note to STAP screeners: a summary of STAP's view of the project (not of the project itself), covering both strengths and weaknesses.*

#### STAP's assessment\*

- Concur - STAP acknowledges that the concept has scientific and technical merit
- Minor - STAP has identified some scientific and technical points to be addressed in project design**
- Major - STAP has identified significant concerns to be addressed in project design

Please contact the STAP Secretariat if you would like to discuss.

### 2. Project rationale, and project description – are they sound?

See annex on STAP's screening guidelines.

1. The system and baseline conditions were described well in terms of "knowns" and "unknowns" in the PCB inventory, the need for GEF financing to incentivize ESM of PCBs, and the need to close the current legislative gaps. The proposal discusses drivers, mostly continued use of PCB-containing transformers in the absence of clear legislation and financial incentives to ensure ESM of PCBs. The issue of cross-contamination when re-filling transformers and the potential for mismanaging those oils was identified. Further, old PCB-contaminated transformers have been used for metal recycling, resulting in unforeseen and difficult-to-control contamination.

2. *Uncertain futures were not discussed* but could be useful when considering measures to mitigate possible outcomes should assumptions not be upheld and if barriers prove more stubborn than anticipated.

3. The *Theory of Change* clearly lays out logical pathways that extend from components to outputs and outcomes. Drivers and assumptions are noted for each pathway. Institutional changes are discussed in terms of strengthening the regulatory and institutional framework for ESM of PCBs. Behaviour change is needed amongst holders of PCB-containing transformers to encourage their participation. That will be addressed through Component 4: increasing awareness and through stakeholder engagement.

4. Although the Theory of Change was clear and a strength of Component 3 (ESM and final disposal) was using a SWOT analysis to prioritize actions. However, *more specific details could have been offered on how some of the components will be achieved*, e.g., Component 1 of strengthening the regulatory and institutional framework (how will this be achieved, what is the timeline vs. the need to eliminate PCBs by 2028, what if political support isn't given?), Component 3 (e.g., how will cross-contamination and the recycling of PCB-contaminated transformer carcasses be avoided?), and Component 5 (e.g., what exactly will be monitored for PCBs in the monitoring system – air? Soils? Transformer oils?).

5. The project intends to achieve the GEB of PCB destruction, which would not otherwise be achieved by 2028, with the attendant benefits of reducing exposures to workers, the public, and the ecosystem. The project will foster the co-benefit of developing technical capacities that can be used to manage other hazardous waste. It is important this aspect of co-benefit is given adequate attention to ensure that the need to develop new capacity building for other hazardous waste in the future is minimal.

6. The project lists major public, private, and civil society stakeholders with an enunciation of their roles and record of consultation. Additional efforts will be taken to consult and involve CSOs and local communities. Engagement of the private sector is sought for co-financing, providing leadership, and preparing an effective stakeholder engagement plan.

7. The project builds on previous activities involving inventory, ESM PCBs, and GEF-6 projects of ESM of PBDEs and uPOPs in Cote d'Ivoire and other GEF projects implemented by UNIDO for ESM of PDBs.

8. The proposal discusses knowledge exchange, for example, through the Stockholm Convention's PCB Elimination Network, and sharing lessons learned among partners.

9. It is a credit to the proposal that the benefits gained from technical expertise and capacity building in this project will be used to support future sound chemicals management and, specifically, the management of other hazardous waste in the country.

10. A series of risks are listed, along with measures for mitigation. For example, risks due to climate change (e.g., extreme events that could impact PCB/transformer transportation and decontamination) will be addressed when considering siting facilities. Political and governance risks will be managed by engaging with key stakeholders, developing a national expert committee and through regular communication with government officials.

*Note: provide a general appraisal, asking whether relevant screening guideline questions have been addressed adequately – not all the questions will be relevant to all proposals; no need to comment on every question, only those needing more attention, noting any done very well, but ensure that all are considered. Comments should be helpful, evaluative, and qualitative, rather than yes/no.*

### **3. Specific points to be addressed, and suggestions**

STAP recommends the following to improve the proposal:

1. Develop a narrative of plausible futures given uncertainties and assumptions that may not come to fruition, such as changes in political support and a lack of stakeholder engagement and leadership. See STAP's [primer on future narratives](#) for more guidance.

2. Although sources of co-financing are indicated (mostly in-kind with a few as grants), few details are provided on actions to encourage further co-financing. Provide these details when developing the proposal further.
3. The barriers and potential remedies could be expanded by considering a lack of adequate financial support, a lack of cooperation by entities owning transformers, and the continuation of potential cross-contamination when changing transformer oils and the use of old PCB-contaminated carcasses for metal recycling.
4. As noted above in #4, more details could be given on how some activities within components will be achieved.
5. Some justification should be given for the expectation that the private sector would be tasked with developing a stakeholder engagement plan.
6. While the proposal articulates the involvement of women and the promotion of gender equality in decision-making, it could be strengthened by specifying decision-making opportunities.
7. The proposal could describe how knowledge exchange was achieved in the projects upon which this is built and how this proposal will build on those lessons learned.

*Note: number key points clearly and provide useful information or suggestions, including key literature where relevant. Completed screens should be no more than two or three pages in length.*

*\*categories under review, subject to future revision*

## ANNEX: STAP'S SCREENING GUIDELINES

1. How well does the proposal explain the problem and issues to be addressed in the context of the **system** within which the problem sits and its drivers (e.g. population growth, economic development, climate change, sociocultural and political factors, and technological changes), including how the various components of the system interact?
2. Does the project indicate how **uncertain futures** could unfold (e.g. using simple **narratives**), based on an understanding of the trends and interactions between the key elements of the system and its drivers?
3. Does the project describe the **baseline** problem and how it may evolve in the future in the absence of the project; and then identify the outcomes that the project seeks to achieve, how these outcomes will change the baseline, and what the key **barriers** and **enablers** are to achieving those outcomes?
4. Are the project's **objectives** well formulated and justified in relation to this system context? Is there a convincing explanation as to **why this particular project** has been selected in preference to other options, in the light of how the future may unfold?
5. How well does the **theory of change** provide an "explicit account of how and why the proposed interventions would achieve their intended outcomes and goal, based on outlining a set of key causal pathways arising from the activities and outputs of the interventions and the assumptions underlying these causal connections".
  - Does the project logic show how the project would ensure that expected outcomes are **enduring** and resilient to possible future changes identified in question 2 above, and to the effects of any conflicting policies (see question 9 below).
  - Is the theory of change grounded on a solid scientific foundation, and is it aligned with current scientific knowledge?
  - Does it explicitly consider how any necessary **institutional and behavioral** changes are to be achieved?
  - Does the theory of change diagram convincingly show the overall project logic, including causal pathways and outcomes?
6. Are the project **components** (interventions and activities) identified in the theory of change each described in sufficient detail to discern the main thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they address the problem, their justification as a robust solution, and the critical assumptions and risks to achieving them?
7. How likely is the project to generate global environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF project (**additionality**)?

8. Does the project convincingly identify the relevant **stakeholders**, and their anticipated roles and responsibilities? Is there an adequate explanation of how stakeholders will contribute to the development and implementation of the project, and how they will benefit from the project to ensure enduring global environmental benefits, e.g. through co-benefits?
9. Does the description adequately explain:
  - how the project will build on prior investments and complement current investments, both GEF and non-GEF,
10. How adequate is the project's approach to generating, managing and exchanging **knowledge**, and how will lessons learned be captured for adaptive management and for the benefit of future projects?
- 11. Innovation and transformation:**
  - If the project is intended to be **innovative**: to what degree is it innovative, how will this ambition be achieved, how will barriers and enablers be addressed, and how might scaling be achieved?
  - If the project is intended to be **transformative**: how well do the project's objectives contribute to transformative change, and are they sufficient to contribute to enduring, transformational change at a sufficient scale to deliver a step improvement in one or more GEBs? Is the proposed logic to achieve the goal credible, addressing necessary changes in institutions, social or cultural norms? Are barriers and enablers to scaling be addressed? And how will enduring scaling be achieved?
12. Have **risks** to the project design and implementation been identified appropriately in the risk table in section B, and have suitable mitigation measures been incorporated? (NB: risks to the durability of project outcomes from future changes in drivers should have been reflected in the theory of change and in project design, not in this table.)