

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
<p>GEF ID: 11015 Project Title: Strengthening the national capacity for the management of POPs in Costa Rica</p> <p>Date of Screening: June 1, 2022 STAP member screener: Saleem Ali STAP secretariat screener: Sunday Leonard STAP’s overall assessment: Minor</p>	<p>This project aims to cover a broad range of activities which would assist Costa Rica in meeting its obligations under various conventions related to chemicals and wastes. We appreciate the systems approach taken by the proponents of the project and their inclusion of a “problem tree” and a “theory of change” that makes connections between various components of the project. The country’s complex waste streams require such an integrated approach for impact. However, the theory of change does not adequately reflect the pathways and assumptions. It is mainly a diagram reflecting the project component. We recommend that it should be improved in congruence with suggested STAP guidelines.</p> <p>The use of pilot projects to profile Best Available Technologies (BAT) and Best Environmental Practices (BEP) has the potential to also spur innovations. We also note the incorporation of circular economy approaches in the plastics and the pineapple waste pilot project components. STAP has prepared detailed guidelines for developing circular economy projects, and we would urge the proponents of the project to consult these in detail: How to Design Circular Economy Projects (stapgef.org). STAP’s report on circular economy and climate mitigation also provides insights that will be useful for this project, including alternative use for pineapple and other waste biomass, highlighted in Case Study 7 of the report</p> <p>Furthermore, Costa Rica has an excellent record of environmental management practices in Latin America and there is existing research which should be harnessed for sharpening project targets. There may also be opportunities to link some of the project goals to energy and carbon mitigation efforts. For example, by selecting the system-thinking-based alternative to biomass burning, e.g., waste to energy solutions, the uPOPs emissions from this sector can be reduced. At the same time, the alternative solution can also reduce carbon emissions from the energy sector. Furthermore, because open burning is a significant source of black carbon – a potent climate forcer and air pollutant, this project has an important opportunity to contribute to climate change mitigation.</p> <p>In line with the above, it is essential that the full range of global environmental benefits possible from this project are accounted for, including the chemicals and waste reduction, climate mitigation, and marine pollution reduction benefits. The proposal currently only accounts for the chemicals and waste benefits. The climate change benefits from black carbon emission avoidance, and reduced marine pollution from better plastic management should be reported since they are part of the GEF results framework. And this will adequately reflect the systems approach of the project.</p>	

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
		<p>Also, there is a significant amount of research on alternative use of biomass waste such as pineapple, sugarcane, and rice, including those undertaken in Costa Rica.</p> <p>Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Valverde, J.C., Arias, D., Campos, R., Jiménez, M.F., Brenes, L., 2020. Forest and agro-industrial residues and bioeconomy: perception of use in the energy market in Costa Rica. <i>Energy, Ecology & Environment</i> 6, 232–243. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40974-020-00172-4 • Ana Chen, Ysabel J. Guan, Mauricio Bustamante, et al. 2020. Production of renewable fuel and value-added bioproducts using pineapple leaves in Costa Rica, <i>Biomass and Bioenergy</i>, 141, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2020.105675. • Lucía Seguí Gil, Pedro Fito Maupoey. 2018. An integrated approach for pineapple waste valorization. <i>Bioethanol production and bromelain extraction from pineapple residues</i>, <i>Journal of Cleaner Production</i>, 172, 1224-1231, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.10.284. • Eixenberger, D., Carballo-Arce, AF., Vega-Baudrit, JR. et al. Tropical agroindustrial biowaste revalorization through integrative biorefineries—review part II: pineapple, sugarcane and banana by-products in Costa Rica. <i>Biomass Conv. Bioref.</i> (2022). https://doi.org/10.1007/s13399-022-02721-9 • Hernández-Chaverri, R., Buenrostro-Figueroa, J., & Prado-Barragán, L. (2021). Biomass: biorefinery as a model to boost the bioeconomy in Costa Rica, a review. <i>Agronomy Mesoamerican</i>, 32(3), 1047-1070. https://doi.org/10.15517/am.v32i3.43736 <p>We encourage the project proponent to explore this set of research to inform the selection of technologies and solutions.</p> <p>In developing the national strategy for plastics, we encourage the project proponent to prioritize upstream solutions that will help avoid using non-recoverable and non-reusable plastics in the first place. Strategies and policies should aim to discourage the unnecessary use of plastics rather than seeking to reuse them at their end of life. STAP report on plastics and the circular economy and circular economy and climate mitigation can provide valuable insights on this.</p> <p>Concerning vehicles, the proposal in paragraph 26 highlights “a great gap in terms of regulations that establish guidelines for the handling and final disposal of vehicle parts, including aspects such as: difficulty in estimating a waste flow of vehicles (since there is no restriction of the time of the allowed useful life), lack of managers registered for disposal in the Ministry of Health, lack of information to estimate the cost associated with the final treatment, and lack of obligation for the owner of the vehicle to deliver it to an authorized manager after carrying out its deregistration.” However, the component related to vehicles in paragraphs 74 and 75 did not adequately address all of these issues, without which there is the risk of not achieving the desired objectives. We encourage the proponent to address all of the gaps identified related to vehicle waste management.</p> <p>While an environmental and social safeguard screening was included, there is no significant assessment of the potential impact of climate change on the project. Given that the World Bank’s Climate Change Knowledge Portal highlights Costa Rica’s considerable vulnerability to climate change and</p>

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
natural disasters, we recommend that the proponent carry out a detailed climate risk screening for the project and develop mitigation measures for any identified risk.		
Part I: Project Information B. Indicative Project Description Summary		
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? Are the global environmental benefits likely to be generated?	Yes – UPOP and PCB reduction GEBs are noted with quantitative targets while others are mentioned as well in more general terms.
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, there are a series of outputs listed along with each outcome but these could be made more specific.
Part II: Project justification		
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? Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references? 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	The multiple focal areas and the linkages and synergies are also presented.

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
	can it only be supported by integrating two, or more focal areas objectives or programs?	
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? 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 very well.
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"> • 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-informed identification of the underlying assumptions? • Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes? 	Theory of change document is provided. However, it does not adequately reflect the pathways and assumptions. It is mainly a diagram reflecting the project component. We recommend that it should be improved in congruence with suggested STAP guidelines.

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
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?</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>	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?</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>	Yes, but need to consider other benefits possible from the project, including climate change mitigation and marine pollution prevention.
7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up	<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, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?</p> <p>Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental</p>	There are some localized innovations, but a lot will depend on how the BAT and BEP are operationalized.

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
	transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	
<p>1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.</p>		Provided
<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 – stakeholder table is included in project design and stakeholder satisfaction also in outcome goals.
<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 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>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences? Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?</p>	Gender equity plan is adequately provided
<p>5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that</p>	Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks	Risk management table is also included

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
<p>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>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>Climate risk screening is provided as part of SESP screening document. Detailed climate risk screening need to be carried out.</p>
<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? Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them? Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?</p>	<p>Yes – there is listing of coordination prospects provided with public and private sector and donors.</p>

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
	<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>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 adequately provided</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>