STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response

GEF ID: **10868**
Project Title: **Integrated Management and Environmentally Sound Disposal of POPs Pesticides and Mercury in Healthcare and Agricultural Sectors in Sri Lanka**
Date of Screening: November 6, 2021
STAP member screener: Saleem Ali
STAP secretariat screener: Sunday Leonard
STAP's overall assessment: Minor issues to be considered during project design

This project provides a proposal with outputs around mitigation of POP and mercury (thus relating to both the Minamata and Stockholm Conventions) from the healthcare and agricultural sectors in Sri Lanka. While these twos sectors are quite operationally different, the emissions profile suggests that an integrated management approach can deliver synergistic benefits.

The proponents have provided a theory of change showing the baseline, root causes, barriers, interventions, and expected outcomes and impacts, including the benefits to Sri Lanka's environment and public health. However, the causal pathways of how the interventions lead to desired outcomes need to be more explicit. Also, the assumptions underlying the theory of change need to be included. The proponent may review STAP's theory of change primer for details on improving the theory of change: https://stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer.

Piloting of technologies such as autoclaves is coupled with standards and policy reform to provide a requisite repertoire of enabling conditions for project success. However, less information is provided on the proposed "Green Finance Framework." We suggest that more details on the framework, including how it will be developed, the expected stakeholders to engage, the business model to be promoted, and criteria for accessing finance, should be presented.

Global Environment Benefits: more information and clarification are needed on how the expected GEBs were estimated. For example, data and information on how preventing illegal imports will help avoid 1000 metric tons of HHPs should be provided, including current baseline information, assumptions, and calculations. Similar information should be provided on how the 800,000 mercury-containing bulbs were estimated. We also encourage that estimates of materials containing POPs and mercury and avoided uPOPs should be done as indicated in the PIF, given that these are essential benefits from the project.

Useful information on climate risks and impacts in Sri Lanka were provided, which we commend. The risk of flooding of interim storage facilities due to changing climate was also noted. The project will involve some form of engineered landfill that could be susceptible to climate risk. We encourage that this should be considered in the project's climate risk screening and management.

Further, on risks, the project is largely dependent on successful enactment and enforcement of new policies and regulations. There is a risk of the project goal being jeopardized if these policies are not successfully implemented or if there is inadequate buy-in or enforcement. This risk should be recognized in the risk management section of the PIF, and management options should be considered for this risk.

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
Another area that the project managers should pay more attention to during project implementation that is not as directly expressed in the proposal is multistakeholder engagement and social and behavioral responses to interventions. Two articles specific to Sri Lanka in this regard are referenced below: • Jinadasa, K. B. S. N., Weragoda, S. K., Valencia, E., Sim, S. T. V., & Ng, W. J. (2018). Community engagement and pollution mitigation at Kandy Lake, Sri Lanka. *Water Practice and Technology*, *14*(1), 55–61. https://doi.org/10.2166/wpt.2018.109 • Horgan, F. G., & Kudavidanage, E. P. (2020). Use and Avoidance of Pesticides as Responses by Farmers to change Impacts in Rice Ecosystems of Southern Sri Lanka. *Environmental Management*, *65*(6), 787–803. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-020-01272-x		
Part I: Project Information **B. Indicative Project Description Summary**		
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes – 4 key areas defined with examples
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 – very clear metrics of GEB calculations are provided though it would be helpful to have some footnoting and backup of how they were calculated.
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
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a 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? Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references? For multiple focal area projects: does the problem statement and analysis	Excellent – provides rationale and country context The multiple focal areas and the linkages and synergies are also presented.

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
	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?	
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	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?	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	What is the theory of change? What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes? • 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	Theory of change document is provided. We suggest further improvement in congruence with suggested STAP guidelines.

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
	to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	
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? LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	Noted
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable? Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment? Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined? Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation? What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Yes, the POP and mercury reduction and the reduction of bioaccumulation in fish are noted and documented as truly GEB activities.
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? Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors? Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Yes, bottom up approaches to HCWM and a range of technologies will be prototyped.

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		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? 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?	Yes – stakeholder mapping is included in project design and stakeholder satisfaction also in outcome goals.
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? Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	Gender equity plan with clear set of question to be addressed and linkages with policies are provided.
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?	Risk management table is also included. Suggest considering risk of unsuccessful policy enactment. Climate risk screening with adequate citations provided. Suggest considering climate impact on landfills

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
	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 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? Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them? Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited? How have these lessons informed the project's formulation? 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?	Yes – there is listing of coordination prospects provided with public and private sector and donors.
8. Knowledge management. Outline the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, and how it will contribute to the project's	What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?	Yes adequately provided

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	

STAP's advisory response

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.