

## STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

| PIF   | What STAP looks for | Response |
|---|---------------------|----------|
| <p>GEF ID: 10972<br/> Project Title: <b>Integrated Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) Management Project</b></p> <p>Date of Screening: June 1, 2022<br/> STAP member screener: Saleem Ali<br/> STAP secretariat screener: Sunday Leonard<br/> STAP’s overall assessment: Minor</p> <p>This project is undertaken under the auspices of Stockholm convention commitments and has set a clear target of reducing 4000 tons of POPs, including 3000 tons of PCBs and 1000 tons of lindane. The project combines waste from the power sector and agricultural wastes and thus has broad coverage within the convention mandate.</p> <p>There is considerable attention given to inventorying the waste sources and developing planning frameworks and “roadmaps” as well as policy reform efforts as a build-up to the actual removal efforts. Since this is a reasonably direct remediation and disposal project, a detailed theory of change is perhaps not as necessary as with other projects that involve more complex and dynamic interventions.</p> <p>The phaseout plan for existing equipment using PCBs is perhaps the part of the project with the most opportunity for innovation. This is where the project is deficient in not clearly identifying technologies that would be used. Instead, the PID only notes that they will follow the successes of projects in Lebanon and Egypt and “appropriate technologies” which offer “online decontamination.” While more specifics are provided with lindane incineration in cement kilns, the PCB phaseout technologies are less clear.</p> <p>A range of innovative technologies has been developed over the years to deal with PCB, including biological treatment. The lead agency should consider including details on these technologies and their potential for upscaling. Some references in this regard are provided below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nabavi, B.F., Nikaeen, M., Amin, M.M., Farrokhzadeh, H., 2013. Biological treatment of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) contaminated transformer oil by anaerobic–aerobic sequencing batch biofilm reactors. <i>International biodeterioration &amp; biodegradation</i> 85, 451–457. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibiod.2013.09.007">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibiod.2013.09.007</a></li> <li>• Akhondi, M., Dadkhah, A.A., 2018. Base-catalysed decomposition of polychlorinated biphenyls in transformer oils by mixture of sodium hydroxide, glycerol and iron. <i>Royal Society open science</i> 5, 172401–172401. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.172401">https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.172401</a></li> </ul> <p>We also refer the project proponent to the various BAT and BET guidance on POPs management available on the website of the Stockholm Convention available at <a href="http://chm.pops.int/Implementation/BATandBEP/Guidance/Overview/tabid/5121/Default.aspx">http://chm.pops.int/Implementation/BATandBEP/Guidance/Overview/tabid/5121/Default.aspx</a>. STAP has also produced a</p> |                     |          |

| PIF   | What STAP looks for  | Response   |
|---|--|--|
|   | <p>report on the Selection of Persistent Organic Pollutant Disposal Technology, which could be helpful.<br/> <a href="https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/publications/POPs_Disposal_Final_low_1.pdf">https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/publications/POPs_Disposal_Final_low_1.pdf</a></p> <p>The project proponent is also encouraged to elaborate on how the project will ensure scale-up and sustainability, especially from the finance dimension. How will the project help ensure that adequate resources will be available beyond GEF resources to address the hazardous chemicals not disposed of through this project?</p> <p>It is also unclear how the 3000 tons of PCB-containing equipment was estimated, given that the inventory of PCBs in Iraq is not yet available as indicated in the proposal. Further clarification on this would be helpful.</p> <p>A climate risk screening was carried out for the project, which is commendable. The screening identified high risk due to the exposure of the project location to climate and geophysical hazards. Given the toxic and hazardous nature of the targeted chemicals, it is essential that adequate mitigation measures are designed and incorporated into the project implementation plan.</p> |  |
| <p><b>Part I: Project Information</b><br/> <b>B. Indicative Project Description Summary</b></p> |  |  |
| Project Objective   | Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?   | Yes – this is a fairly straightforward project in terms of its goals.                                    |
| Project components  | A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project’s objectives?  | Yes  |
| Outcomes  | <p>A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.</p> <p>Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits?</p> <p>Are the global environmental benefits likely to be generated?</p>   | Yes – noted amount of expected PCB and OP removal. GEBs are linked to this removal and well-noted.       |
| Outputs   | <p>A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project.</p> <p>Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?</p>  | Yes, there are a series of outputs listed along with each outcome but these could be made more specific. |

| PIF  | What STAP looks for  | Response  |
|--|--|---|
| <b>Part II: Project justification</b>  | A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.  |   |
| <b>1. Project description. Briefly describe:</b><br>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?<br>Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?<br>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?   | The multiple focal areas and the linkages and synergies are also presented.   |
| 2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects   | Is the baseline identified clearly?<br>Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?<br>Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?<br>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;<br>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, the baseline is going to be inventoried as part of the early phases of the project.  |
| 3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project   | What is the theory of change?<br>What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?   | Given the remediation cadence of the project, a theory of change in the conventional sense is not required, except perhaps in policy interventions to hasten the hazard identification and removal. |

| PIF   | What STAP looks for   | Response  |
|---|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project’s objectives?</li> <li>• Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?</li> <li>• Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?</li> </ul> |   |
| 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>                   | Yes, given the biopersistence and long-range travel of POPs |

| PIF   | What STAP looks for  | Response  |
|---|--|---|
|   | 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? 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? | Further innovations could have been identified in terms of PCB removal and decontamination  |
| <b>1b.</b> Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.  |  | No – will be generated perhaps as part of the inventory   |
| <b>2. Stakeholders.</b><br>Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities.<br>If none of the above, please explain why.<br>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?   | There is a generic listing of stakeholders though a mapping has not been undertaken nor is likely to be essential given the simplicity of this project in terms dealing with legacy issues. |
| <b>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.</b><br>Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g.   | Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?   | Cursory mention of broad gender issues in Iraq is provided. It would be useful to note any disproportionate exposure to women or impacts of POPS on women.                                  |

| PIF   | What STAP looks for   | Response   |
|---|---|--|
| <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Will the project’s results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd</p> | <p>Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?</p>  |  |
| <p><b>5. Risks.</b> 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?</p> <p>Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?</p> <p>For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?</li> <li>• Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?</li> <li>• What technical and institutional capacity, and</li> </ul> | <p>Risk management material is also included</p> <p>Climate risk screening with adequate citations provided.</p> |

| PIF   | What STAP looks for   | Response  |
|---|---|---|
|   | information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?   |   |
| <p><b>6. Coordination.</b> 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>Yes – there is listing of coordination prospects provided with public and private sector and donors.</p> |
| <p><b>8. Knowledge management.</b> 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>  |
| <b>1. Concur</b>  | <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 <b><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></b></p>   |
| <b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b> | <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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;</li> <li>(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.</li> </ul> <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>            |
| <b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b> | <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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;</li> <li>(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.</li> </ul> |