

REVISED STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE

GEF ID	11169
Project title	Eliminating hazardous chemicals from supply chains
Date of screen	13 June 2023
STAP Panel Member	Miriam Diamond
STAP Secretariat	Sunday Leonard

1. Summary of STAP's views of the project

The “eliminating hazardous chemicals from supply chains” IP seeks to transform the fashion and construction supply chains globally to improve land use management with benefits to biodiversity and nature, reduced chemical pollution and greenhouse gas emissions and enhanced human health.

The proposal is well prepared, providing a systems thinking-based analysis of the issues, including the impacts, key systems drivers, barriers, and trends. However, developing a narrative of plausible futures that considers how the drivers could play out in the future and the potential impact on the project outcome could help identify intervention options that are robust to different plausible futures as drivers, barriers, etc., could change.

STAP appreciates the programmatic approach concept that includes outcomes/components across the different aspects of the supply/value chain with the GEF transformational levers embedded into each component. Ensuring that all child projects address each element of the supply chain with appropriate actions toward achieving the transformational levers can help ensure the impact of the IP.

The program theory of change provides the relevant details, including the activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts and the underlying assumptions for causal pathways. The theory of change can be further enhanced by recognizing the gender, IPLC, and youth dimensions, which the PFD has addressed in several aspects of the project components.

A substantial amount of GEBs is expected from the IP. The PFD needs to include details of how the GEBs were estimated. Also, the program will generate several co-benefits, some recognized in the PFD and others not (i.e., local environmental benefits such as air pollution reduction and freshwater contamination prevention).

STAP has provided some recommendations to help further enhance the IP.

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.

The proposal presented a systems-based description of the issues in the two targeted sectors (fashion and construction) in a way that aligned with STAP's recommendation for GEF projects to apply the systems thinking approach in analyzing issues. The impacts of the two sectors were well-presented, as well as the barriers, key systems drivers, and trends. However, given that fashion and construction are two completely different sectors,

the project rationale, including systems description, key drivers, trends, impacts, etc., would have been better presented separately.

The proposal presented some information on future trends across the sector, including for some of the drivers, but needs to analyze how the drivers (some of which are outside the control of the project) could play out in the future and the associated uncertainties. Developing a narrative of plausible futures that considers how the drivers could play out in the future and the potential impact on the project outcome will help identify intervention options that are robust to different plausible futures. See STAP's [primer on future narratives](#) for more guidance.

STAP appreciates the programmatic approach concept that includes outcomes/components across the different aspects of the supply/value chain with the GEF transformational levers embedded into each component. The supply/value chain approach ensures that the proposal appropriately addresses upstream issues (e.g., redesign of products or sourcing sustainable alternative materials) in the sectors as a prerequisite to success in downstream actions (e.g., recycling or waste management). It will be important that this approach (i.e., supply/value chain components/output with GEF transformational levers embedded) is developed further for the global and national child projects to ensure it is well implemented. Ensuring that all child projects address each aspect of the supply chain with appropriate actions toward achieving the transformational levers can help ensure the impact of the IP.

An overall program theory of change (ToC) and specific ToC focused on the fashion and construction sector were presented. The ToCs appropriately provide a detailed account of how and why the proposed interventions would achieve their intended outcomes and show the causal pathway and the underlying assumptions. However, the description of where innovation occurs in the ToC was unclear.

The project components highlight the intention to engage Indigenous and local knowledge and youths in the interventions. The gender dimensions were also reflected in the program. We encourage the proponent to follow through with this. Additional attention is needed to incorporate ILK into the child projects, where engagement takes time and sensitivity. The PFD does not acknowledge some of the challenges of meaningfully engaging ILK, which differs from engaging IPLCs as "stakeholders" for input.

The need for coherence policies was well reflected in the program, including specific activities among child projects to address policy coherence at the country level. This is commended. Given the importance of alignment between policies at the national level for the durability of GEBs and impacts, we encourage all child projects to analyze policies across the various sector to identify any incoherence or contradiction and ensure that the policy and regulatory components of the program address these issues if found (e.g., are they policies and national incentives that encourage unsustainable practices in these sectors and how can these policies be reversed).

The PFD mentions several technical, business model, and financing mechanism solutions and innovations to address the sustainability challenges in the two sectors, for example, organic farming, 3D printing, sustainable chemistry, bamboo alternative for construction, modular construction, prefabrication, taxes, subsidies, and incentives, etc. However, the analysis of innovation needs to be strengthened in the proposal. Is there sufficient analysis of alternative, innovative practices and what would be involved in switching (e.g., "drop-in" replacement vs. the need to change construction practices and resultant barriers to such change)? In other words, sufficient attention to developing and analyzing LCA, which could have geographic specificities? The mention of USEtox (used in LCA to estimate some impacts) to "help to define business strategies and models to inform designs" (p22) belies an understanding of how this model works or the type of information it provides (human & ecotox tuned for the fate of mostly non-polar chemicals in temperature regions). And who would be using USEtox and other eco-innovation tools, and how would this information feed into the child projects?

Also, on innovation:

- How does the ToC account for the time lag and risk/barrier between producing innovative solutions and analysis to ensure that burden shifting isn't occurring (which takes time) vs. translation & adoption by manufacturers of new practices, incorporation into ecolabels, etc.?
- How does ToC account for complexity, lack of transparency, etc., in supply chains that tend to be more local/regional than for fashion?
- For the fashion value chain, assumptions about reverse logistics for the collection, repair, re-use, and coordinated waste management vs. emphasis on upstream solutions to extend the product life span
 - how will innovative materials be identified and evaluated before promotion? (p 24)
 - who decides and basis for decisions on which projects are chosen for "financial rewards and recognition"?

Further, it is essential that these innovations are demonstrated in as many national child projects as possible. The possibility of doing this for relevant child projects should be further explored during the PPG. Furthermore, the global child project should incorporate all technological, business models, financing mechanisms, policy, and institutional/governance solutions into its capacity building, technical assistance, knowledge management and learning aspects, awareness-raising, and advisor activities to help facilitate the dissemination of these solutions within the program as well as to countries outside the program.

Embedding the GEF transformational lever in each component across the global and national child projects demonstrate the programs' quest for transformational change. Notably, the PFD also included indicators for tracking and measuring transformational change. We commend the proponent for this and encourage them to follow through in tracking how this program contributes to the transformation of the two targeted sectors.

The PFD presented the expected GEBs, which cut across various GEF core indicators, including greenhouse gas emissions reduction, carbon sequestered or AFOLU emissions avoided, POPs removed, disposed or avoided, uPOPs to air reduced, residual plastic waste avoided, highly hazardous pesticides eliminated, the quantity of mercury reduced, and area of landscapes under improved practices. This is great for this IP. But how the estimate of GEBs was derived was not included in the PFD, and only some national child projects include details of their calculations and underlying assumptions.

Also, the PFD recognized the different socioeconomic co-benefits that can accrue from the program, including job creation, improved labor conditions, and better human health. The program will also generate local environmental co-benefits, for example, improved air quality, reduced freshwater pollution, and elimination of chemicals outside the purview of GEF-financed MEAs. It is essential that these co-benefits are tracked and reported to give a better picture of the return on GEF's investment in the IP.

3. Specific points to be addressed, and suggestions

Overall, this is well prepared PFD. STAP recommends the following for further improvements:

1. Consider developing a narrative of plausible futures that considers the potential effects drivers of change and their associated uncertainties on achieving the project's goal, and use this to inform intervention options across the value chain and the different national child projects. See STAP's [primer on future narratives](#) for more guidance.
2. Ensure that all child projects address each aspect of the supply chain with appropriate actions toward achieving the transformational levers.
3. Recognize gender, Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, and youths in the ToC, including in the overall project impacts and the example of activities. Pay extra attention to how to incorporate ILK into the child projects, where engagements take time and sensitivity.

4. We encourage all child projects to analyze policies across the various sector within their countries to understand where conflicting policies can hinder the achievement of the expected outcomes and ensure these are addressed appropriately. See [STAP's paper on policy coherence](#) for more guidance.
5. Undertake a detailed analysis of the innovation in the program. Also, consider how the child projects can demonstrate the many innovations highlighted in the PFD. Also, ensure that the global child project incorporates these innovations in its capacity building, technical assistance, knowledge management and learning aspects, awareness-raising, and advisor activities to help disseminate these solutions within the program and to countries outside the program. This will be essential for transformational change.
6. We encourage the program to follow through in tracking the transformational change impact of the program using the selected indicators.
7. Provide more information on how the GEBs across the IP were estimated, including the underlying assumptions.
8. Recognize the local environmental benefits that can be generated through the project and put in place provisions to track, measure and report these and the socioeconomic co-benefits. Please see STAP's [paper on incorporating co-benefits in GEF's investments](#) for guidance.

*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,
- how the project incorporates **lessons learned** from previous projects in the country and region, and more widely from projects addressing similar issues elsewhere; and
- how country policies that are contradictory to the intended outcomes of the project (identified in section C) will be addressed (**policy coherence**)?

10. 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?

11. 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.)