

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

| Part I: Project Information | Response |
|---|---|
| GEF ID | 10547 |
| Project Title | Reduce marine plastics and plastic pollution in Latin American and Caribbean cities through a circular economy approach |
| Date of Screening | 19 May 2020 |
| STAP member screener | Jamidu Katima |
| STAP secretariat screener | Sunday Leonard |
| STAP Rating | Minor issues to be considered during project design |
| STAP Overall Assessment of the project proposal | <p>STAP welcomes the UNEP project on the "reduction of marine plastics and plastic pollution in Latin American and Caribbean cities through a circular economy approach." The project aims to reduce regional marine plastics and plastic pollution by facilitating governments and businesses at the city-level, to accelerate the transition to a circular economy in the three participating countries.</p> <p>STAP has the following comments and recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While this is a good project and several aspects of the PIF were well prepared, including a detailed presentation of planned activities, there is significant concern that the estimation of expected GEBs has not been rigorously done. The proponent should complete this task before the project can proceed. Please see the next set of comments for details. • There is no information on how the expected GEBs from the project were derived. Without this information, the currently projected benefits cannot be verified. For example, how was the projected 3000 metric tons of CO2e emissions reduction estimated, especially when there are no specific interventions in the project explicitly targeted at greenhouse gas emissions mitigation? What are the data and baseline information that informed this estimate? Also, what methodology was used to calculate the amount of marine litter to be avoided? Without these details, it is impossible to ascertain that the predicted GEBs are valid or can be achieved. • Furthermore, this is a multi-focal area project with equal contribution of programming funds from the International Waters and Chemicals and Waste (POPs) focal areas. However, from the PIF, there is no indication of GEBs that will accrue to the chemical and waste focal area. • Figure 3 presents a preliminary theory of change, which includes assumptions, problems, outputs, outcomes, long term outcomes, and impacts. This is good. This may be improved by adding interventions that will help achieve the outputs and outcomes as well as alternative pathways. Please see STAP's theory of change primer for further guidance (https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/STAP%20ToC%20Primer_webposting.pdf). • Potential for scaling-up: According to the PIF, scaling up will be achieved through "a global framework." It is not clear what this means or how it will work. STAP recommends that more details should be presented in the PPG to show how scaling up will be achieved. STAP recommends the following resources which may be useful in this regard: "nine steps for |

| | | |
|--|---|-----------------|
| | <p>developing a scaling-up strategy" https://www.who.int/immunization/hpv/deliver/nine_steps_for_developing_a_scalingup_strategy_who_2010.pdf and "scaling up in development cooperation - practical guidelines" by GIZ (2011) available at https://www.shareweb.ch/site/Learning-and-Networking/sdc_km_tools/Documents/GIZ-Scaling-up-in-development-cooperation.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability: The GEF IEO's terminal evaluation of projects under the chemicals and waste focal area revealed that there is little evidence that GEF's chemicals and waste projects are successful in developing sustainable strategies and financial mechanisms to scale up achieved results or to ensure continued engagement of private sector actors (http://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/files/cw-study-2017_0.pdf). According to the PIF, sustainability is expected to be achieved through assisting cities and municipalities to develop sustainable partnerships with the private sector involved in plastic waste and through improving understanding and awareness to help key stakeholders. These measures are not sufficient to guarantee the sustainability of the project. There is a danger of this project replicating the same drawback identified by the IEO. STAP recommends that more thought should be given to this. • Climate change impact and risks: The PIF is entirely silent about the potential effects of projected climate change on achieving the objectives of the project. Yet, the project is taken place in coastal cities of the targeted countries. Several climate data sources, including Climate Change Knowledge Portal (https://climateknowledgeportal.worldbank.org/), Relief Web (https://reliefweb.int/), and Climate Links (https://www.climatelinks.org/) shows that the three countries and targeted cities are considered highly vulnerable to climate change impacts. It is envisaged that climate change will influence the types of solutions that can be developed and tested. STAP recommends that a detailed climate risk screening should be carried out to ascertain vulnerability of the project is to climate change and what risk management options would be employed, where necessary. • We note that this project is similar to the "Plastik Sulit: accelerating circular economy for difficult plastics in Indonesia – GEF ID: 10546" project in this same work program (June 2020). The two projects should seek to learn from each other even from the PPG stage. Also, given that the project will be implemented in cities, we encourage the project proponent to engage with the GEF Sustainable Cities Impact Program. | |
| Part I: Project Information B. Indicative Project Description Summary | What STAP looks for | Response |
| 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? | Yes (short-term intervention addressing key leakage points and accumulations and longer-term policy interventions.) |
| | Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated? | Yes. See STAP overall assessment for more on concerns about GEBs |
| 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 Yes |
| Part II: Project justification | A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change. | Yes |
| 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? | Yes |
| | Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references? | Yes and the barriers are substantiated by data and reference. |
| | 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? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. – Chemical and waste (reduction UPOS) and international waters (reeducation of microplastic waste), climate change (reduction of plastic open burning) • Yes |
| 2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects | Is the baseline identified clearly? | Yes |
| | Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits? | Yes |
| | Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project? | Yes |
| | 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; | Yes |
| | are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and | Yes |
| | how did these lessons inform the design of this project? | Yes |
| 3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project | What is the theory of change? | Reduce marine plastic pollution by supporting governments and businesses at the city level to accelerate the transition to a circular economy. |
| | What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop governance and policy to enact circular economy approaches in selected cities • Strengthen markets for investments in innovative, scalable upstream actions, waste management and recycling solutions • Establish and engage intercity marine plastics and plastics circular economy network • Capacity development, visibility improvement, knowledge |
| | What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt policies and cross-cutting measures to eliminate problematic and unnecessary plastics • Implement improved sustainable business solutions by small, medium and large private sector entities and the informal sector • Enable transition to circular economy approach in LAC cities through structured and systemic increasing use, sharing and collaboration in the generation and promotion of knowledge on successful solutions. |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions? | Yes |
| | Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes? | None |
| 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? | Yes |
| | LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation, which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change? | NA |
| 6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) | Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits, and are they measurable? | Yes. See STAP overall assessment for more on concerns about GEBs |
| | Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment? | Yes |
| | Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined? | No. Please see STAP overall assessment |
| | Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation? | Indicates that measurement methodology will be that of UNEP |
| | What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change? | This is not discussed |
| 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? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The PIF mentions that the project will promote innovative solutions without being specific |
| | Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors? | Scaling up is not clearly articulated |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability? | None |
| 1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place. | | Yes |
| 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? | Yes |
| | 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? | The roles of stakeholders are explained |
| 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 | Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences? | Yes During PPG, the proposed project will develop a region/city specific gender assessment in circular economy activities |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>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> | No |
| <p>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</p> | <p>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? 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>Yes Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Climate risk has not been discussed. See STAP's overall assessment for further comments on climate risk.</p> |
| <p>6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant</p> | <p>Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?</p> | Yes |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| GEF-financed and other related initiatives | | |
| | Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them? | Yes |
| | Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited? | No lessons mentioned |
| | How have these lessons informed the project's formulation? | No lessons mentioned |
| | 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 |
| 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. | What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used? | A knowledge management strategy will be developed during PPG |
| | What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience? | A knowledge management strategy will be developed during PPG |

Notes

| 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 <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> |
| 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 | <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> |