

Part I: Project Information		Response
GEF ID		10185
Project Title		Implementing Sustainable Low and Non-Chemical Development in SIDS (ISLANDS)
Date of Screening		16-May-19
STAP member Screener		Jamidu Katima
STAP secretariat screener		Sunday Leonard
STAP Overall Assessment		Concur
STAP Overall Comment		<p>The project assumes that a global programme can leverage more resources and attract private sector investment better than single country or regional projects. The program is expected to bring more resources to SIDS to remove environmental stress caused by the unsustainable use of chemicals, materials and products. Information and knowledge from project implementation at the national level will be shared between regions to achieve impacts at the global level.</p> <p>The program concept provides a thorough treatment of prior lessons including: challenges with country ownership of regionally-executed projects; the need for frequent communication between countries and executing agencies; the need for continued commitment of senior national personnel to ensure success; and recognition that the training-of-trainers in SIDS will not automatically lead to desired outcomes - hence the need for continued direct support to improve confidence in new approaches and BAT/BEP. The PFD also recognizes that technical cooperation, defined as the provision of both financial and in-country technical support and guidance, through 'learning-by-doing' can be an effective approach in Pacific SIDS.</p> <p>The program is a cost-effective way to link a series of individual, interlinked projects in three SIDS regions to amplify the results in each of the SIDS regions by ensuring that best available technologies/techniques and best environmental practices are applied consistently across all regions. Strong coordination and exchange of knowledge at the global, regional and national levels between SIDS will be key in supporting the introduction of best practices, approaches and technologies for chemicals and wastes management in SIDS, and ultimately achieving the intended outputs and outcomes.</p> <p>STAP concurs with the proposed program and recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project has the potential to generate Global Environment Benefits (GEBs) beyond the chemicals and waste focal area including: biodiversity benefits (through the prevention of harmful impacts of chemicals and waste on terrestrial and marine ecosystems); international waters benefits (through the prevention of chemical pollution and plastic pollution of international waters); and climate change benefits (through the mitigation of greenhouse emissions from poor waste management). It is recommended that a detailed analysis of these co-benefits should be carried out at the PPG stage and the final interventions designed to maximize these co-benefits. STAP also suggests that detailed information about how the chemicals and waste GEBs were estimated should be provided at the PPG stage. • Component 2: one of the proposed interventions includes infrastructure, for example, engineered landfills. Given the limited land mass of SIDS and the susceptibility of SIDS to the impacts of climate change, for example, sea-level rise and increased frequency of extreme weather events, it is recommended that other alternatives should be assessed to ascertain that landfill is the best option. If landfill is the best option, it is recommended that the BAT be deployed that includes effective leachate management, methane recovery and waste- to-energy applications. • Stakeholders: The proposal contains a good representation of stakeholders, but their expected role in the project is not specified. STAP believes that academic and research institutions, especially local ones, are important stakeholders for this type of project that involves the assessment of BAT, knowledge management and dissemination. It is therefore recommended that relevant academic and research institutions should be

		<p>engaged in the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risks: The proposal presents a good preliminary analysis of the potential risks to the success of the project. STAP appreciates that the potential impact of climate change and sea-level rise is recognized and included in the preliminary risk analysis. It is important that ways of mitigating these risks be designed at the PPG stage and incorporated during project implementation. Beyond the identified risks, STAP recommends that the project proponents consider other potential risks, including political risk and coordination challenges for a large program.
Part I: Project Information	What STAP looks for	Response
B. Indicative Project Description Summary		
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Not well aligned with expected project outcomes. Suggest revising accordingly
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.	yes, with core indicators including quantitative targets
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	yes
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	reasonable likelihood, as estimations are based on concluded activities
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?	The correlation of outputs and outcomes is not very clear
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?	Yes
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes. Adequate data to substantiate the barriers
	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?	
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	yes, well described
	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?	adequate
	For multiple focal area projects:	n/a

	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?	
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	Avoiding future imports and use of chemicals and wastes, treating chemicals and wastes that is currently present in SIDS, developing systems for circular management of chemicals and waste.
	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?	This integrated approach responds public health concerns; climate change and sea level rise, promotion of clean tourism and protection of ecosystems
	· Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond 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?	GEF additionality clearly identified
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?	Yes
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes compared with the size of SIDS
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	Yes
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Not explicitly shown
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Not shown
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?	Yes. Use of multi-stakeholder implementation, involvement of PPP, collaboration of other donor agencies
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Not clearly elaborated
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Most likely

1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		
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?	
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?	Yes
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	No
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?	See overall comments
	Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?	
	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?	See overall comments
	· Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?	See overall comments

	· 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?	Yes
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Yes
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	Yes
	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?	Integrated in programmatic project design
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	The child project is implemented to assist replication, scale up, and to ensuring the GEF ISLANDS Programme equates to more than the sum of its parts.
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	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.	