Part I: Project Information		Response
GEF ID		10218
Project Title		AFLDC-2 Scaling-up Investment and Technology Transfer to Facilitate Capacity Strengthening and Technical Assistance for the Implementation of Stockholm and Minamata Conventions in African LDCs
Date of Screening		26-May-19
STAP member Screener		Jamidu Katima
STAP secretariat screener		Sunday Leonard
STAP Overall Assessment		Major issues to be considered during project design
		The project proposes to scale-up investment and technology transfer to facilitate capacity building and technical assistance for the implementation of the Stockholm and Minamata Conventions in some African LDCs through improvement of the legislative and regulatory framework; promotion of enforcement and administrative capacity; implementation of BAT/BEP pilot demonstrations; and coordinated information dissemination and awareness raising in the region. The project will build on a prior project in the same countries (AFLDC-1). The PIF listed some of the shortcomings of AFLDC-1 but did not adequately present those shortcomings or show how AFLDC-2 (the current project) will address them and ensure success. It is important to provide specific lessons learned from AFLDC-1 which had almost the same components: (i) legislative and regulatory framework development; (ii) sustainable enforcement and administrative capacity; (iii) coordinated information dissemination and awareness raising; (iv) BAT/BEP in industrial production processes; and (v) reduction of exposure to POPs, and contaminated sites. This information should be used to inform the design of the project. For example, the reasons why some outputs /outcomes were not achieved in AFLDC-1. STAP believes that this is an important project that can generate global environment benefits (GEBs). However, the current PIF needs to be significantly improved: • Project objective: the current objective is focused on the elimination, reduction and control of POPs pollution sources in African LDCs. However, the detailed proposal suggests that the project will also address mercury pollution. The project objective needs to be revised to reflect this. • The circular economy is included in the project objective and littered across several sections of the PIF, but there is limited information on how the approach will be implemented, how it will deliver the expected GEBs. And the project components, and their associated outcomes and outputs, do not adequately reflect circular economy principles. For more information on elements of the circular economy, please see: STAP, 2018: http://www.stapgef.org/plastics-and-circular-economy; Circle Economy: https://www.circle-economy.com/the-7-key-elements-of-the-circular-economy; and further information is available from the Ellen MacArthur Foundation at: https://www.ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/resources/read • The PIF lacks specificity about the planned interventions and which chemicals or waste are being targeted, and the expected GEBs. For example, as presented in the PIF, agro-industrial parks are a thematic window for addressing the chemicals and waste related challenges in child projects. However, the PIF contains limited information on how the establishment of an agro-industrial park will provide chemical and waste (mercury and POPs) benefits. The PIF states that “child projects under this thematic window will promote BAT/BEP to reduce uPOPs releases, phase-out POPs and mercury used or emitted from or in processes and products and demonstrate the sound management/disposal of POPs and mercury/mercury-containing waste”. But there are no details on how this would be done, the specific chemicals concerned, how they are generated, and what will be needed to deliver the alternative scenario, including which BAT/BEP would be adopted. Instead, there is more emphasis on the developmental and economic transformation expected from integrated agro-industrial processing.

		• Similarly, the PIF indicates that electrical and electronic equipment is a sector of interest, but there is limited information on what will be done, and what outcomes are expected. • Project components/outcomes and outputs: the PIF only presents the expected outcomes and outputs for each component with minimal or no information on the actual interventions that will lead to these outcomes/outputs. Without this information, it is impossible to assess the scientific or technical quality of the interventions. This information is also essential to monitor the implementation and assess the success of the project. • Component 2, Output 2.3 aimed at "increased awareness amongst farming associations and cooperatives, farmers and farm suppliers of sustainable approaches to plant protection that avoid the use of POPs chemicals and mercury and mercury compounds". What aspect of mercury and mercury compounds use in agriculture is being considered? What agricultural production uses mercury and mercury compounds? How significant and how prevalent is this in the African LDC context? What intervention is expected to curb this, and what are the benefit expected to be achieved through these interventions? • Output 3.6 under component 3 will demonstrate "approaches to collection and recycling of short-lived and single-use plastics." The recycling of short-lived and single-use plastics may be a step in the right direction, but the latest scientific knowledge, including about the circular economy, waste management hierarchy and current global trends, suggests that the sustainable solution is to avoid single-use plastics completely. STAP recommends that the project proponents review its paper on plastics and the circular economy (STAP, 2018: http://www.stapgef.org/plastics-and-circular-economy) as well as relevant publications on the new plastics economy (https://newplasticseconomy.org/about/publications), which would provide some guidance on what to consider for alternatives and sustainable solutions in the plastic sector. • Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs): the section mainly contains a listing of expected GEBs from the project with no quantitative information. Some quantitative information is presented in the "core indicators" section of the PIF; this is usually elaborated in the section on Global Environment Benefits, including information on how the expected GEBs were estimated. This information is lacking in the current PIF. • The stakeholder section is mainly a listing of possible stakeholders without any information on how they will be engaged during project preparation and their respective roles and means of engagement as requested in the PIF. • Several risks may affect the project, and these have been listed. The risks, however, need to be qualified (rated) in terms of low, medium or high. This is essential to ensure risks are properly managed and monitored. . • Some of the child projects are in coastal countries susceptible to climate change and extreme events, including sea-level rise and flooding. It is essential that these climate impacts are considered in determining which BAT/BET is adopted, and how interventions are carried out to ensure limited environmental and human exposure to pollutants. Climate change is expected to increase the remobilization and bioavailability of POPs. It is also important that project outputs, for example, waste management infrastructure is designed and built to withstand future climate change impacts and are protected against natural hazards. STAP therefore recommends that climate risk screening is carried out during the project design phase, and a management action drawn up. • Coordination and information dissemination need further clarification, because LDCs have different challenges and political dynamics, which will affect the performance of the project.
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?	Need improvement to incorporate all targeted GEBs in the project. See STAP overall comments

Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	The interventions do not explicitly explain the transfer of technology. The project is talking of BAT/BET in general terms without mentioning which technologies
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.	Without elaboration on the type of BAT/BEP to be implemented it is not easy to tell whether the global environmental benefits will be generated.
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	
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?	More elaboration is needed.
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?	Need some improvements. See STAP overall comment
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	The barriers are summarized in the sentence "insufficient capacity to introduce and enforce regulatory approaches; lack the capacity and financial resources to implement plans to address priority issues; lack viable alternative environmentally sound technologies and techniques; and struggle to engage the private sector and potential beneficiaries in the behavioural change" however no data is provided.
	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?	n/a
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?	It lacks data as such cannot provide basis for quantifying benefits
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	It is not robust enough. The shortcomings of AFLDC1 projects are listed without explanation
	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?	The project intends to strengthen the enabling environment and national enforcement capacities for the management and phase-out of POPs/Mercury and its compounds; promote the environmentally sound management of chemicals and wastes; replicating and scaling up of efforts to reduce POPs and mercury trade, use, emission and release
	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?	Yes, however, assumptions are not explicitly stated
	· 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?	
	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?	See further comments on GEBs in STAP's overall comments above
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	See further comments on GEBs in STAP's overall comments above
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	See further comments on GEBs in STAP's overall comments above
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Methodology for monitoring not apparent
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	n/a
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?	More elaboration is needed
	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 articulated

	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	
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?	Yes but roles are not yet defined
	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?	See above
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 but needs more elaboration
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	
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?	More thinking on risks is needed. Besides the level of risk, whether low, medium or high is not shown. Furthermore, climate risk on project output and outcome need to be considered. See STAP overall comment for more information
	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?	
	· 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?	More elaboration on coordination is needed
	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?	
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?	More elaboration is needed
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	
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.	