

Part I: Project Information		Response
GEF ID	10373	
Project Title	Supporting a Green Economy - Decoupling Hazardous Waste Generation from Economic Growth in Rwanda	
Date of Screening	27th November 2019	
STAP member Screener	Jamidu Katima	
STAP secretariat screener	Sunday Leonard	
STAP Overall Assessment		Minor issues to be considered during project design
		<p>The project aims to decouple hazardous waste generation and harmful releases by introducing the 4R approach (Reuse, Reduce, Recycle, and Recovery) in priority industries and economic sectors. The project is expected to dispose off 164 MT of POPs, 35,000MT POPs/Hg containing materials, and avoid the generation of 24.5 gTEQ of POPs. It will create an enabling framework for the green economy, including by developing a financing model, introducing cleaner production processes, and enhancing private sector capacity to manage waste soundly.</p> <p>STAP recommends the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP welcomes the green economy concept; however, the proposal does not explicitly describe the business model that will be used to achieve a transition to a green economy. STAP suggests that more thought is needed on the business model. The proponents should consider reviewing relevant publications on the green economy to guide them in developing the business model. Examples include Green Business Model Innovation (http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:707235/FULLTEXT01.pdf); the Green Economy and Emerging Green Business Models in the Danish Window Industry (https://backend.orbit.dtu.dk/ws/portalfiles/portal/115442796/The_Green_Economy.pdf); and the Green Economy Transition Handbook (https://www.ebrd.com/what-we-do/get/business-model.html). • The project intends to implement the 4R approach – Reuse, Reduce, Recycle, and Recovery to decrease releases and generation of hazardous and toxic wastes and chemicals. However, this is an incomplete concept which is missing one of the necessary actions to achieve cleaner production, that is, the redesign of products. STAP recommends that the project proponents consider how best to incorporate product redesign into the proposed interventions. • The Polluter Pays Principle (PPP) is being proposed as an incentive for reducing the generation of hazardous wastes. However, there are several types of incentives apart from PPP that could be implemented, including fiscal, regulatory and policy incentives. STAP recommends that a rigorous analysis of possible incentives be carried out to determine which will produce the best result. • The IEO's terminal evaluation study of projects under chemicals and waste focal area revealed that there is little evidence that GEF's chemicals and waste projects have been successful in putting in place sustainable strategies and financial mechanisms to scale up achieved results or to ensure continued engagement of private sector actors (http://www.gefieo.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/files/cw-study-2017_0.pdf). This proposal does not present detailed information about the financial mechanism that will be implemented to sustain the project. There is a danger of this project replicating the same problem identified by the IEO. STAP recommends that more thought be given to how the project will be financed beyond GEF's funding. Ideas on financing soil remediation projects may be obtained from a report on financing model of contaminated soils by the Norwegian Institute for Water Research (https://www.iisd.org/sites/default/files/publications/green-finance-soil-remediation-international.pdf).
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scaling up and replication is very critical to the durability of project outputs. The proposal mentions some elements of scaling up, but these need to be further elaborated. STAP recommends that the project proponents refer to relevant publications on scaling-up, such as the nine steps for developing a scaling-up strategy (https://www.who.int/immunization/hpv/deliver/nine_steps_for_developing_a_scalingup_strategy_who_2010.pdf) and WHO's document "developing national strategies for phasing out mercury-containing thermometers and sphygmomanometers in health care, including in the context of the Minamata Convention on Mercury" (http://www.euro.who.int/_data/assets/pdf_file/0006/295611/Phasing-Out-Mercury-containing-thermometers-sphygmomanometers-HC-en.pdf). The following publications may be useful too: "scaling up in development cooperation by GIZ" (https://www.shareweb.ch/site/Learning-and-Networking/sdc_km_tools/Documents/GIZ-Scaling-up-in-development-cooperation.pdf). • Risks: The proposal also presents a preliminary analysis of the potential risks to the success of the project. However, the risks were not rated in terms of their potential impacts. STAP recommends that this should be done. • Climate risk: The PIF identified climate risk, including extreme weather events such as extreme rainfall, flooding, and landslides. STAP welcomes this; however, there is no detailed analysis of how this will affect the project's objectives in the long term. STAP recommends that further analysis including sensitivity analysis, should be carried out and rigorous management options developed. • Lessons learned from other projects – this needs further elaboration to avoid similar problems to those experienced during the implementation of the projects presented in the baseline.
Part I: Project Information		What STAP looks for
B. Indicative Project Description Summary		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.	Yes
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	Yes
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes
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
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?	the barriers were describe but no data 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?	
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?	
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	
	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;	
	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?	Implementation of the 4R strategy: reuse, reduce, recycle and recovery
	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?	
	· 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?	Yes
	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?	
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	
	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?	See STAP overall assessment for STAP comments on scaling-up and sustainability
	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?	
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?	
	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?	See STAP overall assessment for STAP comments on risks including climate risks
	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?	
	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?	Specific Knowledge Management Strategy will be developed during the PPG phase.
	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.	