

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

| Part I: Project Information | Response |
|--|--|
| GEF ID | 10519 |
| Project Title | Reduce the impact and release of mercury and POPs in Vietnam through lifecycle approach and Ecolabel |
| Date of Screening | 11 May 2020 |
| STAP member screener | Jamidu Katima |
| STAP secretariat screener | Sunday Leonard |
| STAP Rating | Concur |
| STAP Overall Assessment of the project proposal | <p>STAP welcomes the UNDP project on "reducing the impact and release of mercury and POPs in Vietnam through lifecycle approach and ecolabel." The project aims to reduce the impact and release of mercury, PBDEs, PFOS, PFOA, HBCD, SCCP in products with the ultimate objective of protecting human health, environment and promote sustainable production and consumption. The project will address the intentional or secondary contamination of POPs in plastic, foam, paint, chrome plating, incineration, iron and steel, and other related sectors. This will be achieved through the introduction of eco-labeling schemes, the establishment of green financing framework, promotion of sustainable production and consumption, promotion of environmental design to eliminate POPs of concern, and controlling emission of UPOPs.</p> <p>STAP concurs with the proposed projects and recommends the following moving forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal presents useful baseline information, including on relevant regulations in Vietnam; the current status of POPs in plastic production and recycling in the country; as well as on the inventory of mercury and POPs in the country. This information is foundational to a successful project, and STAP recommends that it should be built upon as the project moves to the PPG stage. • The project presents a theory of change on page 26. It highlights mainly the issues, baselines, barriers, interventions, and expected outcomes. Essential components of a functional theory of change, including the underlying or key assumptions and causal and alternative pathways, are, however, missing. STAP recommends that this should be improved. Please see STAP's theory of change primer for further guidance on theory of change preparation (https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/STAP%20ToC%20Primer_webposting.pdf). • It was recognized in the PIF that most plastic recyclers or manufacturers do not have a clear understanding of the various chemical additives used in their processes. The PIF also states that "the informal recycling chain (mostly based on craft villages) do not follow quality standards." This is one of the significant reasons for POPs and other chemical use and pollution in the country. Given this situation, it is crucial to come up with a strategy for engaging these sectors to catalyze change. How this will be achieved is not very clear in the current PIF. Suggested activities may include targeted capacity building and awareness-raising within these sectors. However, most of the capacity building and awareness-raising interventions in the current PIF are mainly aimed at the elimination of mercury and not POPs. |

| | | |
|--|--|-----------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project will "design and implement modern air pollution control systems to prevent the release of mercury and U-POPs suitable also for small enterprises." Given the interrelationship between most air pollution mitigation systems and climate change abatement technologies, it is vital that the design and selection of pollution control systems are optimized to deliver air pollution, mercury reduction, as well as climate mitigation benefits. The possible synergies and trade-offs should be considered in the design and implementation. • It is noted that the quantification of the amount of avoided mercury and POPs releases from the proposed activities will be further assessed in detail at the PPG stage. STAP welcome this further review of GEBs at the PPG stage and recommends that the potential climate benefits (for example, through air pollution system – see above comment) should be considered in the improved estimates. • Innovative, sustainability, and potential for scaling-up: This section focuses more on innovative approaches that are embedded in the project. However, green financing and procurement (which are essential for project sustainability) are not discussed. Furthermore, the scaling up aspect is missing. The project proponent may consider reviewing the GIZ paper on "scaling up in development cooperation - practical guidelines (https://www.shareweb.ch/site/Learning-and-Networking/sdc_km_tools/Documents/GIZ-Scaling-up-in-development-cooperation.pdf)" for further guidance. • Stakeholder engagement: the roles of all stakeholders need to be elaborated. • Coordination: It is shown in the PIF that the project will be implemented by MONRE (VEA) as the main implementing partner but in partnership with MOIT (VINACHEMIA) and MOH (HEPA). However, under sections 2 and 4, the PIF commits to work with other stakeholders, including the private sector. The diagram provided in section 6 does not contain any information on how this coordination will be done. • Climate change impact and risks: it was indicated that the project would be intrinsically neutral or positive in terms of generation of GHG or energy consumption. Alternative processes/materials in terms of energy consumption and the release of GHG will be assessed in the selection of interventions. STAP encourages that this should be rigorously carried out and note that the lifecycle approach, which the project intends to implement if adequately done, can help achieve this goal. On the risk of projected climate change, the intention to include the resilience of manufacturing plants to climate impacts as one of the plant selection criteria is welcomed, and STAP recommends that a detailed climate risk assessment should be carried as the project is developed further. | |
| 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 (although they are not categorized as such) 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 – updating regulatory regime to support sustainable production and consumption to eliminate POPs; Develop a policy on mercury and mercury containing product and wastes; developing green financing framework and green procurement; application of LCA approach Yes |
| Part II: Project justification | A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change. | Yes, the theory of change. See STAP overall assessment for comments on the 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 are well described, and project components are designed to address these 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? | NA |
| 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. However, quantification is by estimation |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project? | Yes |
| | For multiple focal area projects: | NA |
| | are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators; | NA |
| | are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and | NA |
| | how did these lessons inform the design of this project? | NA |
| 3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project | What is the theory of change? | The reduction of the use of POPs, new POPs and mercury and the release of POPs, U-POPs and mercury throughout the entire lifecycle |
| | What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotion of sustainable production and consumption • Introducing lifecycle approach in material and product design (to eliminate POPs, Mercury) |
| | What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updating relevant regulations and policies • Developing green financing and procurement • Introduction of ecolabeling • Introduction of alternative material/product design |
| | Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions? | The assumptions are not explicitly defined |
| | 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 |
| | 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? | Yes |
| | Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The methodology used in a mixture of estimation, surveys and measurements. • The values will be confirmed during PPG. • See STAP's overall assessment for further comments |
| | What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change? | Mentions – avoid construction in flood prone areas as a way of ensuring resilience to climate risks. See STAP's overall assessment for more comments. |
| 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? | Green financing framework is an innovative approach, although the PIF is not listed as one on innovative ideas on the project |
| | Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors? | No – under item G (Innovation, Sustainability and Scaling up) the project discusses innovative ideas. In other words, there is nothing showing how will the activities will be scaled up |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability? | More transformational changes will be required for long sustainability, since the project proponents state that the innovative ideas are not new, but they need more push to be implemented |
| 1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place. | | The project map is not provided |
| 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: However more civil societies should be included if possible – so far only two associations are identified |
| | 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? | Role of private sector is more elaborate The roles of other stakeholders are missing |
| 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? | Gender differentiated risks have been identified Gender opportunities are not discussed More thought on how to address the gender equality and empowerment is needed. |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <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> | <p>This aspect is not discussed</p> |
| <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>Not likely</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No major impacts are expected</p> <p>None</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> | <p>Yes</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 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 specific lesson mentioned |
| | How have these lessons informed the project's formulation? | Not 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? | Not mentioned |
| 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? | Knowledge management indicators and Metrix are not discussed |
| | What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience? | Through training workshops, awareness raising events, posting materials on website |

Notes

| STAP advisory response | Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed |
|--|---|
| <p>1. Concur</p> | <p>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.</p> |
| | <p>* 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></p> |
| <p>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</p> | <p>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:</p> |
| | <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;</p> |
| | <p>(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.</p> |
| | <p>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> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</p> | <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> |