

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10523
Project Title	Reducing uses and releases of chemicals of concern, including POPs, in the textiles sector
Date of Screening	13 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 "reducing uses and release of chemicals of concern (CoC), including POPs, in the textiles sector." The project aims to achieve its objectives through eco-innovative strategies for circular textiles in four Asia-Pacific countries. A Life cycle thinking tool will be used to create eco-innovative solutions.</p> <p>STAP has the following comments on the proposed project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline: The PIF provides baseline information in section B. The analysis focuses on the amount of textiles produced in the participating countries, existing industry initiatives, government regulatory controls, circular textiles economies, and eco-innovation initiatives and baseline projects, which are useful. The estimate of baseline POPs and CoC in the countries upon which the indicators of success will be based, was, however, not provided. • It was indicated that a theory of change was prepared and included in Annex F of the PIF. This annex is, however, missing. A problem tree was provided (Figure 1), which describes the causality pathway that underpins the continued use of POPs and CoCs by textiles producers and forms the basis for the missing theory of change. It will be useful to review the theory of change to ascertain that it accurately captures the essential components of a functional theory of change, including the underlying key assumptions, causal and alternative pathways, and expected outcomes. • Page 18-19 of the PIF, as well as Figure 2 (Problem Tree), highlights the significant impact that chemical pollution has on freshwater bodies in the targeted countries. This suggests a linkage between this chemical and wastes project and the international waters focal area of the GEF. STAP recommends that this interlinkage should be explored during the PPG stage to ensure that the synergies and any possible trade-offs are well addressed. This will ensure that the global environmental benefits from the project are maximized. • The term non-toxic circular economy approach is technically incorrect as it assumes that a circular economy can be toxic. The circular economy, by design, removes hazardous and toxic substances from products and their supply chains. Any intervention that continues to have toxic

substances does not fit the definition of a circular economy. The use of the term should be corrected when preparing the next project document.

- “Fast fashion” (a phenomenon characterized by quick turnarounds of new styles, a larger number of collections offered per year, and lower prices coupled with a lower cloth utilization rate) was identified as a critical driver of chemical use and pollution in the textiles sector. The proposal, however, fails to present information on how this project will address this challenge. There are possible opportunities to effectively address this under Components 2 and 3 of the project. For example, through the strengthening of policies related to textile value chains (Component 2) and through awareness raising geared towards behavioral change and knowledge exchange (Component 3). STAP recommends that relevant activities and output for addressing fast fashion should be explicitly presented when revising the proposal.
- It is encouraging that this project intends to work with the UNDP project on ecolabel in Vietnam (GEF ID: 10519). STAP believes that synergistic opportunities can be harnessed between the two projects through cross-fertilization of ideas and coordination of activities.
- Incremental cost calculation: The PIF provides a discussion on incremental costs. The analysis may be improved by referring to the GEF's operational guidelines for the application of the incremental cost principle (https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/C.31.12_Operational_Guidelines_for_Incremental_Costs-2007_0.pdf).
- Global environmental benefits: The table of indicators shows the "tentative" estimate of the global environmental benefits that will accrue from the project. STAP notes that a more accurate estimate will be available at the PPG stage, and encourages the project proponent to present information on the methodology and assumptions used in preparing the estimates.
- Innovation: The project will implement eco-innovation and circular economy principles through lifecycle thinking. This is good. However, the PIF only presents wastewater circulation as an example of such strategies. More examples will help clarify what kind of interventions the project will implement.
- Potential for scaling-up: The PIF does not show clearly how the results from the project will be scaled up. The project proponent may review the GIZ paper: 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).
- Climate change impact and risks: It is essential to carry out an adequate assessment of proposed alternatives and approaches in the project to ascertain that adopted solutions do not contribute to greenhouse gas emissions and other unintended consequences. Also, the risk from a changing climate to achieving project objectives was not considered in the PIF. Yet, Bangladesh is known to experience frequent floods and is one of the most vulnerable countries to the impacts of climate change globally. (<https://www.arcgis.com/apps/Cascade/index.html?appid=79bf52aefcc74ca1a542658cb47e2d04>). STAP recommends that a detailed climate risk assessment should be carried as the project is developed further, to ensure that the GEF investment is not negatively impacted by climate change.

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 not defined as such - short term will be done in component 1, medium term during component 2 and long-term during component 3)
	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 Yes
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	The narrative of the project is provided. It is mentioned that the theory of change is attached in Appendix F – which is not attached
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. Sufficient 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?	The project focusses on a single focal area

2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	The baseline is defined; however it provides data on articles e.g. textile it does not provide estimates of POPs at the beginning of the project
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	The PIF neither provides basis for quantifying project benefits Th global environmental benefits listed in table of core indicators are not quantified in the relevant sections of the PIF.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	No. More elaboration is needed.
	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;	Information sharing – on eco innovation and piloting the same
	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 reduction of the release of CoC including POPs in the textile industry through application of eco-innovation strategy
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information sharing and eco-innovation pilots on priority CoCs including POPs • Eco-innovative strategies towards a non-toxic circular textiles economy • Knowledge management for scaling up
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrict use, releases, and exposure to priority CoCs including POPs • Strengthening Governments' and global textile value chains policies for phase out of CoC and POPs

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upscaling of project results to global textile and garment sectors and reporting to MEAs
	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?	The USD per tonne of reduced POPs and CoC is relatively high
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Yes, these are listed in the table of indicators. However, these are not quantified in the PIF
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	The indicators are provided. The methodologies for quantifying them is lacking
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	These are not discussed in the PIF
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 – through application of Eco-innovation methodology, that is based on life cycle thinking.

	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Not explicit. The PIF is banking on dissemination of the outcomes to achieve the scaling up – this is not adequate.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Not likely
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		The project map is provided in Annex A, which is not attached
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?	Yes Government Institutions Regional Convections Centres SAICM Secretariat National Cleaner Production Centres Private Sector NGO
3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response	Gender differentiated risks have been identified

<p>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.</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>measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Gender opportunities are discussed</p> <p>More thought on how to address the gender equality and empowerment is needed. The PIF intends to target women headed enterprises – this will only maintain status quo. Efforts to bring in more women are important</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>No</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 	<p>The risks have been identified and strategies to mitigate them are presented</p> <p>No</p> <p>Climate risk is not discussed. See STAP's overall assessment for more comments on the need for climate risk assessment.</p>

	<p>been considered? How will these be dealt with?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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?	There are specific lessons listed
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	Not shown
	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. the PIF states that this project will link with ongoing regional or national 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?	<p>Knowledge Management platform will be established</p> <p>Indicators and metrics of KM are not discussed</p>
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	Establishing a KM platform.

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>