

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10543
Project Title	Promotion of circular economy in the textile and garment sector through the sustainable management of chemicals and waste in Lesotho, Madagascar and South Africa
Date of Screening	17 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 UNIDO project on "promotion of circular economy in the textile and garment sector through the sustainable management of chemicals and waste in Lesotho, Madagascar, and South Africa." The project aims to reduce the use and release of POPs and uPOPs through the adoption of the circular approach in the textile industry in the three participating countries. The project will assist the participating countries to strengthen their regulatory and institutional capacities for adoption and promotion of circular economy in the textile and garment (TG) sector; enhance the recyclability of textile and garment wastes through POPs-free textile manufacturing process; and implement BAT/BEP and RECP investments. It will also introduce circular economy concepts for uPOPs emission reductions and contaminated land mitigation through the environmental sound management of TG wastes.</p> <p>STAP has the following comments on the proposed project:</p> <p>Table 1, pg 21, shows that Mauritius is the largest exporter of apparel in Africa. Why is the country not included in the project as the leading exporter of apparel compared to the other targeted countries? Are there already ongoing projects in Mauritius? Paragraph 31 suggests that the challenge of recycling of textiles also exists in Mauritius and that the country presents an opportunity for delivering substantial global environment benefits. STAP recommends that this project should plan to include measures for the transfer of knowledge and experience from this project to Mauritius and other countries listed in Table 1.</p> <p>Paragraph 47 indicates that a theory of change was included in Annex D. However, Annex D is missing. It is recommended that the theory of change should always be included in the body of the PIF. 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.</p> <p>The PIF presents a list of interventions to achieve the project objective, but the details of the activities are quite vague. There is limited information on the type of planned interventions, for instance, examples of circular economy approaches or BAT/BEP or RECP that will be introduced. The same goes for the kind</p>

of financing mechanisms and business models that are being considered in the project. Besides, there are several terms used in PIF, e.g., green investment, green financing, green technologies, green industry, green products, which are not defined.

Although component 3 is intended to focus on introducing circular economy concepts for uPOPs emissions reduction and contaminated land mitigation, no information is presented in the PIF on contaminated land mitigation. There is no baseline information on contaminated lands caused by textile production or recycling in the targeted countries or why this needs to be addressed. This makes it difficult to understand why an intervention on contaminated land is included in the project.

Global Environmental Benefits: How are the estimates of POPs and uPOPs reduction presented on page 41 derived? The assumptions that informed these numbers are not provided. It is understood that there are limited data available during the development of this PIF. Still, it is essential to provide information on the assumptions and data that inform the current estimate of expected GEBs. Furthermore, page 41 of the PIF (section f) states that the implementation of BAT/BEP will reduce the release of uPOPs and greenhouse gases. Also, the project intends to promote energy efficiency, renewable energy measure, and clean production (listed under component 2 and noted as part of the innovative approach of the project). Hence, the project is expected to generate climate co-benefits. These benefits should also be assessed and included in the expected GEBs from the project. This will ensure that the global environmental benefits from the project are maximized.

Climate change impact and risks: It is essential to carry out an adequate assessment of proposed alternatives and approaches to ascertain that adopted solutions do not contribute to greenhouse gas emissions and other unintended consequences. Paragraph 6 (page 21 of the PIF) states that "the vulnerability of these countries to climate change, especially the island state of Madagascar, has been taken into consideration in this project." But no detailed information was presented on how this was done. What are the identified vulnerabilities? How will they affect the project? What measures are included to manage these vulnerabilities? STAP recommends that a detailed climate risk screening should be prepared at the PPG stage. For guidance on climate risk screening, we suggest relevant STAP papers, including "guidance on climate risk screening of GEF projects April 2020" (<https://stapgef.org/stap-chairs-report-gef-agency-retreat-1-april-2020>) and "STAP guidance on climate risk screening, June 2019" (<https://stapgef.org/stap-guidance-climate-risk-screening>).

Innovation, sustainability, and potential for scaling-up: The PIF states that sustainability and scaling up of project activities will be achieved through information exchange and participation of the private sector in the project. More efforts, than information exchange, may be needed to scale up the project activities outside participating countries. 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).

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.	It is stated that theory of change is attached in Annex D. However, this Annex 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
	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?	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;	Multiple benefits are not fully presented
	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?	Promotion of circulate economy in the textile sector
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthening of regulatory and institutional capacities for adoption and promotion of Circular • Economy in the textile and garment (TG) sector in the participating countries. • Enhancing recyclability of textile and garment wastes through POPs-free textile manufacturing process and the implementation of BAT/BEP and RECP investments. • Introducing Circular Economy concept for UPOPs emission reductions and contaminated land mitigation through ESM of textile and garment wastes and pilot demonstration of textiles/ garment wastes recycling and reuse.

	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthening regulatory and institutional framework and capacities for adoption of Circular Economy in the TG sector. • Implementing BAT/BEP/RECP and Circular Economy concept in selected textile production facilities for the ESM and prevention / reduction of POPs, hazardous chemicals and wastes while improving process efficiency and profitability at plant level. • Implementing BAT/ BEP and Circular • Economy concept through selected TG and recycling facilities for the reuse, recycling and ESM of textile and garment wastes.
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Yes. The assumptions are not explicitly defined. More information on the specifics of the activities are needed. See STAP's overall assessment for more details.
	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. See STAP's overall assessment for specific comments on GEBs
	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?	Yes
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	The PIF acknowledges the vulnerability of Madagascar dur to climate change, but there is nod discussion on how the project will increase 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?	Yes - The promotion of Circular economy
	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?	Financing will be a prerequisite requirement for scaling up and ensuing ling term sustainability of the project
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Google maps of the project sites are 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	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Yes

respective roles and means of engagement.		
	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?	The stakeholders' roles are listed
<p>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</p>	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	Yes. However, a gender plan to address and mainstream gender issues in all project outcomes/outputs will be designed in the PPG phase
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	No
<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</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>	<p>Yes Yes Yes – but these are ranked low</p>

risks to be further developed during the project design	<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>Climate risk is mentioned but the measures to address this risk are not appropriate. See STAP's overall assessment for more comments on the need for climate risk assessment.</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>This should be thoroughly discussed in the PPG</p>
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 no 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>Information exchange mechanism will be put established</p> <p>Indicators and metrics of KM are not discussed</p>

	<p>What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• It is planned to promote national and regional platforms and networks for information and knowledge exchange• Organisation of annual meetings to share knowledge and experience
--	---	--

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>