

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10564
Project Title	Environmentally Sustainable Development of the Iron and Steel Industry
Date of Screening	20 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 World Bank project on "environmentally sustainable development of the iron and steel industry" in China. The project aims to reduce uPOPs release from the iron and steel industries in China through the strengthening of policy and regulatory regime and by implementing BAT/BEP in sinter and electric arc furnace plants.</p> <p>STAP has the following comments on the proposed project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Theory of change: On page 6 of the PID, the proponent provided a narrative description of the problem to be addressed and interventions – as the theory of change. However, this analysis does not contain all the necessary information expected in a complete theory of change. It will also be useful if the theory of change can be presented in a diagram to clearly show the root cause and drivers of environmental degradation, key assumptions, planned interventions, causal and alternative pathways, and expected output and outcomes. Please see STAP's theory of change primer (https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/STAP%20ToC%20Primer_webposting.pdf) for further guidance on theory of change preparation. Barriers: The PIF lists several barriers, the majority of which are addressed by the project components. However, the PIF is silent on the risks which could derail the project. For example, what if the private sector does not cooperate. The project developer should provide an analysis of potential risks and information on how they will be managed. There are possible interlinkages, including potential synergies and tradeoff between measures and technologies aimed at mitigating uPOPs, greenhouse gas, mercury emission, and air pollution control. This was recognized on page 5 of the PID. STAP recommends that an integrated approach that seeks to maximize benefits and reduce tradeoff or unintended consequences should be applied in deciding on the solutions to be adopted in the project. Further to the above, it is essential that all the possible global environmental benefits from the project are considered and reported. While the PID acknowledges the possibility of climate change mitigation benefits from the project, this was not accounted for in the expected global environmental benefits in the PIF. Only the chemicals and waste (uPOPs) benefit was noted. We

	<p>recommended that the expected climate change benefits be analyzed and fully accounted for as the project is further developed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Innovation: The PIF states that the "innovativeness relies on the promotion of least-cost, applicable techniques dealing with UPOPs emissions, and on the integration of BAT/BEP for PCDD/Fs control with emission reduction of more conventional pollutants and energy-saving and greenhouse gases emission reduction." This statement does not provide adequate information on what is innovative about the project. Innovativeness may include project design, financing mechanism, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning model (https://www.stapgef.org/innovation-and-gef). STAP recommends that this section should be revisited at the PPG stage. • Climate change impact and risks: The PIF is silent about the potential effects of projected climate change on achieving the objectives of the project. STAP recommends that a detailed climate risk screening should be carried out to ascertain the vulnerability of the project to climate change and come up with risk management options, where necessary. 	
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 (though not presented in terms of short-term effects) 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 Yes
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	The narrative explanation of the project is provided; however it does not address all key elements of theory of change.
1. Project description. Briefly describe: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes	Is the problem statement well-defined?	Yes

and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)		
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	The barriers are described. The threats are not discussed. The barriers are not substantiated with data and references
	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?	Current emission data is provided under institutional context.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	The baseline section does not 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?	More work is needed
	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;	NA
	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?	Reduction of uPOPs emission from iron and steel industry
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application of BAT/BEP in iron and steel industry • <i>Strengthening of Institutions, Policies and Regulations</i>

	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Implementation of BAT/BEP demonstration in two sinter plants, and one EAF</i> • Assessment and drafting of updated emission standards; development or revision of technical standards; revision to documents that guide industry and technology; support the development of rapid and cost effective PCDD/Fs monitoring methods and improvement of emissions control systems; enhancing monitoring capacity at national and local level; and improving information management system
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Yes. underlying assumptions are not indicated
	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	Methodologies are not shown

	benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	This is not discussed
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?	Innovation aspect is not well articulated, it lacks specifics
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Scaling up is not clearly articulated
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	None
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		The PIF states that the map is presented as Annex A – unfortunately this is not appended
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?	Not clear if the listed stakeholders participated in consultations during the project identification phase
	What are the stakeholders' roles, and how will their combined roles contribute to robust project design,	A stakeholder engagement plan will be developed during project preparation

	<p>to achieving global environmental outcomes, and to lessons learned and knowledge?</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?</p>	Not yet
	<p>Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?</p>	No
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>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? 	The risks are not discussed

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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?	Yes
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	No lessons mentioned
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	No lessons 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 discussed
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 metrics are not shown
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	A knowledge management strategy is not discussed

Notes

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 " <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> "
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.