

Part I: Project Information

GEF ID

10082

Project Title

Enhancing environmental
performance in the expanded and
extruded polystyrene foam industries

Date of Screening

12/5/2018

Screener

Sunday Leonard

Panel Member

Ricardo Barra

STAP Overall Assessment

Minor

This is an important project to find a sustainable replacement for HBCD - one of the so-called new POPs, listed by the Stockholm Convention in 2013. This is particularly important for Turkey and other developing countries because the exemptions deadline given by the Stockholm Convention will soon lapse. Hence this project may provide an opportunity to showcase alternatives for other developing countries.

Considering the complexity of the issue, three years may be too short to achieve all of the project's objectives, including identifying suitable alternatives and increasing the market demand for the alternatives. STAP recommends that this should be considered in the project planning and implementation stage.

The analysis and verification of the use and alternatives to HBCD-based flame retardants should not only focus on the state-of-the-art in Turkey but should be global. This will ensure that the Best Available Technology that is Economically Achievable is identified and deployed. A useful publication that can be explored at the start of this analysis is the USEPA report on alternatives to HBCD available at: https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-06/documents/hbcd_report.pdf. Based on what is available globally, the project can then seek to identify the best alternative considering the current Turkey situation.

It was not stated explicitly whether a risk assessment of

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.	Yes
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits?	Yes, avoided release/production of POPs, and climate change mitigation
	Are the global environmental benefits likely to be generated?	Yes, if the project is well implemented
Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project.	Alternatives to HBCD-base flame retardant; capacity building; regulation and incentive schemes; and pilot conversion of HBCD-base flame retardant production lines.
	Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?	
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	No explicit theory of change, but the sequence of activities and their outcomes represent a plausible logical framework that will lead to the adoption of alternatives to HBCD-based flame retardants in Turkey
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 featured in two paragraphs (9&10). They are mainly limited awareness and cost. STAP thinks the barriers should be elaborated further to align with the various components of the project

	<p>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?</p>	<p>Not an MFA project, although the project will also generate climate change mitigation benefits</p>
<p>2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects</p>	<p>Is the baseline identified clearly? Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
	<p>Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?</p>	<p>Yes, and it is used in calculating the benefits.</p>
	<p>Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?</p>	<p>Yes, without the project, the business as usual case of using HBCD-based flame retardants will continue</p>
	<p>For multiple focal area projects:</p>	<p>Not a MFA project, although it was indicated that the project will also generate climate change mitigation benefits</p>
	<p>are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators;</p>	<p>Not a MFA project, although it was indicated that the project will also generate climate change mitigation benefits</p>
	<p>are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and</p>	<p>Not a MFA project, although it was indicated that the project will also generate climate change mitigation benefits</p>
	<p>how did these lessons inform the design of this project?</p>	<p>Not a MFA project, although it was indicated that the project will also generate climate change mitigation benefits</p>

3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	<p>What is the theory of change?</p> <p>What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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? 	<p>No explicit theory of change, but the sequence of activities and their outcomes represent a plausible logical framework that will lead to the adoption of alternatives to HBCD-based flame retardants in Turkey</p> <p>Regulatory strengthening and capacity building; pilot conversion of production lines; and monitoring and evaluation</p> <p>See above.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No. The basic assumption is that the chain of activities and their outcomes will work smoothly. Various types of risks are considered - see below.</p>
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing	<p>GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?</p> <p>LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?</p>	<p>Yes, avoided release/production of POPs and climate change mitigation</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>

6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)

Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?

On the global environmental benefits, it is important to clarify that the project is not eliminating existing POPs but helping to avoid the use or production of new POPs in the future. The PIF also says that some climate mitigation benefits will be achieved through the greater efficiency of modern insulation material compared to traditional insulation materials. It is, however, unclear what is meant by modern or traditional insulation material. Neither is it clear how the projected climate benefits were calculated. STAP recommends that these should be clarified when the project is developed further.

Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?

Yes. However, considering the complexity of the issue, three years may be short to achieve all of the objectives of the project, including identifying suitable alternatives and increasing the market demand for the alternatives. STAP recommends that this should be considered in the project planning and implementation.

Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?

On the global environmental benefits, it is important to clarify that the project is not eliminating existing POPs but helping to avoid the use or production of new POPs in the future. The PIF also projects that some climate mitigation benefits will be achieved from the project through the efficiency of modern insulation material compared to traditional insulation materials. It is, however, unclear what is meant by modern or traditional insulation material. Neither is it clear how the projected climate benefits were calculated. STAP recommends that these should be clarified when the project is developed further.

Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?

Yes. But see above for some comments on that

7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up	<p>What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?</p>	<p>Not considered</p> <p>Yes, this is an important project aiming to find a sustainable replacement for HBCD - one of the so-called new POPs, listed by the Stockholm Convention back in 2013). This is particularly important for Turkey and other developing countries because the exemptions deadline given by the Stockholm Convention will soon lapse. Hence this project may provide an opportunity to showcase alternatives from a developing country perspective.</p>
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.	<p>Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?</p> <p>Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?</p>	<p>Partially. The success of the project could be a model for other developing countries</p> <p>The objective is a fundamental transformation of the sector in the long term</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?</p>	<p>Yes, relevant stakeholders were identified. Efforts should be made to engage them fully at the PPG stage. Academics and research institutions are omitted from the list of stakeholders. Given the research nature of the project, it is important that they should be engaged.</p>
	<p>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?</p>	<p>See above. The role of stakeholders is not clearly defined. The PIF only indicates that they will be engaged. STAP recommends that this should be done to improve the likelihood of a successful project</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

Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?

The PIF indicates that gender disaggregated data will be recorded and targets will be set for women participation in the project

Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?

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

Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?

The identified risks are valid, mitigation measures were also identified. But an important potential risk is ignored: government commitment and chance that new regulations are not adopted.

Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?

Yes

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? PIF indicates that there is no expected climate risk for the project
- Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed? See above
- Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with? See above
- What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures? See above

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? Not applicable for this particular project
- Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited? See above
- How have these lessons informed the project's formulation? See above

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?

See above

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?

New knowledge will be shared with national and international institutions. No indicator or metrics were provided

What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?

Knowledge will be shared with national and international institutions. The information will also be used as the basis for the conversion of production lines and the related awareness activities: training and information sessions, as well as publicity in websites of companies and the government. After completion of pilot conversion activities, the corresponding lessons learnt will be shared with relevant stakeholders at the national and international level through the same channels.

STAP Notes