

Part I: Project Information

GEF ID

10094

Project Title

Environmentally sound management
of POPs, mercury, and other
hazardous chemicals in Argentina

Date of Screening

12/6/2018

Screener

Sunday Leonard

Panel Member

Ricardo Barra

STAP Overall Assessment

Minor

STAP welcome this proposed UNDP project on “environmentally sound management of POPs, mercury, and other hazardous chemicals in Argentina”. The project aims to minimize the risk posed by POPs, mercury and other hazardous chemicals to human health and the environment and to promote compliance with the Stockholm and Minamata Conventions. The project will employ policy, capacity building and technical assistance efforts geared to eliminating POPs, and the management and disposal of mercury waste. STAP regards this project as a continuation of previous efforts, including GEF-funded projects, and expects the project proponent to consider how to make the project more innovative based on lessons learnt from previous projects. In STAP’s view, a more critical analysis of what has worked or not in previous interventions needs to be considered since other GEF-funded projects have already been developed in Argentina towards similar objectives (as mentioned in the proposal). This will ensure that we do not continue to take the same action and expect a different result.

STAP has the following further comments:

STAP encourage the project proponent to review available information which highlights recent knowledge on the issues in Argentina including Ridolfi et al., 2014, human exposure to POPs in Argentina is going down; A. Alvarez, M.A. Polti (eds.), Bioremediation in Latin America: Current Research and Perspectives, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-05738-5_2. These publications indicate that exposure to several POPs pesticides

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, however several clarifications are needed. Please see STAP comments in Cell C8 above
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, POPs, UPOPs, and Mercury elimination
	Are the global environmental benefits likely to be generated?	Yes, if project is well implemented and necessary analysis done. See Cell C8 above
Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project.	Strengthened legal and institutional framework; capacity building and trainings; pilot destruction of POPs, UPOPs, Mercury; Action Plans; knowledge management products
	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 could help achieve the project objectives. However more detailed analysis is still needed. See STAP comments in Cell C8 above
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?	Yes, but information limited. The barriers need to be better explained especially in the context of previous projects that have been implemented on the same issues.

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?

Not an MFA project

2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects

Is the baseline identified clearly? Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?

Partially. Baseline information for some of the proposed activities were not provided, for example, newly identified POPs/UPOPs will be included but no baseline information was presented on the current status of this

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?

Partially. Baseline information for some of the proposed activities was not provided, for example, newly identified POPs/UPOPs will be included but no baseline information was presented on the current status of this

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;

Not an MFA project

Not an MFA project

	<p>are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and</p>	<p>Yes, past projects are mentioned and the project intends to learn from them. STAP regards this project as a continuation of previous efforts, including GEF-funded projects, and expects the project proponent to consider how to make the project more innovative based on lessons learnt from previous projects. In STAP's view, a more critical analysis of what has worked or not in previous interventions needs to be discussed in the proposal since other GEF-funded projects have already been developed in Argentina with similar objectives (as mentioned in the proposal). This will ensure that we do not continue to take the same action and expect a different result.</p>
<p>3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project</p>	<p>how did these lessons inform the design of this project?</p>	<p>See above</p>
	<p>What is the theory of change?</p>	<p>No explicit theory of change, but the sequence of activities and their outcomes represent a plausible logical framework that will could help achieve the project objectives. However more detailed analysis is still needed. See STAP comments in Cell C8 above</p>
	<p>What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?</p>	<p>Institutional strengthening; inventory development; capacity building for monitoring and enforcement; pilot of chemical elimination technologies</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives? 	<p>See above.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions? 	<p>See STAP comment in Cell C8</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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. The basic assumption is that the chain of activities and their outcomes will work smoothly. STAP recommends that previous projects should be studied to identify what has worked or not and based on this, a Plan B should be developed</p>

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?	Not applicable.
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental 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 explicitly defined?	Yes
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Yes
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Not considered in the PIF. STAP recommends that this should be done

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?

Not significantly. The PIF indicates that the project is innovative because of scale of hazardous waste management and integrated approach. However, it is not really an integrated approach but a combination of activities on chemical management. Further, STAP regards this project as a continuation of previous efforts, including GEF-funded projects, and expects the project proponent to consider lessons learnt from other project and develop innovative solutions that goes beyond those of past projects

Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?

No. STAP recommend that this should be done

Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?

No

1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.

<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>This is a major deficit in the PIF. Information on stakeholders is minimal. Important stakeholders such as academics and research institutes needed for the scientific analytical aspects of the project are not included and the role of identified stakeholders and how they will be engaged is not presented. The current version of stakeholder engagement is very poorly done and STAP recommends that a detailed stakeholder analysis should be done before this project can proceed.</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.</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?

No, the PIF indicate that a detailed analysis will be conducted at the PPG stage.

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

See above

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?

Yes

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? Not provided in the PIF. STAP recommends that a climate risk assessment should be carried out, and if any substantial risk is identified, adaptation measures should be incorporated into the project design
- 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? Yes
- Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited? Yes
- How have these lessons informed the project's formulation? See STAP recommendations in Cell C8 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?

Yes

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?

Component 4 of the project focuses on elements of knowledge management.

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

See above.

STAP Notes