

Part I: Project Information

GEF ID 10080

Project Title AIM-WELL: Algeria
Integrated Management of
Waste Energy at the Local
Level

Date of Screening 2018.11.28.

Screener Sunday Leonard

Panel Member Ferenc Toth

STAP Overall Assessment

Minor

STAP welcomes this project on integrated management of waste energy at the local level in Algeria and has the following comments:

Please correct project duration: it is 60 rather than 5 months. In Part I B. Indicative project description summary, component and output numbering is confusing and inconsistent (page 3: Component 3 has output 1.5) It would be useful to rearrange components in their numerical sequence that represents the logical flow.

Under Component 2, it was stated that poultry manure would be used to modify the N-P-K concentrations of the fertilizer produced from organic waste so that this new product replaces the imported fertilizers, and ensures a sustainable, and reliable revenue source for farmers. This is a very ambitious goal. However, no detailed analysis was provided on how the volume of poultry manure compares with the volume of imported fertilizers and the volume of manure consumed currently, what technology will be employed, what quality control measures will be put in place to ensure that manure is comparable with imported fertilizers? For this component to be successful, these factors and other economic parameters are needed. STAP recommends that a detailed analysis should be carried out when the project is fully developed. Further to this, a waste transformation plant is expected to convert organic waste and poultry manure to fertilizer and renewable energy. But no information was provided on the technology involved. What exactly is a waste transformation plant? Has this technology been proven? What is its track record? What type of renewable energy will be generated, liquid fuel or burning of waste; what will the generated electricity be used for, for charging the electric trucks for waste collection or transmission into the national grid? This pertinent information is currently missing in the current PIF and should be provided.

Part I: Project Information
B. Indicative Project Description
Summary
Project Objective

What STAP looks for

Response

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 |
| Outputs | Are the global environmental benefits likely to be generated? | Yes, however further analysis is needed. See comments in Cell C8 above |
| | 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, but more information and analysis is needed before the project proceeds. See comments in Cell C8 above |
| Part II: Project justification | A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change. | |
| 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 Yes
well described, and
substantiated by data and
references?

For multiple focal area Not a MFA project
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?

2) the baseline scenario or any
associated baseline projects

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

Does it provide a feasible Yes it provide a feasible basis
basis for quantifying the
project's benefits?

Is the baseline sufficiently Yes
robust to support the
incremental (additional
cost) reasoning for the
project?

For multiple focal area Not a MFA project
projects:

| | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators; | Not a MFA project |
| | 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? | Yes Draws on the results and lessons from an earlier project. |
| 3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project | What is the theory of change? | No explicit theory of change presented but the storyline is simple: establish regulation and infrastructure, separate household waste, utilize part of it by transforming it into a marketable product, demonstrate the feasibility and foster replicability of the waste management model. |
| | What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes? | Develop a master plan, establish waste collection stations, organize poultry manure collection, invest in plants to convert it into fertilizer, promote the integrated waste management model. |
| | · What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives? | See above |
| | · Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions? | Yes, but a more detailed analysis is needed before project proceeds. See comments in Cell C8 above |

· Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes? No. STAP recommends that the project team consider changing conditions beyond those in the project risk analysis that might affect the implementation of the project and prepare a plan to deal with them.

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, the expected GHG emissions reductions resulting from the project are presented, but the methodology is unclear. STAP recommends that the project team explain the methodology by which the numbers in the GHG emissions reductions table were arrived at two decimal places.

| | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?</p> | <p>The expected GHG emissions reductions resulting from the project are presented but the methodology is unclear. STAP recommends that the project team explain the methodology by which the numbers in the GHG emissions reductions table were arrived at two decimal places.</p> | |
| <p>What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?</p> | <p>Climate change is included in the risk table but no substantive discussion is provided. STAP recommends that the project team prepare a climate impact and adaptation assessment for components of the integrated waste management system that might be affected by a changing climate, especially extreme weather events.</p> | |
| <p>7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up</p> | <p>Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?</p> | <p>The project transfers the concept of integrated waste management and technologies to a region where they has not yet been used.</p> |
| <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>Yes</p> | |
| <p>Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?</p> | <p>Establishing a new very different waste management system is a fundamental transformation in the two areas involved in the project.</p> | |

1b. Project Map and Coordinates.

Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.

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? Clearly explained.

3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences? Yes

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

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 risks included in the risk table are all valid. Yet one issue is not clear. Is the potential unwillingness of the population to separate and separately collect waste considered? Are there any incentives or penalties to entice people to separate waste? In the new system, private (fertilizer), club (repositories) and public (climate benefits) goods will be generated but people do not seem to be compensated for the inconvenience of having to separate waste.

Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project? For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:

Yes, and they are properly considered.

· 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?

This is not discussed in the PIF. See STAP's recommendation regarding a climate impact and adaptation assessment above.

· 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? Climate scientists to prepare regional scenarios of climate change. Technologists and engineers to assess the impacts of those changes on various components of the integrated risk management system.

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 explicit lessons mentioned but the intention is to build on results and lessons from a recent European Union project on solid waste management.

How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?

Yes

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?

No mechanism specified in the PIF but the intention is there. Component 3 includes the promotion of a municipal model of integrated waste management, there is not much about KM. STAP recommends that the project team prepare a more detailed KM plan, including KM indicators and metrics. The related STAP document Managing knowledge for a sustainable future <https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/publications/STAP%20Report%20on%20KM.pdf> is a good source of advcie.

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?

Not presented in the PIF. See STAP's recommendation above.

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

Only a few ideas are mentioned in the PIF, See STAP's recommendation above.

STAP Notes