

Part I: Project Information**GEF ID** 10110**Project Title** Sustainable Bioenergy Value Chain Innovations**Date of Screening** 12/3/2018 **Screener** Sunday Leonard**Panel Member** Ferenc Toth**STAP Overall Assessment** Concur**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.	Reducing GHG emissions by using agricultural wastes for energy purposes
----------	--	---

Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits?	Yes, GHG emissions reductions
--	-------------------------------

Are the global environmental benefits likely to be generated?	Yes
---	-----

Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project.	Provided in an organized manner in sufficient detail
---------	---	--

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.
--------------------------------	---

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, absolutely

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 a 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? Yes

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: are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators; Not a MFA project

Not a MFA project

<p>3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project</p>	<p>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? What is the theory of change?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Directly based on intimate knowledge of related EBRD an other projects</p> <p>The proposed project components and their outcomes imply a series of changes to reach the objectives of the project: establish an enabling policy environment to facilitate bioenergy innovation and deployment, put in place technical resources and capacity to support the bioenergy value chain, the combination of the two will increase investment in innovative technologies at various points in the bioenergy value chain which, if successfully implemented, will increase awareness and knowledge about these bioenergy technologies and result in replication and scaling up</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>Policy environment - technical resources and capacity - investments on the ground - awareness and knowledge fostering scaling up</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</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, rough estimates are provided using the GEF methodology. STAP encourages the preparation of more precise estimates
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Designing various elements of the agribiomass supply chain will provide more flexibility in feedstock supply. This is certainly a useful first step. STAP recommends that the project team prepare a more detailed climate impact assessment across the whole supply chain and specify hard technical and soft management options to increase the project's resilience to climate change, especially extreme weather events.

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 project involves technology and business model innovation and adapts innovative financing solutions as well

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

Yes. Based on the performance of the initial projects, additional funders are expected to join in financing new projects. They will be supported by the outputs of Component 4 involving diverse channels for disseminating lessons from this project.

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

The project involves incremental growth in utilizing agricultural waste for energy purposes which is expected to transfer the whole agribio waste system from almost completely discarding these wastes to almost complete utilization.

Coordinates for possible project areas are provided

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?

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?

In a very preliminary form. STAP recommends that the project team improve the presentation of stakeholder involvement. The civil society organizations box is not marked, although NGOs, research institutes and universities are listed as potential contributors in the text. The role of government organizations and the private sector can be second-guessed based on the output/outcome lists but they should be explicitly listed in the stakeholder section together with tasks and responsibilities. Similarly, the list should also specify the perceived roles and expected contributions of NGOs and research organizations.

This is not provided. See STAP's recommendations concerning stakeholder involvement above

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?

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

Not really. STAP advises the project team that instead of describing the general EBRD gender policy, they prepare a project-specific assessment of gender issues and develop plans to deal with them during project implementation

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 PIF identifies various types and sources of risks that are valid and comprehensive. However, what are presented as risk mitigation actions for the first three risks in the risk table (macroeconomic, government interest, incentive to GHG emissions reductions) are only remotely related to risk management. STAP suggests that the project team develop true risk management strategies for these risks.

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?

Climate risk is included in the risk table but not assessed in any detail. See STAP's recommendations for a climate impact and adaptation assessment above.

· Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?

Considered but not assessed. See above.

· Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?

Only sketchy ideas are presented in the PIF. See STAP's recommendations above.

· What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures? Climate scientists to prepare scenarios of changes in climate attributes of interest, especially extreme weather events; agronomist to assess the implications of these changes on growing conditions and yields, and engineers to assess the impacts on energy facilities and infrastructure. STAP recommends mobilizing these experts to undertake the climate impact and adaptation assessment to make the project robust to climate change.

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? 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? Lessons from earlier projects are properly considered in the formulation and design of the current project. The PIF also presents a well-developed KM plan to accumulate, organize and disseminate new information from this project via various channels.

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?

Although KM plans are well-developed, they do not use KM indicators and metrics. STAP suggests that the project team consider using such indicators or metrics to strengthen the KM component of the project.

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

Scaling up is supposed to be supported by the KM plan, see above. This is a very laudable project and STAP suggests that an activity should be included in Component 4 aimed at disseminating the findings and replicating the project in similar countries

STAP Notes