

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response	
GEF ID	10926	
Project Title	Ecosystem based adaptation for improved livelihood in Tuvalu	
Date of Screening	June 6, 2022	
STAP member screener	Ed Carr	
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski	
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Minor.</p> <p>The proposed project in Tuvalu seeks to reduce vulnerability to climate change through adaptive agricultural practices and ecosystem management in Tuvalu. This objective is straightforward, and the project components support this aim by focusing on integrated land management and restoration in a country that is one of the most vulnerable to the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>STAP appreciates the inclusion of social barriers and factors among the population of Tuvalu in the PIF and notes that this is well aligned with the most recent IPCC report which has identified social, cultural, and political factors to be some of the most important in identifying pathways to effective adaptation and climate resilient development.</p> <p>The PIF includes a diagrammed theory of change; however, it would be helpful during PPG phase to elaborate on this using a narrative that elaborates on the connections between barriers, interventions, and outcomes as well as underlying assumptions. See STAP’s Theory of Change primer for more information.</p> <p>Finally, this project supports incremental adaptation of agricultural practice in the face of climate change impacts which will be helpful in the short-term; however, more transformational change will likely be needed given the extreme vulnerability of this low-lying island nation.</p>	
Part I: Project Information	What STAP looks for	Response

B. Indicative Project Description Summary		
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes. The objective is straightforward and clearly responds to the problems facing Tuvalu related to food security.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes. The components support activities related to integrated land management and restoration.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	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.
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. STAP appreciates the enumeration of the non-climate causes of the challenges Tuvalu faces, and the ways the historical and projected climate change are expected to intersect with and exacerbate these issues. STAP appreciates that the climate futures for Tuvalu articulated in this PIF include two RCP scenarios and report a range of possible temperature and sea-level futures. However, the PIF does not distinguish between the challenges these scenarios will create for the people of Tuvalu. STAP recognizes that Tuvalu is existentially challenged by climate change and its impacts. However, the speed with which those

		challenges manifest may speak to the different strategies the country adopts to adapt and the interventions it seeks to prioritize. STAP recommends that in the PPG stage the project consider if these different possible climate futures call for different strategies or interventions for adaptation. See STAP’s decision tree for adaptation rationale and “There’s more than one plausible future: using simple narratives to help ensure the durability of GEF investments.”
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Barriers and threats are well-described and substantiated. STAP appreciates the inclusion of social barriers/factors among the population of Tuvalu in this section of the PIF, as the most recent IPCC report has identified social, cultural, and political factors to be some of the most important in identifying pathways to effective adaptation and climate resilient development.
	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?	n/a
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Yes: “Without urgent interventions to adapt Tuvalu’s agricultural sector to climate change — by promoting climate-resilient agricultural management and soil remediation practices — and increase freshwater recharge, the production of pulaka in the country will continue to decline, directly impacting Tuvaluans’ food security and cultural heritage.”
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project’s benefits?	Yes. The extended discussion of the alternative scenario lays out the number of beneficiaries, hectares of pulaka pits and coastal ecosystems.

	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Yes, though STAP notes that the heavy focus on pulaka production and livelihoods in the PIF is only matched by a proposed restoration of 10ha of pits and the introduction of EbA to an additional 13ha of pits. While the PIF mentions work in 180 ha of coastal ecosystems around the pits, the pits themselves are a very small area and it is not clear what percentage of total production is accounted for in the project area.
	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;	n/a
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	n/a
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	n/a
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	The PIF includes a diagrammed theory of change. STAP appreciates this, but notes there is no narrative version of this diagram that succinctly states the connections between barriers, interventions, and outcomes. There is also no clear identification of assumptions in the diagram.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	See below
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	<p>Component 1: Identifying and implementing integrated land management and ecosystem restoration strategies for increased resilience</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Output 1.1.1 Rehabilitation of 3 historically degraded pulaka pit areas carried out. • Output 1.1.2. Proven climate-resilient technologies and practices — such as raised concrete beds and impermeable geomembranes to minimize saltwater

		<p>intrusion under current climate change — implemented in ~32 pulaka pit areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Output 1.1.3 Alternative irrigation strategies — such as drip irrigation from roof catchments and tanks/micro-dams — installed to improve water supply to ~32 Pulaka pit areas. • Output 1.1.4 Diversified cropping strategies introduced to ~32 Pulaka pit areas to promote the use of climate-resilient crops that are able to withstand atoll conditions and simultaneously enhance soil quality. These strategies will include raising plants around Pulaka pits to generate organic material for remediation. • Output 1.1.5 8 community training groups — including representatives from women’s groups — established around pilot sites to generate knowledge of appropriate methodologies and upscale best practices of adaptation strategies among stakeholders, particularly for farmers and communities engaged with the Pulaka pit agriculture. • <u>Outcome 1.1: Restoration of 10 ha of degraded Pulaka pits and increased resilience of 13 ha of agricultural systems on 8 islands against the impacts of climate change and salt- water intrusion through innovative land management and agricultural practices.</u> • Output 1.2.1. 180 ha of coastal ecosystems restored to enhance the provision of associated ecosystem services, including flood reduction • and storm surge attenuation — to withstand increasing climate change impacts.
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Output 1.2.2. Groundwater recharge zones in and around ~32 pulaka pit areas protected using EbA buffer zones to improve soil quality and freshwater infiltration potential • Output 1.2.3. Diversified livelihoods strategies introduced for ~800 people in local communities reliant on natural resource-based livelihoods based on sustainable fisheries management to conserve coastal ecosystems and their services • <u>Outcome: 1.2 Groundwater infiltration and flood-risk reduction services improved on 8 islands through SLM practices that include the restoration and conservation of degraded atoll ecosystems.</u> <p>Component 2: Creating an enabling environment for implementing EbA through improving national policy and planning frameworks, strengthening institutional capacity, raising awareness and addressing barriers to CCA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Output 2.1.1. Revisions made to 3 national policies and 1 sub-national sector plan relevant to EbA, water and agriculture to align with the Go T's broader sustainability indicators, streamline funding for adaptation priorities and facilitate coordination between government agencies. These revisions will enable the upscaling of EbA and CCA-related knowledge generation and capacity building of male and female stakeholders through the project. • Output 2.1.2. Training conducted for 100 government officials, with a focus on technical officers, coastal adaptation
--	--	---

		<p>management professionals, representatives from women’s groups and community representatives on the integration of EbA, climate-resilient agriculture and SLM principles into policies and planning at both national and community levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Outcome 2.1. Institutional uptake of EbA enhanced through policy revisions and capacity building among core government staff.</u> • Output 2.2.1. Guidance Note for compliance monitoring and enforcement of EbA policy recommendations prepared under Output • Output 2.2.2. Land-use zoning plan developed to enable EbA, climate-resilient agriculture and SLM under existing land tenure systems. Sub activities will include updating land ownership databases within the Department of Lands to clarify land ownership boundaries. These boundaries will facilitate stakeholder engagement and reporting arrangements in the context of Tuvalu's current land tenure system • <u>Outcome 2.2. Develop and implement strategic action plans for streamlining EbA national policy and planning frameworks</u> • 2.3.1. Gender-responsive best-practice guidelines developed and disseminated to raise awareness and facilitate replication and upscaling of EbA, climate-resilient agricultural and land management practices. • 2.3.2. A gender-responsive knowledge management and communication strategy
--	--	--

		<p>developed for integrating EbA best practices and lessons learned into planning and policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.3.3. Continuous training and gender-responsive knowledge generation programmes for public sector officials developed using the results of the direct capacity building of technical officers in Output 2.1.2. • <u>Outcome 2.3. Uptake of EbA and climate-resilient agriculture practices enhanced through multi-level stakeholder decision-making programmes, knowledge management and awareness-raising regarding CCA.</u>
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Yes, the mechanisms are plausible. However, there is no discussion of 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?	The risks section of the PIF notes several possible changes in condition that might require adaptation and suggests measures that can be taken. STAP notes in particular that land tenure, livelihoods, and identity are often closely linked, so project efforts to work on land tenure should be connected to detailed gender and social analysis to ensure that changes to land tenure do not produce new challenges for the population.
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?	n/a
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	Yes. There is some question as to the impact and adequacy of these benefits, given the scale of challenges faced by Tuvalu. Supporting agrarian livelihoods is very important but might be irrelevant if overshadowed by climate change impacts.

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, but see the point above about adequacy/impact given the scale of challenges faced.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	The scale of benefits is plausible, but it is not clear if they are compelling. How long will the benefits of this project last if greenhouse gas emissions and sea level rise remain on today's levels?
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Yes
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Yes
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	See discussion in the section on risks.
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?	The integrated approach to building the resilience of agriculture in Tuvalu appears to be innovative for this context.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	The vision appears to be to scale this up across Tuvalu, through formal and/or informal farmer demonstrations and formal training groups.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	This project is about the incremental adaptation of agricultural practice in the face of climate change impacts. However, Tuvalu is facing existential climate challenges and may need transformative approaches to adaptation to survive.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		There are maps of Tuvalu and images of the areas in which the project will work. STAP suggests the PIF would benefit from a regional map that places Tuvalu geographically relative to other countries in the region to help those not familiar with the region understand where this place is located.
2. Stakeholders. Select the stakeholders that have participated in	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Table 5 covers a range of stakeholders that appears relevant to the project.

<p>consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities.</p> <p>If none of the above, please explain why.</p> <p>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>STAP appreciates that the project has already started to engage with the beneficiary population through Falekaupule and the project explicitly states the need for a community-based approach is required for the further development of the project in the PPG stage.</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>The roles are enumerated in Table 5.</p>
<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.</p> <p>If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality: access to and</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Yes, gender differentiated risks and opportunities have been identified. The project references the Tuvalu National Gender Policy to highlight three major arenas of challenge: i) high rates of violence against women; ii) low numbers of women in wage employment; and iii) limited access of women to decision-making.</p> <p>The project lists some preliminary responses. These focus on identifying “opportunities to increase women's participation in the project's activities and decision-making processes. This will be achieved by ensuring women and representatives from women’s groups participate in community training programmes and consultations (Output 1.1.5) and upscaling CCA-related knowledge and the capacity of men and women stakeholders involved in the project.” STAP notes that</p>

<p>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>		<p>efforts to increase women's participation in activities and decision-making can have negative consequences, particularly in contexts where domestic violence is a common tool for managing women's behavior. The project should conduct a comprehensive gender analysis that considers how to increase participation and decision-making in a manner that minimizes these risks.</p>
	<p>Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?</p>	<p>Yes – see above.</p>
<p>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>	<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? • 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? 	<p>The risks are valid and comprehensive. Many of the risks are directly related to project activities and within, to some extent, project control. These include limited women's participation, challenges around land tenure, limited buy-in from community leaders, and low community ownership.</p> <p>There are social and environmental risks – they are listed in Table 6.</p> <p>Climate risk is addressed only in terms of extreme weather events. The project characterizes such impacts as unlikely, yet in the problem statement such events and impacts are described as relatively common and impactful. The project should 1) address this confusion in the PIF (which part is incorrect regarding frequency and impact?) and develop a plan for project resilience to these impacts in the PPG stage.</p>
<p>6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives</p>	<p>Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?</p>	<p>Yes</p>

	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes, the baseline has an extended discussion of previous projects.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Yes, some lessons have been mentioned.
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	This is not elaborated in the PIF
	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?	This is not elaborated in the PIF
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?	KM will be structured around gender-responsive training programs for local communities, a communication strategy for distributing information, and a knowledge management system. Much of this is vague in the PIF.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	Nearly all KM is focused on local communities. There is only a short mention of upscaling to other SIDS at the end of the section.

Notes

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
<p>1. Concur</p>	<p>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.</p>
	<p>* 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></p>
<p>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>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:</p>
	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;</p>
	<p>(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.</p>
	<p>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.</p>

<p>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>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:</p>
	<p>(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.</p>