

## STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
<p>GEF ID: 10796                      Project Title: Greening Hurghada                      Date of Screening: May 18, 2021                      STAP member screener: Saleem H. Ali                      STAP secretariat screener: Sunday Leonard</p>	<p>STAP's overall assessment: <b>Minor issues to be considered during project design</b></p> <p>This is a focused urban and coastal greening project for a critical Red Sea tourist destination that offers a wide range of co-benefits and exemplifies an integrated approach to project design and implementation. We especially appreciate the natural capital accounting incorporation and the range of connections made between terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems in the project.</p> <p>For a relatively modest budget, the project has the potential for high-level impact. The theory of change is provided with details linking each output and the steps toward desired outcomes. The problem tree diagram is also helpful. However, the underlying assumptions of what needs to happen to achieve the desired results are missing. For example, to achieve some desired outcomes, it is assumed that the government is committed to enacting and enforcing new policies and legislation; and a new management plan for tourist sites or guidelines for coral carrying capacity would be adopted and implemented. These assumptions need to be reflected in the theory of change. We recommend that all such assumptions be reflected in the theory of change. Also, the alternative pathways, if these assumptions do not materialize as planned, should be included. STAP's theory of change primer (<a href="https://stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer">https://stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer</a>) can be a helpful guide in this regard.</p> <p>The additional appendices, including the key facts on Hurghada metropolitan area, relevant policies and regulatory framework, ESS Screening, and Global Environment Benefits (GEBs), also provide valuable clarity and context. It is also commendable that the biodiversity benefits are aligned with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. It would, however, be useful to have justifying citations for the GEB calculations from the literature.</p> <p>Climate change risks specific to Hurghada that could impact the success of the planned project interventions were identified, including storm surge, floods, sea-level rise, and increasing temperature. Information on current and projected temperature and precipitation variation up to 2099 were also provided, as well as mitigation measures for identified climate risk. We commend this effort and encourage the proponent to follow through with a more detailed climate risk assessment and mitigation measures at the PPG stage as promised and deploy the identified adaptation measures during implementation.</p> <p>Some aspects of the proposal require more clarity:</p>	

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although the PIF mentioned implementing green and circular investments and resource efficiency measures in hotel facilities, it is unclear what these would entail. There are significant opportunities to mitigate climate change and deliver biodiversity and other environmental benefits through the circular economy, including in the hotel and tourism sectors. For example, recovery and use of food waste can mitigate GHG emissions, and composting the waste can benefit soils and terrestrial biodiversity. Similarly, managing plastics by deploying circular economy/resource-efficient principles can reduce greenhouse gas emissions and reduce adverse impacts on fresh and marine waters and biodiversity. STAP recently released a report on the circular economy and climate mitigation, which provides examples and case-study of 14 interventions that can be implemented, including those relevant to hotels and tourism. We encourage the project proponent to review this report: Ali, S and Leonard, S.A. 2021. The Circular Economy and Climate Mitigation. A STAP Advisory Document. Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel to the Global Environment Facility. Washington, DC.</li> <li>• Nature-based solutions and infrastructure were mentioned in the proposal, but the specific type of solution and infrastructure and relevance to the tourism sector remain vague. We recommend that the proponent clarify these as the proposal is further developed. STAP advisory on nature-based solutions and the GEF can be helpful in this regard. (<a href="https://stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/nature-based-solutions-and-gef">https://stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/nature-based-solutions-and-gef</a>).</li> <li>• It will be helpful if the proponent can clarify how "promoting electrification of boats" (page 42 of the PIF) is a key technology to mitigate impacts on marine ecology.</li> <li>• Also, the financial policy framework to support tourism facilities needs to be further elaborated.</li> </ul> <p>Component 3 (long-term environmental and economic sustainability of low-carbon infrastructure and biodiversity investments are ensured) incorporates behavioral change elements to facilitate the adoption of solutions to be proposed under components 1 and 2 of the project. It is therefore important to design this component reflecting the latest and proven knowledge on behavioral change. We recommend that the proponent review STAP's recent advisory on behavior change, which highlights six strategic levers for changing behavior, to help provide further insight into designing this component. (<a href="https://stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/why-behavior-change-matters-gef-and-what-do-about-it">https://stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/why-behavior-change-matters-gef-and-what-do-about-it</a>).</p> <p>The World Bank/IFC has submitted a project in this same project cycle (GEF ID: 10766 - IFC-GEF Hotel Green Revitalization Program (HGRP), which aims to retrofit hotels in 30 countries, including Egypt. Some of the planned interventions overlap with this project, although it is unclear whether it will include hotels in Hurgada. We, therefore, encourage UNIDO to coordinate with the WB/IFC team as both projects are further developed to avoid any overlap and promote synergy. A similar recommendation has been made to IFC in STAP's review of the 10766 proposal.</p> <p>A few suggested citations related to the specific project goals and case region are provided below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lau, Kwok Hung. "Benchmarking Green Logistics Performance with a Composite Index." <i>Benchmarking</i> 18, no. 6 (2011): 873–96. <a href="http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/10.1108/14635771111180743">http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/10.1108/14635771111180743</a>.</li> </ul>

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Narayan, Siddharth, Michael W. Beck, Borja G. Reguero, Iñigo J. Losada, Bregje van Wesenbeeck, Nigel Pontee, James N. Sanchirico, Jane Carter Ingram, Glenn-Marie Lange, and Kelly A. Burks-Copes. "The Effectiveness, Costs and Coastal Protection Benefits of Natural and Nature-Based Defences." <i>PLOS ONE</i> 11, no. 5 (May 2, 2016): e0154735. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0154735">https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0154735</a>.</li> <li>Ahmed Shata, A. S., and R. Hanitsch. "Electricity Generation and Wind Potential Assessment at Hurghada, Egypt." <i>Renewable Energy</i> 33, no. 1 (2008): 141–48. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2007.06.001">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2007.06.001</a>.</li> <li>Nassar, Karim, Ahmed El-Adawy, Mohammed Zakaria, Reda Diab, and Ali Masria. "Quantitative Appraisal of Naturalistic/Anthropic Shoreline Shifts for Hurghada: Egypt." <i>Marine Georesources &amp; Geotechnology</i>, 2021, 1–16. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/1064119X.2021.1918807">https://doi.org/10.1080/1064119X.2021.1918807</a>.</li> </ul>	
<b>Part I: Project Information</b> <b>B. Indicative Project Description Summary</b>		
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Excellent
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes, some aspects need to be further clarified.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits? 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. Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?	Very well
<b>Part II: Project justification</b>	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
<b>1. Project description. Briefly describe:</b>	Is the problem statement well-defined?	Yes – this is adequately presented.

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)	<p>Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?</p> <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>	
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	<p>Is the baseline identified clearly? Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits? Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?</p> <p>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; 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?</p>	Yes, there are citations to earlier studies and materials provided.
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	<p>What is the theory of change? What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?</li> <li>• Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-</li> </ul>	Yes – well presented and can be further improved.

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
	<p>informed identification of the underlying assumptions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?</li> </ul>	
<p>5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing</p>	<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>Partially presented</p>
<p>6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)</p>	<p>Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?</p> <p>Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?</p> <p>Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?</p> <p>Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?</p> <p>What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?</p>	<p>Yes – provided in an addendum though further clarifications could be provided through citations on how the calculations were reached.</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>Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up,</p>	

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
	<p>for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors? Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?</p>	
<p><b>1b. Project Map and Coordinates.</b> Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.</p>		
<p><b>2. Stakeholders.</b> 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? 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>There is a detailed addendum social review provided as per UNIDO templates</p>
<p><b>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.</b> 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</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</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, noted through partnership with National Women Council of Egypt</p>

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
<p>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</p>		
<p><b>5. Risks.</b> 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"> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?</li> <li>• Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?</li> <li>• What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate</li> </ul>	<p>Yes, there is a detailed pro forma assessment as per UNIDO templates.  Climate risk screening is also provided.</p>

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
	risks and resilience enhancement measures?	
<p><b>6. Coordination.</b> 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>Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?</p> <p>Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?</p> <p>How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?</p> <p>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?</p>	<p>Private sector engagement should have been noted more clearly given that this involves tourism sector</p>
<p><b>8. Knowledge management.</b> 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.</p>	<p>What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?</p> <p>What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?</p>	<p>Material is noted on databases and government repositories of information which could be linked.</p>

### STAP's advisory response

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<p><b>1. Concur</b></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 <b><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></b></p>
<p><b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b></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><b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b></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>