

STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE

GEF ID	11699
Project title	Resilient rural economic growth and food security
Date of screen	May 19, 2025
STAP Panel Member	Jon Barnett
STAP Secretariat	Guadalupe Duron

1. Summary of STAP's views of the project

STAP welcomes the Solomon Island's LDCF proposal "Resilient rural economic growth and food security". This is an excellent proposal that is grounded in a good understanding of climate risks and the ways these may cascade through food systems; thereby supporting the project objective to protect the food system from these risks.

The project is thoughtful and has a good theory of change, with complementary objectives. It is attentive to social dimensions and seeks to mitigate risks to peace and livelihoods from climate change. More details about the means of implementation will be needed in the complete project.

In addition, STAP encourages the project team to think more carefully about challenges that could undermine the project logic. This will require embedding these challenges throughout the project logic (e.g., potential of social norms undermining capacity outcomes); hence, planning to mitigate these challenges during implementation while identifying residual risks and embracing adaptive learning as necessary.

The project could also usefully work further on its future narratives. Doing so will help the project plan strategically for resilient outcomes across different futures.

STAP provides further details below.

STAP's assessment*

X Concur - STAP acknowledges that the concept has scientific and technical merit

- ☐ Minor - STAP has identified some scientific and technical points to be addressed in project design
- ☐ Major - STAP has identified significant concerns to be addressed in project design

Please contact the STAP Secretariat if you would like to discuss.

2. Project rationale, and project description – are they sound?

See annex on STAP's screening guidelines.

The project rationale demonstrates a very good understanding of the context and the problem to be addressed, particularly the future risks of climate change and the way these may affect land tenure and use, food systems, food production, and social stability. A thorough description of these interrelationships is provided not only to provide a national-level context of the adaptation problem, but also to detail the adaptation rationale in each of the project sites, which is commendable.

The start of plausible futures is described relying on different climate scenario data (for rainfall, temperature, sea level rise, and drought), detailing how climate change will affect the interconnections between agricultural production, a host of social and economic variables, vulnerability, and adaptive capacity, as mentioned previously. Although these descriptions provide valuable insights into the adaptation problem, the descriptions

of plausible futures (2 – 3 simple descriptions are recommended) can be strengthened by considering one or two other key drivers, in addition to climate change, and their interactions.

As currently written, the project is designed to address the identified risks. In doing so, it makes a unique proposition that it will help secure other significant investments to address adaptation challenges in the Solomon Islands. For instance, it proposes to generate synergies between GCF and LDCF investments, which is sensible. In this vein, STAP appreciates Figure 3 depicting the complementarity between GCF and LDCF investments and how this harmonization will contribute to the Solomon Islands' investments in climate adaptation. Additionally, the project provides a good account of other investments, and how this project will complement them, including by building on lessons learned.

The project also seeks to enhance policy coherence and proposes a reasonable approach to knowledge exchange. Its focus on strengthening conflict management capabilities is wise.

The project description includes a thorough theory of change, including detailed assumptions associated with each key outcome and barriers. The narrative for the theory of change is also robust, although more barriers than enablers are recognized in the logic chain. Details are lacking in how the theory of change will be implemented, although this is to be expected at the PIF stage.

The project has three well-considered, complementary components that work at different scales. The causal logic between these components, outputs, and outcomes and the overall objective looks strong. The proposal also makes a good case for additionality, based on the strong adaptation rationale described for each project site.

Stakeholders could be better identified. However, STAP notes, and is pleased, that in-depth, multi-stakeholder engagements will occur during the project development.

The identification of risks regarding financial and fiduciary risks is too concise and incomplete. In addition, the risk table is not appropriately completed, especially regarding risks that undermine the logic chain. Further details on how to strengthen project design to deal with challenges to its logic chain are provided below.

3. Specific points to be addressed, and suggestions

STAP recommends addressing these points as the project is designed to strengthen it further.

1. The project often provides good detail about outputs, though these are missing from the discussion of component 2 on page 31.
2. The full proposal would need more detail on means of implementation, for example about ways in which the various capacities will be enhanced, the means of communication of knowledge, and improving access to finance.
3. As mentioned above, the project describes how different climate scenarios are affecting communities' adaptive capacity, and agricultural production. The project could usefully benefit from more thorough future narratives (2 to 3 narratives) that consider the connections between one or two key drivers in addition to climate change, and assess to what extent the impact pathways will remain resilient in all plausible futures. The relevance of developing future narratives cannot be understated, as they are a valuable process to avoid maladaptation. For example, diversified livelihoods (to strengthen adaptive capacity) may work in one future, but not in another, possibly leading to maladaptation. [STAP's future narrative](#) advice details the steps on how to construct these simple scenarios.

4. The risk table is not completed correctly. The PIF states that the entire project is designed to address climate risks, so this should appear more explicitly throughout the theory of change. In this manner, the project is designed explicitly to address these risks and mitigate against these challenges during its implementation.

Risks that have the potential to undermine institutional and policy innovations, should be recognized as challenges in the theory of change, as well as in the risk table. For example, the risk table implies there will be no risks to institutional or policy innovation as “strong capacity sub-components are embedded in the design of the project”. Nonetheless, there may be challenges to achieving this innovation. These challenges include vested interests, cultural norms, or other social structures that may compromise strengthening capacity for resilience (component 1). Identifying these social structures and how they may pose challenges to achieving strengthened, resilience capacity outcomes should initially be described in the theory of change, as they are foreseen challenges. Once the project is designed, including the development of the theory of change, the risks that remain in achieving strengthened institutional capacity should be described in the risk table. Mitigation measures should also be identified. Refer [to STAP’s risk note](#) for further details, including examples of how to complete the institutional and policy innovation risks in the risk table.

ANNEX: STAP'S SCREENING GUIDELINES

1. How well does the proposal explain the problem and issues to be addressed in the context of the **system** within which the problem sits and its drivers (e.g. population growth, economic development, climate change, sociocultural and political factors, and technological changes), including how the various components of the system interact?
2. Does the project indicate how **uncertain futures** could unfold (e.g. using simple **narratives**), based on an understanding of the trends and interactions between the key elements of the system and its drivers?
3. Does the project describe the **baseline** problem and how it may evolve in the future in the absence of the project; and then identify the outcomes that the project seeks to achieve, how these outcomes will change the baseline, and what the key **barriers** and **enablers** are to achieving those outcomes?
4. Are the project's **objectives** well formulated and justified in relation to this system context? Is there a convincing explanation as to **why this particular project** has been selected in preference to other options, in the light of how the future may unfold?
5. How well does the **theory of change** provide an "explicit account of how and why the proposed interventions would achieve their intended outcomes and goal, based on outlining a set of key causal pathways arising from the activities and outputs of the interventions and the assumptions underlying these causal connections".
 - Does the project logic show how the project would ensure that expected outcomes are **enduring** and resilient to possible future changes identified in question 2 above, and to the effects of any conflicting policies (see question 9 below).
 - Is the theory of change grounded on a solid scientific foundation, and is it aligned with current scientific knowledge?
 - Does it explicitly consider how any necessary **institutional and behavioral** changes are to be achieved?
 - Does the theory of change diagram convincingly show the overall project logic, including causal pathways and outcomes?
6. Are the project **components** (interventions and activities) identified in the theory of change each described in sufficient detail to discern the main thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they address the problem, their justification as a robust solution, and the critical assumptions and risks to achieving them?
7. How likely is the project to generate global environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF project (**additionality**)?
8. Does the project convincingly identify the relevant **stakeholders**, and their anticipated roles and responsibilities? is there an adequate explanation of how stakeholders will contribute to the

development and implementation of the project, and how they will benefit from the project to ensure enduring global environmental benefits, e.g. through co-benefits?

9. Does the description adequately explain:

- how the project will build on prior investments and complement current investments, both GEF and non-GEF,
- how the project incorporates **lessons learned** from previous projects in the country and region, and more widely from projects addressing similar issues elsewhere; and
- how country policies that are contradictory to the intended outcomes of the project (identified in section C) will be addressed (**policy coherence**)?

10. How adequate is the project's approach to generating, managing and exchanging **knowledge**, and how will lessons learned be captured for adaptive management and for the benefit of future projects?

11. Innovation and transformation:

- If the project is intended to be **innovative**: to what degree is it innovative, how will this ambition be achieved, how will barriers and enablers be addressed, and how might scaling be achieved?
- If the project is intended to be **transformative**: how well do the project's objectives contribute to transformative change, and are they sufficient to contribute to enduring, transformational change at a sufficient scale to deliver a step improvement in one or more GEBs? Is the proposed logic to achieve the goal credible, addressing necessary changes in institutions, social or cultural norms? Are barriers and enablers to scaling be addressed? And how will enduring scaling be achieved?

12. Have **risks** to the project design and implementation been identified appropriately in the risk table in section B, and have suitable mitigation measures been incorporated? (NB: risks to the durability of project outcomes from future changes in drivers should have been reflected in the theory of change and in project design, not in this table.)