

## STAP Screen 11564

GEF ID	11564
Project title	Building Urban Resilience to Climate Change and Transitioning to Green Economy in Somalia
Date of screen	2 June 2024
STAP Panel Member	Ngonidzashe Chirinda
STAP Secretariat	Virginia Gorsevski

### 1. Summary of STAP's views of the project

This project aims to “enhance the resilience of urban systems and improve the adaptive capacity of vulnerable urban communities and ecosystems to reduce the adverse impacts of climate change on urban areas in Somalia.”

Overall STAP finds that the project presents a good understanding of the important issues and trends relevant to the issues it seeks to address. STAP is also pleased to note the focus on vulnerable communities, including Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) as both stakeholders consulted during project design and also as project beneficiaries. The project proposes innovative nature based solutions (NbS) such as ‘sponge cities’ and supports women – operated micro, small and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs).

However, the project lacks clarity regarding the relative importance of the role of climate change impacts vis-à-vis the other noted challenges, including political instability and conflict, which is unsatisfactorily described and for which there is no assessment to inform project design and implementation. The project Theory of Change (ToC) is somewhat unclear and does not sufficiently articulate the causal pathways to convincingly connect barriers to components, for example.

STAP provides additional observations and recommendations below.

*Note to STAP screeners: a summary of STAP's view of the project (not of the project itself), covering both strengths and weaknesses.*

#### STAP's assessment\*

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

Somalia is plagued by numerous inter-connected problems – all of which are well described in the rationale section of the PIF. The main drivers behind environmental degradation and human suffering include rapid population growth, a history of conflict, poor planning (especially in urban areas where most people live), and climate change impacts. Information is presented on past and projected future climate impacts indicating that the country is getting (and will get) hotter and drier, except in some areas with more precipitation and flooding.

STAP suggests summarizing these climate trends more clearly, focusing on nearer-term scenarios (2050, not 2100) and mid-range scenarios (RCP 4.5, not 8.5).

The main climate risks can be summarized as increased temperatures and changes in rainfall patterns, seasonality and intensity, with more frequent and intense flood risks, droughts and damages to crops and infrastructure. While this is undoubtedly true, it is not clear the relative importance of climate change vis-à-vis the other significant problems facing the country – particularly conflict and political instability – which negatively affects people directly through displacement, poverty, food insecurity, etc. and indirectly from environmental degradation and deforestation.

While the trends are clear – population growth, urbanization, climate change – it is necessary to better understand how they interact with each other and other issues identified to develop several future narratives that can inform the development of the Theory of Change and the various causal pathways leading to the goal of increasing resilience in urban communities. See the STAP guidance documents on [Simple Future Narratives](#) and STAP's [Primer on Theory of Change](#) for additional guidance.

In terms of the project descriptions, the barriers are well described; however, they are disconnected from the individual components within the Theory of Change, giving the appearance of a log frame rather than a carefully considered ToC that works backwards from the ultimate objective and develops specific causal pathways that correspond to the barriers standing in the way of achieving the stated goal. Curiously, no effort is made to develop solutions grounded in conflict analysis despite the important role of conflict, fragility and political insecurity in Somalia. Project proponents may consult the recent STAP guidance on working in [fragile and conflict situations](#), which included input from UNDP's conflict and crisis branch and could be beneficial to help frame this project.

Despite this shortcoming, the project components are relatively sound. STAP notes, however, that implementing NbS is challenging in countries that are much more politically and financially stable due to lack of experience and financing solutions, casting some doubt on the extent to which these efforts will be successful in urban areas of Somalia given the many barriers listed in the project.

**Component 1** seeks to establish a coordination mechanism to support policy coherence and capacity building between Federal agencies (and their respective sectors) and 'vertically' between Federal, State and local authorities currently operating at cross-purposes. Presumably, they will be persuaded to align their priorities over NbS and mainstream climate adaptation as a result of this coordination body. This is well-intentioned but seems somewhat ambitious given the challenges facing the government and the problems plaguing the country.

**Component 2** seeks to prioritize NbS in urban planning processes. Examples include NbS to support flood protection, water, and stormwater management through green infrastructure, natural barriers, rainwater harvesting, green roofs, permeable pavements and bioswales that will increase water retention, reduce runoff, and prevent flooding in urban areas. This component also includes enhanced planning through GIS; however, it does not specify how these activities will be financed apart from an existing GCF project. Will this be sufficient?

**Component 3** aims to leverage sustainable finance through private-sector investments. Specifically, it aims to enhance MSME support through micro-financing, loans, equity, grants and guarantees that encourage job creation and private-sector investment in NbS. Notably, it focuses on providing training, capacity building and access to finance opportunities to vulnerable communities, including women and IDPs; however, it seems somewhat ambitious – again, given the current political instability, which is typically a significant barrier to attracting private sector financing due to the high levels of risk.

**General comment:**

The risk section discusses inclusive, community-based participation, but this type of approach is not reflected in the actual components, which mainly focus on government agencies, with the exception of Component 3, working with MSMEs.

*Note: provide a general appraisal, asking whether relevant screening guideline questions have been addressed adequately – not all the questions will be relevant to all proposals; no need to comment on every question, only those needing more attention, noting any done very well, but ensure that all are considered. Comments should be helpful, evaluative, and qualitative, rather than yes/no.*

**3. Specific points to be addressed, and suggestions**

1. With the trends described in the rationale, develop simple narratives to describe different plausible futures for Somalia depending on possible trajectories. The interventions should then be designed to be robust to the different plausible futures. This will ensure that the expected outcomes are durable under the different futures. See STAP guidance on [Simple Future Narratives](#).
2. Use STAP's decision tree tool to ensure that this project has a clear rationale with particular attention on four main elements: the presence of worsening climate hazards, either now or in the future; evidence for the diverse ways in which these hazards affect people and places; interventions that address the impacts of climate change; and effective monitoring, evaluation, and learning. See STAP's [decision tree for adaptation rationale](#) for more information.
3. Revise the ToC to develop causal pathways that work backwards from the good, consider what is 'necessary and sufficient' to achieve the goal, and include assumptions and information on conflict context and how that will be addressed using UNDP or other available approaches. See STAP Primer on [Theory of Change](#).
4. Consult STAP's recent document on Environmental Security: [Achieving Durable Outcomes in Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations](#) to learn more about and make use of the tools and methods that GEF agencies (including UNDP) employ to reduce the risk of working in FCS and improve likelihood of achieving GEBs.

*Note: number key points clearly and provide useful information or suggestions, including key literature where relevant. Completed screens should be no more than two or three pages in length.*

\*categories under review, subject to future revision

## 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.)