

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10508
Project Title	Integrated transboundary water resources management in the Corubal basin between Guinée and Guinée-Bissau
Date of Screening	22 November 2020
STAP member screener	Blake Ratner
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Minor</p> <p>STAP welcomes this project from IUCN to support integrated, transboundary water resources management in the Corubal basin.</p> <p>The project addresses a clear gap in transboundary basin governance. It provides a good analysis of the weak institutional and legal framework for transboundary cooperation. The approach is typical for TDA-SAP projects in the IW portfolio, but the context of a defunct legacy transboundary agreement can provide lessons for the revitalization of governance cooperation in similar transboundary contexts, amidst considerable capacity constraints.</p> <p>There is a very good visual representation of theory of change, showing interconnections among actions and outcomes. Before CEO endorsement, STAP recommends specifying assumptions and mechanisms to enable adaptation in implementation plans.</p> <p>Specific gender barriers (e.g., related to land tenure, management decision making, income opportunities, benefits sharing, etc.) remain to be identified.</p> <p>The initial description of the project’s knowledge management (KM) approach is very general. Specific objectives and mechanisms, as well as processes for adaptive learning, should be specified prior to CEO</p>

	endorsement. Metrics for KM performance should also be provided.	
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. Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	Yes, with good quantification.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Very challenging context but clear need.
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?	Clear structure.
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.
	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?	

2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Relevant prior initiatives indicated. Good analysis of weak institutional and legal framework for transboundary cooperation.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Yes, with good preliminary
	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;	
	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?	
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	Clearly follows from 5 barriers identified.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Clearly presented.
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	Very good visual representation of theory of change, showing interconnections among actions and outcomes.
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Yes.
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	Before CEO endorsement, recommend specifying assumptions and mechanisms to enable adaptation in implementation plans.
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?	Logic of anticipated GEBs is clear, with good specification of co-benefits.

	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	
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, well aligned with IW priorities.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes.
	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, preliminary.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Climate resilience is part of key rationale for intervention.
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?	Approach is typical for TDA-SAP projects in IW portfolio, but context of defunct legacy transboundary agreement can provide lessons for revitalization of governance cooperation in similar transboundary contexts, amidst considerable capacity constraints.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Clear aim to institutionalize transboundary basin organization and norms of cooperation.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Objectives require fundamental transformation in comparison to recent trends.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Good description but geo coordinates missing.
2. Stakeholders. Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Very preliminary indication of stakeholder groups beyond government.

<p>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>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>Sensible initial indication of stakeholder roles, but much more detail will be required prior to CEO endorsement, particularly regarding civil society and private sector groupings.</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. If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality: access to and control over resources;</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Reasonable plans regarding participatory processes for project development incorporating gender analysis and measures for inclusion. But specific gender barriers (e.g., related to land tenure, management decision making, income opportunities, benefits sharing, etc.) remain to be identified.</p>

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		
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	Not yet identified.
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? Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project? For climate risk, and climate resilience measures: <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? 	Reasonable identification of potential risks and responses. Climate risk analysis to be completed, though preliminary factors have been identified.
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?	Good, specific linkages identified to projects in the 2 countries and in the broader region.
	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?	Recognition of governance constraints, prior restoration action.

	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?	Yes.
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?	Initial description of KM approach is very general. Specific objectives and mechanisms, as well as processes for adaptive learning, should be specified prior to CEO endorsement. Metrics for KM performance should also be provided.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	Initial plans for sharing indicated; requires further development.

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>

3. Major issues to be considered during project design	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:
	(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.