

## STAP Screen: 11575

GEF ID	11575
Project title	Guinea Water and Sanitation Project
Date of screen	2 June 2024
STAP Panel Member	Edward Carr
STAP Secretariat	Virginia Gorsevski

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

STAP acknowledges the project "Guinea Water and Sanitation Project" which aims to increase access to water in Greater Conakry and to support the implementation of water supply and sanitation policy and institutional reforms." The project seeks LDCF funding to support increased climate resilience in one component of a larger project.

STAP appreciates that the PIF contains a range of climate futures and offers a good explanation of how observed and expected changes in the precipitation regime will translate into impacts on the dam and therefore the overall project via increased erosion, sediment transport, and siltation.

However, STAP notes that the climate futures presented are not integrated with non-climate drivers of change that might alter the overall dynamics in the watershed. Further, the biggest driver of the erosion challenge targeted by the LDCF is local land use; however, the PIF does not offer information regarding how the populations engaged in these land uses will be meaningfully engaged and there appears to be limited understanding of the behaviors implicitly targeted for change.

Achieving the goals outlined in this project to deliver durable adaptation benefits will require a better understanding of future uncertainty that integrates climate and non-climate drivers of change and improved knowledge of the local situation based on in-depth consultations with the populations living in the watershed. Therefore, the project should be co-designed with these important stakeholders.

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.

- This project proposes to support Component two of a larger project whereby funding from the LDCF will be used to render the watershed from which Conakry gets its water more resilient to changing precipitation regimes that might lead to greater erosion, sediment transport, and therefore dam sedimentation. This is

intended to contribute to the durability of the overall project, particularly Component 1, which is financed by IDA. While the project's theory of change, particularly with regard to Component 2, appears sound in the abstract, STAP notes that there are a number of questions that remain unanswered in the PIF that are central to determining if this component will deliver a durable adaptation benefit within the larger project. These questions are discussed below.

- The PIF contains a useful characterization of the climate future, and STAP appreciates that there is more than one climate future represented. However, the representation of the differences between these futures is not very clear and could be sharpened. The PIF also does a good job of explaining how particular observed and expected changes in the precipitation regime will translate into impacts on the dam and therefore the overall project via increased erosion, sediment transport, and siltation.
- STAP notes that the project is mainly concerned with agricultural practices in the watershed, particularly agriculture on slopes. Given the centrality of these practices to the challenges this project seeks to address, the PIF contains remarkably little discussion of farming techniques, rationales, or even the importance of agriculture in the watershed to local and national economies. At least implicitly, the proposed project will change, if not transform, some of these agricultural practices. This is not a simple technical question – agricultural practice engages issues ranging from land tenure (particularly who has the right to make modifications to land, such as the terracing proposed in the project) to farmers' very identities, which are often deeply intertwined with the crops they cultivate and how they cultivate them.
- There is no discussion of why farmers in the watershed would take on these new practices in a durable way (i.e. beyond the project cycle). For example, will these practices help farmers increase yields or cultivate desirable crops? In short, this aspect of the proposed Component 2 reads like a technical agricultural/land management intervention with little, if any, consideration for the land managers. The only real reference to these farmers is one that treats them as upstream users to be consulted in project design. While it is clear that the project intends to conduct consultations with these populations at later stages of the project, the viability of changing overall runoff and erosion patterns via NbS in this project hinges on understanding these farmers. Developing even a preliminary proposal with so little information on agrarian livelihoods and practices, and very little consultation with the relevant populations, creates a significant risk for project design that overlooks the factors that shape the practices central to project success.
- STAP also notes that the PIF does not provide integrated future narratives, at least within this component, that are also critical for identifying appropriate nature-based solutions for expected erosion and runoff. For example, the PIF does not provide a sense of the current and expected contribution of agriculture to livelihoods in the watershed. With information provided in the PIF, it is not possible to assess if current agricultural practices will be exacerbated by a growing agrarian population or if there will be fewer farmers as the national economy transitions away from primary production. Further, there is no discussion of current or expected future crop selection. Are current crops expected to be continued for the next several decades, or will there be transitions, for example, to high-value export tree crops (cocoa, oil palm) that might change patterns of runoff and erosion?

*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**

Based on the issues identified above, STAP recommends the following specific points to be addressed:

1. Develop two or more [simple future narratives](#) of the watershed to be addressed in Component 2: specifically, these narratives should integrate the existing information on climate change and runoff with

wider information about plausible futures for livelihoods and population in the watershed. These narratives will be important for assessing the viability and effectiveness of any NbS selected to address runoff issues. See STAP's document on [Simple Future Narratives](#) for further guidance.

2. Engage substantively during PPG stage with the agrarian livelihoods in the watershed to better understand the activities undertaken, who undertakes them, and why. The project suggests that there will be a degree of behavioral change needed for the project to work, but does not clearly identify which behaviors have to change, nor whose behaviors have to change. See STAP document on [why behavioral change matters to the GEF and what to do about it](#) for additional guidance. Further, the PIF shows little understanding of the foundations of existing livelihoods techniques, though these have often been developed through trial and error to suit the context – both the environmental and social context. Obtaining answers to these questions is central to the likely success of any interventions involving new practices or techniques.

*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.)