STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE

GEF ID	11303
Project title	Amplifying the impact of the "Challenge Programme for Adaptation Innovation" of the Global Environment Facility through learning and knowledge management
Date of screen	June 8, 2023
STAP Panel Member	Ed Carr
STAP Secretariat	Virginia Gorsevski

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

This project establishes a common platform for learning and knowledge management on adaptation innovation and financing. Specifically, it will 'gather, discuss, manage and disseminate the learnings and knowledge generated through the implementation of several GEF funded projects, such as the ones from the Challenge Programme for Adaptation Innovation, to accelerate private sector investment in climate adaptation innovation.' Similar to the IW:Learn platform, this project will develop a community of practice geared towards an area of interest to the GEF – that is, climate change adaptation - to overcome barriers to private sector engagement related to lack of information and metrics, among others. STAP notes that the evidence base for adaptation success and impact is limited, a concern expressed by Working Group II of the IPCC, and appreciates that this project might help to fill this knowledge gap. The impact of the project will be improved by clarifying how it is distinct from and might leverage other adaptation knowledge platforms, such as WeADAPT, to ensure the project does not duplicate existing efforts while maximizing the reach of lessons learned.

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*

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 rationale behind this project lies in the significant gap between current levels of finance for adaptation and current and expected needs as climate impacts increase. The PIF argues that bridging this financing gap requires attracting private sector finance for adaptation projects. To date, this source of funding has been limited due to three major reasons:

1) lack of localized climate risk and vulnerability data and information services

2) lack of effective institutional arrangements, policies and plans for adaptation

3) low perceived or actual returns on adaptation investments

Despite these challenges, the PIF notes that the high number of applications from the private sector in the LDCF-SCCF Challenge Grant may indicate growing interest in adaptation finance opportunities.

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**

STAP notes that this project is addressing challenges for private sector actors - the PIF identifies project beneficiaries as (i) the private sector (investors, entrepreneurs, microfinance institutions, financial institutions, IPLCs, CSOs etc. that are engaged and/or would like to be engaged in adaptation innovation and finance), (ii) donors; and (iii) recipient policy makers. The project makes a critical assumption, that if these challenges are addressed, adaptation investment will increase and adaptation benefits will result. However, given the significant questions in the literature, and reflected in IPCC AR6 WGII, about the efficacy and impact of prior and existing adaptation projects, increased funding does not guarantee adaptation benefits.

1. In the PPG stage, the project should clarify the pathways from its three objectives to the ultimate goal of delivering more adaptation benefits. STAP notes that the second objective to 'strengthen design and impact of LDCF and SCCF projects' appears to be a means to the end of delivering adaptation benefits. This is less clear with the other objectives.

2. STAP recommends that project proponents consider using the framework developed by STAP "[A Typology of Climate Change Adaptation Benefits: Exposure, Sensitivity, and Adaptive Capacity](#)" as a potential means of organizing the benefits to be delivered by new adaptation finance and tracking what sorts of benefits most attract private sector engagement. Using such a typology will facilitate later MEL efforts, particularly with regard to understanding what sorts of adaptation benefits are delivered by private sector engagement.

3. STAP recommends that project information be made spatially-explicit and easily searchable in an interactive map to coordinate place-based activities and allow users to visualize the location, type and number of projects.

4. STAP encourages project proponents to reach out to IW:Learn managers (this is noted under coordination and cooperation) and others to take advantage of lessons learned from their experience in this arena, and to consider how this platform will be connected with other GEF focal areas, relevant integrated programs, other CCA platforms, etc. to maximize knowledge sharing and learning.

5. STAP encouranges project proponents to consider opportunities to align with and leverage existing adaptation communities of practice, such as WeADAPT. While there is no substantial adaptation community of practice focused on finance, there are many that focus on identifying adaptation need and capturing good practice in project design, implementation, and MEL. Clarifying how this community of practice, and the associated outputs, might make unique contributions to other communities of practice while leveraging the lessons and content of those other communities increases the chances of durable impact.

6. Also related to durability, a major issue discussed during the recent [GEF-STAP KML convening](#) related to the durability of platforms once GEF project funding ends. Several IP leads stated that it is important to work with an organization or institution that is able to maintain and support the platform for the foreseeable future. Project proponents should explicitly address how will this project be sustained once GEF funding is

terminated. Several other issues were discussed in detail including accessibility (will information be translated, for example).

7. If the platform intends to provide information on best practices, STAP suggests that the WOCAT platform offers a good example from which to draw, including a database of best practices for sustainable land management.

8. STAP suggests the project clarify how the total expected core indicator results apply to this project, since the information in Table 1 is focused on past projects funded through the Challenge Program.

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.)