

### STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

<b>Part I: Project Information</b>	<b>Response</b>	
<b>GEF ID</b>	10778	
<b>Project Title</b>	Gulf of Fonseca Transboundary Management	
<b>Date of Screening</b>	May 20 2021	
<b>STAP member screener</b>	Blake Ratner	
<b>STAP secretariat screener</b>	Virginia Gorsevski	
<b>STAP Overall Assessment and Rating</b>	<p><b>Minor.</b></p> <p>Project proposes to develop at TDA/SAP for the Gulf of Fonseca at a finer scale than the existing TDA/SAP that was developed beginning in 2006. Specification of outcomes is problematic. This is likely an artifact of misalignment between the PID requirements to articulate “PDO-level results” vs. the PIF requirement to distinguish outcomes.</p> <p>Less clear is how specified outcomes will result in improved and durable transboundary management of the Gulf of Fonseca, given that a TDA-SAP was previously developed for the region. What are the lessons learned? How will this be different or build on the prior TDA-SAP?</p> <p>Given the deep issues of poverty and inequality, it seems unlikely that education and awareness will do much to move the needle alone; what are the key incentives for behavioral change? How will policy improvements reinforce these?</p> <p>No clear articulation of innovation. Pilot projects are included but there is no development of a strategy for scaling up to a level that can meaningfully tackle the many challenges described. Much depends upon the quality of the TDA-SAP process pursued.</p>	
<b>Part I: Project Information</b>	<b>What STAP looks for</b>	<b>Response</b>

<b>B. Indicative Project Description Summary</b>		
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes. Objective is “To improve the capacity of the Project Countries to manage the transboundary natural resources of the Gulf of Fonseca, including for climate change adaptation.”
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project’s objectives?	Yes – essentially development of a finer scale TDA/SAP as well as pilot projects and education and awareness raising.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.  Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	Preparation of “key strategic documents” should not be listed as an outcome. Their endorsement, also listed, can be considered an outcome, though still early-stage. This is likely an artifact of misalignment between the PID requirements to articulate “PDO-level results” vs. the PIF requirement to distinguish outcomes. Other outcomes in the “enabling framework,” including national and regional institutional mechanisms, and a trilateral monitoring system, are suitable if they entail shifts in stakeholder behavior.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Possible from the pilot projects and TDA-SAP could lead to results in the longer run, if implemented.
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?	TDA-SAP + National and regional mechanisms + Trilateral monitoring system + improved public understanding and adherence to the principles of sustainable management of the Gulf of Fonseca.  Yes these outputs should lead to the listed outcomes. Less clear is how these will result in improved transboundary management of the Gulf of Fonseca, given that a TDA-SAP was previously developed for the region. What are the lessons learned? How will this be different or build on the

		prior TDA-SAP?  Given the deep issues of poverty and inequality, it seems unlikely that education and awareness will do much to move the needle alone; what are the key incentives for behavioral change? How will policy improvements reinforce these?
<b>Part II: Project justification</b>	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	Yes – though in separate Project Information Document, not in PIF. Part II, section 1a is missing from the PIF.
<b>1. Project description.</b> <b>Briefly describe:</b> 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. The underlying problem is poverty. The threats to the environment (and people) include: declining fish stocks due to overfishing, decreasing coverage of healthy mangrove forests, increasing pollution from inland sources and aquaculture, increasing sedimentation resulting from upstream deforestation – all aggravated by climate change.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes. In addition to the problems listed above, solving them is hampered by the scarcity of relevant data, the weakness of local governance and the transboundary nature of many environmental issues.
	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?	N/A
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Baseline projects, including existing TDA/SAP, are identified.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Adequate, regarding institutional context.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Yes.
	For multiple focal area projects:	N/A
	are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators;	N/A

	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	No. This is a major oversight by the project. What are the outcomes from the previous TDA-SAP? How will this be different?
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	See above.
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	TOC is presented in separate Annex and is a graphic depiction of the outcomes, outputs and activities. It does not include underlying assumptions of different causal pathways or a separate TOC for scaling – all of which would be very helpful.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Assumptions not included in the TOC. This is where lessons from the previous TDA-SAP could be particularly helpful, so that there is explicit attention to learning from past successes and failures.
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	Not explicit, though identification of ESS risks indicate areas that will require attention and possible adaptation of approach.
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?	Possibly, through the pilot project and in the longer term once the SAP is agreed and actions taken.
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	N/A
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?	
	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, though only in relation to standard IW core indicators.
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	No.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Yes, this is a focus.
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?	No. The TDA/SAP approach is not new or innovative. There is potential for learning about the opportunities and approaches to behavioral change, and to managing transboundary resources under shifting political economy contexts, but these aspects are not highlighted.  This is difficult to assess when the PIF is incomplete, with no responses to these required sections.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	This is difficult to assess when the PIF is incomplete, with no responses to these required sections.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Clearly past efforts have not reversed the ecological trends, so a more transformational change agenda is needed.
<b>1b. Project Map and Coordinates.</b> Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Provided.
<b>2. Stakeholders.</b> Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities.	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Provisional, given COVID constraints. The potential stakeholders will be identified as civil society, local communities, and their representative organizations and networks in the Gulf region. According to the ESS Supporting document, a Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) will be prepared.

<p>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>Initial indications of potential roles are provided. Good, early focus on CSOs and fishers associations, as well as private aquaculture producers.</p>
<p><b>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.</b> 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; participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services. Will the project's results framework or logical</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Very preliminary, but good reference to OECD comparative data on discrimination towards and vulnerability of women and girls in the region.</p>

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?	Yes. Plans to be developed. This would be another important opportunity for explicit harvesting of lessons from other initiatives in the three countries, including beyond the target sectors.
<b>5. Risks.</b> 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	<p>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?</p> <p>For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?</li> <li>• Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?</li> <li>• What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?</li> </ul>	<p>The risks are identified in a separate Environmental and Social Safeguards document.</p> <p>Climate change is mentioned throughout the project and adaptation is highlighted. Climate risks to the project objectives are not adequately detailed.</p>
<b>6. Coordination.</b> 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?	Prior and ongoing activities noted. However, it is unclear how this project will follow on to the previous TDA-SAP for the Gulf of Fonseca.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	No
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	No
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	See above
	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?	
<b>8. Knowledge management.</b> Outline the	What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?	Sub component 2.3 on Communication and awareness raising discusses the development of

<p>“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.</p>		<p>“knowledge sharing publications and events” including via IW:LEARN and through conferences.</p> <p>Good emphasis on data collection and sharing; needs to be complemented by building capacity within the region to gather and use these data and any associated software long after the project is over to take ownership and to be able to monitor change in the future.</p>
	<p>What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?</p>	<p>The scaling-up of project activities will be facilitated through coordination with investments planned by CABI and other development partners, which may be further augmented through a potential follow-up investment by the World Bank. A TOC for scaling would be helpful.</p>

Notes

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
1. <b>Concur</b>	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.
	* 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 <b><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></b>
2. <b>Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	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:
	(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, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.
	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><b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b></p>	<p>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:</p>
	<p>(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.</p>