REVISED STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE, OCTOBER 2022

GEF ID	11208
Project title	Strengthening inter-institutional coordination for the mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation in national, regional, and local public policies in Chile.
Date of screen	8 June 2023
STAP Panel Member	John Donaldson
STAP Secretariat	Alessandro Moscuzza

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

This is a sound project with a clear logic to overcome three barriers associated predominantly with poor institutional coordination for the mainstreaming of biodiversity in Chile. The PIF presents a coherent set of activities organized into three components and these are well described. The combination of high level institutional coordination with a series of on-the-ground projects in selected landscapes offers a good chance for effective mainstreaming and durable outcomes in a country with high levels of both terrestrial and aquatic biodiversity.

STAP's screening of the PIF has identified a few areas that could be further improved.

The information on stakeholder engagement and innovation is adequate for this stage of the project although both areas will need further development in the PPG stage. In the case of stakeholders, the full project proposal will need to ensure that there is strong commitment and buy in from all relevant institutions and sectors.

For innovation, the proposal mentions an intention for various types of innovation and these will need to be more explicitly defined and supported by project design elements to ensure proper testing, identification of pathways to scaling, and rapid learning.

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
   o Minor - STAP has identified some scientific and technical points to be addressed in project design
   o 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 proposal presents a sound **rationale** based on overcoming three interlinked **barriers** to the mainstreaming of biodiversity across sectors and institutions in Chile. The proposal outlines the **problems** in sufficient detail and provides evidence of the challenges associated with the *status quo* as well as the intended gains from implementing the project. The importance of Chile as a biodiversity-rich country, together with the projected gains from more effective mainstreaming, are likely to generate important global environmental benefits.

The **theory of change (ToC)** provides a reasonably explicit account of how the proposed interventions will achieve their intended outcomes. In terms of content, the theory of change provides a sound logic for the project components and the objectives are well formulated with realistic outputs and outcomes. This is particularly true for component 3 where the focus on a few pilot landscapes provides an achievable way to test mechanisms for harmonized approaches.

The three **components** are described in reasonable detail and adequately represent the issues that need to be addressed. Similarly, the information on **stakeholder engagement** is adequate for this stage of project development. Key groups of stakeholders have been identified and preliminary engagements have already taken place with different ministries at both local and national level as well as NGOs and indigenous communities. The business sector seems to be relatively under-represented in the current suite of stakeholders although the PIF does recognize the need for further engagement

There is a reasonable explanation of the existing **baseline** and how the project builds on other projects in the region, including a current GEF project also implemented through FAO. The proposal also identifies opportunities for collaboration and linkages with other projects operating at the municipal scale.

The project intends to explore **innovative approaches**, notably for coordination of multiple actors from different sectors and institutions, fostering coherence in the use and allocation of resources, and financial instruments but these are not presented in any detail.

.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. The narrative description of the components is quite dense and difficult to unpack and would benefit from further structure to make it easier to link the components and interventions to specific barriers.
2. The diagram for the theory of change (Fig. 1) would be more informative if it included the three components, in addition to the subcomponents, and if it included assumptions under each of the components.
3. Specific areas of innovation need to be more clearly defined and to ensure that the project is designed to ensure proper testing of innovative ideas and for rapid learning. None of these are currently dealt with in any detail so it is not possible to determine the extent of innovation nor how the level of ambition for innovation will be achieved.
4. During the PPG phase, it will be essential to ensure that all stakeholders are engaged and committed to the overall achievement of environmental objectives.
5. Pilot interventions under component 3 should be treated in the same way as innovative approaches and should be designed for effective testing and rapid learning.

Note: number key points A 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.)