REVISED STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE, OCTOBER 2022

GEF ID	11532
Project title	Climate-resilient Banjul: Enhancing Urban Resilience in the Greater Banjul Area (CLIMB)
Date of screen	29 May 2024
STAP Panel Member	Ngonidzashe Chirinda
STAP Secretariat	Alessandro Moscuzza

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

This is a strong proposal, which provides an excellent overview of the problems the project is trying to address, as well as the background and context of the target geographical area and region within which it will operate. The information provided throughout the document was comprehensive and detailed, and was bolstered by an impressive amount of hard data, maps and figures, which provided additional context and perspective.

STAP identified a few minor aspects of the proposal, including the description of the outcomes and outputs, the theory of change (ToC) and the strategy to overcome the barriers that could be further improved and developed during the PPG phase. These are described in more detail in sections 2 and 3 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.

☐ **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 the annex on STAP's screening guidelines.

The **project summary** was clearly presented, well-written, highly informative and included all the required information.

The **project objective** was clear and concise and generally fitted well with the overall scope of the components, as well as the proposed outcomes, outputs, and project activities.

However, STAP identified a few aspects in the scope and structure of the **outcomes** and **outputs** that could be improved.
- **Under component 1**, the outcome should have a stronger focus on: a) developing adaptation strategies and plans to address different climate scenarios and increase preparedness in case of climate-related shocks that are specifically tailored to the context of the Greater Banjul Authority (GBA), and b) building the technical capacity of city planners and municipal agencies in charge of infrastructure planning, building and maintenance.
- **Under component 2**, the project was not specific about the alternative livelihoods (AL) options that are available in the local context of the GBA and can be implemented realistically and effectively within the project's lifetime.
- **Under component 3**, the proposal presents a good analysis of the need for and barriers to the diffusion of knowledge related to Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) and Ecosystem-based Approaches (EbAs).

However, it should be more specific about the type of knowledge products it can and should develop for different audiences, including women and Indigenous People, & Local Communities (IPLCs).

The proposal provides a very strong **project rationale**, making a sound case for the project. This comprises an impressive and well-presented array of data, information and analyses, covering a range of sectors such as socio-economic, institutional, political, ecosystems and natural resources, infrastructure and climate. Among these, the climate sub-section was particularly noteworthy as it provided a thorough analysis of the climate baseline, current climate trends, future climate scenarios, and impacts. The proposal included additional complementary sections on gender dynamics, the urban and infrastructure profile of the GBA, where the project is planning to operate, and the root causes of vulnerability, which were all highly relevant and added valuable context that strengthened the case for the project.

The **problem statement** comprised a short narrative section, which described the main issues affecting the GBA and the resulting challenges. This was complemented by a very detailed problem tree diagram, which illustrated more than fifty factors and how they are all interconnected to a range of primary and secondary impacts on the ground. The proposal identifies three main **barriers**, which are well described, and a clearly delineated strategy to overcome them. The description of the barriers is well aligned with the issues identified under the 'project rationale' and 'problem' sections, which it complements well by adding further granularity and detail. The strategy for overcoming the barrier is generally good. However, it could be improved in a couple of places, such as barriers 2.3 and 2.4, which were too generic and did not provide a clear idea of what the project would do, and barrier 3.2, which did not provide any details or options about the type of AL that could be developed and did not explain how developing AL options would foster knowledge exchange or raise awareness about climate change impacts.

The description of the **baseline** is comprehensive and provides clear and detailed information about 12 relevant projects. These comprise six ongoing projects, which this one will synergize with and build upon, and six concluded projects, whose best practices and lessons learned will be incorporated into this one.

The **project's Theory of Change (ToC)** comprised a brief narrative section and a ToC diagram. The narrative provided a general overview of what the project aims to achieve but could be strengthened by adding a clear "hypothesis statement" describing the logical pathway underpinning the ToC, from activities and inputs to impact. The diagram included all required elements and effectively illustrated the proposed logical pathway towards the project objective. The **assumptions** were logical and plausible, but the proposal could be strengthened by explaining how the project will aim to overcome all of them. It is good to see that there will also be a focus on innovative and context-relevant financial mechanisms; these will be key in ensuring continuity after project completion. Our screening also revealed a minor inconsistency between the text used to describe the second assumption in the narrative and that used in the diagram. It is STAP's opinion that the correct definition is that used in the diagram. The narrative description of the **components** was comprehensive and provided a good overview of the proposed interventions and underlying rationale by bringing together and clearly labelling the baseline, project approach, outcome and outputs for each component.

The proposal includes an excellent analysis of **key risks**, which identifies a good range of risks across ten comprehensive categories and describes the nature, potential impact and proposed mitigation measures for each risk category.

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 justification for the proposed solution should provide a more detailed explanation of why the proposed approach will ensure cost effectiveness, relevance, and impact. The proponent should also explain how the project will ensure the durability of results and impact beyond the lifetime of the funded activities.

2. Conduct a "livelihood analysis" to identify whether any preferred AL options fit the project's objectives, are feasible within its lifetime and resource availability, and can deliver desirable gender and development outcomes.
3. Provide a "hypothesis statement" describing the logical pathway underpinning the ToC.
4. Provide a stronger explanation of how the project will aim to overcome and mitigate any potential adverse effects that could occur if the assumptions are not realized.
5. Revise the descriptions of the second assumptions used in the narrative section of the proposal and the ToC diagram to ensure these match. STAP recommends that the description used in the diagram be adopted as the correct one.
6. Identify a range of knowledge products that can be developed by the project during its lifetime and disseminated effectively, ensuring that these include options that are accessible to disadvantaged social groups such as women and IPLCs.
7. As The Gambia has adopted the Gender and Women Empowerment Policy for 2010–2020, the envisaged urban resilience master plan should align with this policy. It is essential to reflect on concrete actions that can be made to empower women, considering the potential resistance to change.
8. The project proponents must also reflect on the capacity for change (i.e., whether organizations and other actors are developing the capacity to think about and deliver change). Please see STAP's paper on Transformation. Include references highlighting the data sources, maps, and other hard evidence used to draft the proposal.

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.

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.)