

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10939
Project Title	Upscaling Ecosystem-based Adaptation for Madagascar's Coastal Zones
Date of Screening	6 June 2022
STAP member screener	Ed Carr
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Minor.</p> <p>STAP acknowledges the project “Upscaling Ecosystem-based Adaptation for Madagascar’s Coastal Zones.” STAP suggests that the project consider clearly differentiating the climate futures that would emerge under the different RCP scenarios and how those futures, if sufficiently differentiated, would impact the performance of planned interventions. This should aid the project in selecting interventions likely to yield robust results across a range of plausible futures. STAP’s decision tree tool for adaptation rationale can be a good resource for guiding this process as well as STAP’s multiple plausible futures brief.</p> <p>STAP appreciates the systems view of climate change impacts present in the problem statement, and suggests the project consider extending this to the non-climate drivers of vulnerability in the context. Some of these non-climate drivers are often interrelated (i.e. population growth and the expansion of swidden farming) and should be considered in connection with one another in the context of a changing climate to gauge the likely future challenges they will create.</p> <p>STAP strongly suggests the project undertake a comprehensive stakeholder engagement process that focuses on the ultimate beneficiaries of the project. The project currently rests on some assumptions about these beneficiaries that are not substantiated by any engagement to this point or any reference to project or other literature. For example, the PIF assumes that the limited uptake of interventions has to do</p>

	<p>with limited information and knowledge, when a growing literature demonstrates that limited uptake is often a product of a disconnect between immediate needs and long-term adaptation benefits. The project should work to validate its assumptions about the beneficiary populations, carefully stratifying the population by identities relevant to who conducts different livelihoods activities and why (which will include gender, but might also include age, etc.) as it engages them to ensure it captures a wide range of vulnerabilities and opportunities that it can address with its interventions.</p> <p>Finally, STAP recommends the project more clearly and concretely define what “climate-proofing” an intervention means in this context. Madagascar is likely to deal with a tropical cyclone and other disruptions during implementation, so this is not a hypothetical concern but a practical need for the project.</p>	
Part I: Project Information B. Indicative Project Description Summary	What STAP looks for	Response
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project’s objectives?	Yes.
Outcomes	<p>A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.</p> <p>Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?</p>	Yes.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes – assuming the project conducts a significant stakeholder engagement process in the PPG stage.
Outputs	<p>A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project.</p> <p>Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?</p>	Yes.

Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
1. Project description. Briefly describe: 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?	<p>Yes. STAP appreciates how the PIF clearly identifies non-climate drivers of vulnerability, and then discusses how climate change exacerbates these challenges – this is in line with current thinking in the adaptation community. STAP notes that some of the non-climate drivers discussed in the PIF are deeply interrelated: for example, the expansion of slash-and-burn agriculture is generally closely tied to pressure on the land driven by a rising population and/or land degradation. Thus, these drivers cannot be treated independently in the context of a changing climate. STAP encourages the project to take a systems view of the challenges it is trying to address (much as it takes a systems view of deforestation and coastal flooding and erosion) to ensure that it identifies the connections not just between climate and drivers of vulnerability, but between the drivers of vulnerability themselves.</p> <p>STAP notes that while the PIF mentions two RCP scenarios in the section on climate, the different outcomes under these scenarios are grouped under a single trend for precipitation, sea level rise, heat waves, and intense rainfall events. While the PIF notes that sea level rise will vary depending on the coastal region in question, it never elaborates how these climate trends would diverge and what that might mean for adaptation challenges and project interventions under these different scenarios.</p>
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	They are well-described, but there is little substantiation in the PIF. This raises at least one important question: The PIF asserts that communities need evidence for the interactions between climate and their ecosystems to allow them to make evidence-based decisions

		regarding adaptation. In many parts of the world, the lack of uptake of adaptation interventions and thinking is not due to a lack of evidence, but a fundamental incompatibility of the proposed interventions (which will yield benefits over time) and immediate needs. STAP suggests the project carefully work through its assumptions about needs and outcomes through community engagement during the PPG stage.
	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?	Yes, in a narrative sense. However, there is little measurable in the baseline that might allow us to measure project impact.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Partially. There are indicators to capture the expected number of hectares of mangroves restored, degraded/deforested land rehabilitated, number of entrepreneurs trained, and number of climate resilient ecosystem based cooperative businesses established. However, most of the baseline discussion is narrative in character and not easily measured.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	The narrative framing appears robust.
	For multiple focal area projects:	
	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	n/a
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	n/a
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected	What is the theory of change?	STAP appreciates the inclusion of a theory of change diagram and summary narrative. The theory of change can be summarized as "by

outcomes and components of the project		addressing several key intervention pathways supporting the resilience of marine ecosystems and related livelihoods and building awareness and community engagement for longer-term behavioral change, the four selected regions will have in place an institutionally and financially sustainable comprehensive approach to strengthening the climate resilience in coastal areas.”
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	See below
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project’s objectives?	<p>Component 1: Climate- resilient governance and planning in coastal zones of Madagascar</p> <p>Output 1.1.1: LDC: Six (6) technical assistance and training sessions a year organized to support the National ICZM Committee, each of the four Regional ICZM Committees, and BNCC-REDD+ on mainstreaming EbA, and on developing partnerships and financial sustainability plans, for better coordination of adaptation action in coastal areas</p> <p>Output 1.1.2: Regulation developed to strengthen National and Regional ICZM Committees’ legitimacy, mandate and sustainable financing</p> <p>Output 1.1.3: Twenty (20) Municipal Planning Schemes (SACs) that integrate EbA approaches developed or updated through a cross-sectoral and participatory process</p> <p>Outcome 1.1: Strengthened institutional capacity and policy and legislative framework for EbA in coastal zones</p>

		<p>Component 2: Ecosystem-based adaptation in response to climate risks</p> <p>Output 2.1.1: Twenty (20) communal development plans (PCDs) that guide the implementation of EbA priorities and the sustainable management of natural resources developed or updated through a cross-sectoral and participatory process</p> <p>Output 2.1.2: Five (5) new locally managed marine areas established for increased climate resilience of marine ecosystems and related livelihoods</p> <p>Output 2.1.3: Five (5) fisheries management plans developed for marine fisheries, including provisions for sustainable catches and shing practices to increase ecosystem and livelihood resilience to climate change</p> <p>Outcome 2.1: Enhanced community capacity and planning framework to plan and implement EbA approaches and locally manage natural resources to increase climate resilience</p> <p>Output 2.2.1: 3,000 ha of mangroves and coastal forests restored for adaptation benefits through community-based approaches</p> <p>Output 2.2.2: 2,000 ha of degraded/deforested land rehabilitated upstream of degraded wetlands and small lakes through community-based approaches to increase climate resilience of ecosystems and communities</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Outcome 2.2: Enhanced environmental protection and rehabilitation by local authorities and communities for adaptation benefits</p> <p>Component 3: Green Economy Approach for Resilient Ecosystem- based Livelihoods in Coastal Areas</p> <p>Output 3.1.1: 100 climate-resilient ecosystem-based cooperative businesses established, with a focus on women and youth, and sustainable business plans developed</p> <p>Output 3.1.2: A sustainable financing and investment platform for ecosystem-based businesses established and operationalized</p> <p>Output 3.1.3: Training/technical support and/or equipment provided to 3,000 entrepreneurs, including women and youth, to build capacity of ecosystem- based businesses</p> <p>Outcome 3.1: Increased diversification of income-generating activities and businesses to enhance communities' climate resilience</p> <p>Component 4: Awareness, monitoring and evaluation, and knowledge management for upscaling</p> <p>Output 4.1.1: A project communication strategy developed and implemented, including awareness raising strategy on climate change and EbA aimed at local stakeholders</p> <p>Output 4.1.2: A participatory M&E and learning framework developed and implemented</p>
--	--	--

		Output 4.1.3: A coastal EbA upscaling strategy and knowledge sharing mechanism developed Outcome 4.1: Strengthened awareness and knowledge of EbA approaches to support upscaling of project results across Madagascar's coastal zones
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Yes, if the project assumptions hold true. Most assumptions are somewhat implicit in the PIF. One assumption of concern is noted under barriers and threats above.
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	There is a recognition there may need to be adaptations, but what these are is not elaborated.
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?	n/a
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	If the assumptions of the project hold, the project will produce such benefits
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?	Yes.
	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 – they are clearly defined
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	The clearest indicator is the number of beneficiaries. Other benefits are not quantified or clearly stated.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	These are vaguely lumped under "climate-proofing" with no further detail.

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?	The PIF claims the project is innovative in the context of Madagascar. The activities proposed in the project, such as transferring natural resource management to coastal communities and supporting green businesses, have been introduced elsewhere.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	The project has scaling-up as a product, under output 4.1.3. The project also plans to mainstream EbA into local planning strategies. There is some discussion of the mechanisms for disseminating lessons learned and findings, such as awareness raising events.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	The project seems focused on implementing incremental adaptation interventions that preserve and support the existing livelihoods of most beneficiaries, while creating some new opportunities for those who are entrepreneurs. It is possible the project could catalyze transformational change, but this is uncertain.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		There are several useful maps showing the implementation areas, biophysical context, etc.
2. Stakeholders. Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities. If none of the above, please explain why. In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	The PIF describes an extensive effort to reach stakeholders up to this point. The relevant stakeholders appear to have been identified, though the beneficiaries of the project (at the most local level) seem to have been less engaged by this effort – except through representatives of associations to which they might belong. It appears the project plans more engagement with this group in the PPG stage. This engagement should take into account the diversity within beneficiary communities, recognizing that needs and benefits will be different depending on social categories such as

<p>peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.</p>		<p>gender, age, etc., to ensure that the widest possible understanding of who will benefit and to what extent informs the project.</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>The PIF has a short paragraph on stakeholder roles that is not as comprehensive as the list of stakeholders engaged. The PIF states that the project will develop a stakeholder engagement plan during the PPG stage of the project. Normally, this would be quite late in the project's preparation, but to this point the project has been engaging a wide range of stakeholders. Again, the project should take care to engage beneficiary communities as early and comprehensively as possible.</p>
<p>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. 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.</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>The PIF identifies differentiated risks but does so in a general manner. For example, the PIF states that value addition of fish and storage closer to harvesting sites would allow women more time and supplement incomes – has this been substantiated by the women who would be impacted? During the gender analysis proposed for the PPG stage, the project should develop a more detailed understanding of the structures that produce gendered differences in the project areas, how these relate to the different activities men and women engage in, and how other aspects of identity, such as age, ethnicity, or livelihood, intersect with gender to produce specific vulnerabilities and opportunities. For example, approach b to 'increase economic capacity' is vague. Finally, the project would benefit from the identification of opportunities where women are already positioned to succeed with investment and support. There is no discussion of such opportunity in the PIF.</p>

<p>Will the project’s results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /td</p>		
	<p>Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?</p>	<p>Yes, but these considerations are described very generally and will largely be identified and addressed through the gender analysis in the PPG stage.</p>
<p>5. Risks. 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>	<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? For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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? • Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed? • Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with? • What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures? 	<p>The risks are valid and comprehensive. STAP suggests that the project is likely underestimating the likelihood of risk #4, the limited acceptance and/or adoption of adaptation interventions by local communities. This is a very common problem in adaptation projects and the limited engagement of the project with the beneficiaries of its efforts thus far means there is little evidence in this PIF for what those communities do and do not want and why. While the PIF lists several mitigation methods for this risk, STAP notes that the active engagement of girls and women in the project, while laudable, can itself become a reason for the limited acceptance and uptake of an intervention, as such projects can threaten existing social orders. The project will need to develop measures of uptake and acceptance and monitor them very carefully to detect and adapt to these issues when they arise.</p> <p>The PIF does mention climate shocks as a risk, but speaks generally of climate-proofing interventions without explaining how this will happen. There is no discussion of impacts on the project and its outcomes to 2050. It is unclear what capacity will be needed to address these risks.</p>

6. Coordination. 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?	Yes.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Yes
	How have these lessons informed the project’s formulation?	There is a discussion on pages 64-66 of the PIF, as well as in other places earlier. From the projects listed in this PIF, it is clear that there have been <i>many</i> GEF-funded projects that relate this one –with much overlap (e.g. institution strengthening), not to mention other donor-funded projects. Given this, it will be critical to do a thorough analysis of the outcomes and lessons learned from earlier projects and to coordinate with those which are currently underway to optimize outcomes for this project.
	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?	Yes
8. Knowledge management. Outline the “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.	What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?	Not clear – a KM plan is to be developed in the PPG phase.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	There are general statements about this in the PIF, but this will be elaborated in the PPG phase.

Notes

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
1. Concur	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 <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>
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	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>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</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>