

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10180
Project Title	Planning and implementing Ecosystem based Adaptation (EbA) in Djibouti's Dikhil and Tadjourah regions
Date of Screening	8 May 2020
STAP member screener	Edward R. Carr
STAP secretariat screener	Guadalupe Duron
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Minor issues to be considered during project design</p> <p>STAP welcomes UNEP's project "Planning and implementing Ecosystem based Adaptation (EbA) in Djibouti's Dikhil and Tadjourah regions". The project seeks to address the challenges of flooding and draught, which manifest in different parts of Djibouti, and which are linked to the changing climate. Broadly speaking, the project adopts a framework to guide action, but broad enough to allow for tailoring to address these disparate impacts. This process includes: the development of a regional climate risk and vulnerability assessment; participatory planning exercises to inform adaptation interventions; and, interventions to support alternative livelihoods activities. In this way, the project expects to find locally-appropriate ways to both reduce environmental pressures and drivers of migration from the project area, while allowing for lessons from each project to be captured and communicated across communities and levels of government in a manner that builds future capacity for adaptation planning.</p> <p>While the project has an implicit theory of change that appears sound and well-supported, STAP recommends the project elaborate this theory of change transparently, as this will facilitate the monitoring and evaluation of the assumed links between well-documented stressors, proposed interventions, and the expected outputs and outcomes. This will allow the project to be implemented in an adaptive manner, adjusting activities and interventions</p>

	<p>in response to actual outcomes in a manner that maximizes benefits.</p> <p>STAP also suggests the project consider alternative framings of the adaptation scenario where either the relative importance of pressures might change (that is, where socio-economic pressures become more important than climate pressures) or where environmental pressures play out more or less significantly than projected in the single adaptation scenario. This exercise will allow the project to test the assumptions in the theory of change, and address how the project might shift emphasis or interventions to address those new scenarios.</p> <p>STAP also suggests that the project clearly articulate the connection between indicators and project goals, and where necessary identify other indicators that more clearly capture progress toward those goals (see discussion below).</p> <p>Finally, STAP suggests the project conduct some initial analysis of the social cleavages that might limit participation in the vulnerability assessment and participatory planning phases of the project, to ensure the widest possible range of voices is heard and the project addresses the needs of as broad a segment of the population as possible. The mention of a gender gap analysis is welcome, but even this work presumes knowledge of factors that limit or facilitate participation in these processes.</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?	The project begins with a regional climate risk and vulnerability assessment, which informs a participatory adaptation planning exercise resulting in adaptation interventions. The interventions will

		then be implemented, and learning from this experience will be used to build capacity and awareness both within the project communities and at all levels of government. These activities support the project's objectives
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	Short term, the project expects to make communities more resilient to drought (Dikhil Region) and flooding (Tadjourah area), while also identifying and implementing practices and livelihoods activities that mitigate the causes of these stressors. Long-term, the learning and communication activities are expected to build local and government capacity for adaptation planning and for the maintenance of interventions to sustain their impact.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes, the benefits are likely to be generated, and the sum of the outputs will contribute to the outcomes.
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?	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?	The problem statement is very well-defined and documented
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes, they are.
	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?	Does not apply

2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Yes, it is
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Yes, it does
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Yes
	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;	Does not apply
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	Does not apply
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	Does not apply
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	The theory of change is not articulated as such in the PIF, but it appears to be that by supporting processes to restore degraded environments, and promoting livelihoods and appropriate planning to address the baseline causes of ecosystem degradation, the project will enhance the resilience of communities to droughts and floods in rural areas. STAP recommends the project elaborate a clear theory of change that transparently links the well-documented stressors in the problem statement to the proposed interventions and the expected outputs and outcomes so that these assumptions might be monitored and evaluated during project implementation, and project activities adaptively managed to maximize benefits.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	The project will start with the development of a regional climate risk and vulnerability assessment, then use this to inform a participatory adaptation planning exercise informing the selection of appropriate adaptation interventions. The interventions will then be implemented. These interventions are expected to boost crop and fodder

		yields, and when coupled with interventions to boost alternative non-degrading livelihoods activities the project expects to both reduce environmental pressures and drivers of migration from the project area. In parallel to these activities in the project areas, the project will also work to increase the awareness, knowledge and capacity of local authorities and communities through trainings, exchange of experience events, campaigns as well as the production of evidence-based knowledge on climate change impacts and best-practice adaptation options.
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	See above.
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	The assumptions are plausible, but the identification of underlying assumptions would benefit from a clearer theory of change.
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	The project does not consider alternative framings of the baseline scenario where pressures might increase or decrease, or where the relative importance of pressures might change. STAP suggests the project consider plausible scenarios where such changes might impact the assumptions in the theory of change, and address how the project might shift emphasis or interventions to address those new scenarios.
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?	Does not apply
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	There is a good likelihood these activities will achieve these goals
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?	The project puts forth adaptation benefits

	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	The scale of projected benefits is plausible, and it is compelling given the size of the LDCF request
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	The adaptation benefits are explicitly defined
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	The indicators to capture adaptation benefits are quite general and may not capture the benefits of the project. For example, area under climate-resilient management is an interesting indicator, but it is not clear how this area relates to the reduction in vulnerability to drought or flood that is the goal of the project. STAP suggests that the project more clearly articulate how this indicator relates to reduced flood or drought vulnerability, or establish intermediate indicators linking land under climate-resilient management to these desired outcomes.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	The project is aimed at a range of activities that would likely be resilient to climate change. However, it does not consider multiple climate scenarios in its scenarios, and therefore cannot evaluate that resilience to potential changes. Such consideration allows for the selection and/or prioritization of indicators for the monitoring of project outputs and outcomes and the facilitation of effective adaptive management. STAP recommends considering a range of climate scenarios and not just the most likely, and the ways in which proposed interventions might gain or lose efficacy under those scenarios.
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 project is innovative in that it is using a similar broad approach to address two different climate change stresses (drought and flooding) that appear in two different places in the country, and then using the lessons across these disparate places/stresses to build capacity and facilitate learning for adaptation.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Yes. STAP is particularly pleased to see a clearly-articulated effort to bring academic researchers and students into efforts around capacity building, learning, and awareness-raising.

	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	The proposal includes activities that encompass both incremental adaptation and some transformation, though transformations appear to be focused at the level of livelihoods activities and land/resource management practices.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		There is a map with geo-referenced data on the locations of the two project sites. It is not very detailed and a bit hard to read. STAP’s guidance on earth observation can be used to strengthen the project’s geo-referenced information (see page 64): https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/GEF%20EO%20Mainstreaming%20March2020%20Final%2020200331-v3.0.pdf
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 peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	The PIF identifies relevant government stakeholders, but generally does not discuss local stakeholders beyond reference to “communities.” These communities are diverse, as the reference to women’s cooperatives and small businesses in Gobaad suggests, but this diversity is not captured in the PIF. While the project will include participatory planning processes that should bring forth a diversity of stakeholders, STAP suggests that the project consider how those diverse stakeholders will be identified and empowered to participate, particularly women.
	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?	The stakeholders are to work together on a participatory planning process that results in a regional land use/adaptation plan, city adaptation plans that regulate settlement and wadi management, and the identification and implementation of new livelihoods practices or activities where needed.

<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.</p> <p>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>Will the project’s results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no/tbd</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>There are some references to gendered needs, activities, and opportunities in the PIF, but they are not clearly tied to gendered risks. The PIF states that a gender gap analysis will take place at the project preparation grant stage. While the PIF strongly suggests that gender-differentiated risks and opportunities will be identified and addressed through the participatory planning and implementation phases of the project, the fact that very little is said about gender in the narrative description of activities and project phases suggests the need for a more serious weaving of gender considerations into project activities. STAP suggests that at the PPG phase the project consider how gendered risks and opportunities might compromise or enhance their efforts at each stage of the project, and include a discussion of how risks will be mitigated and opportunities leveraged in their theory of change.</p> <p>There is no statement of how the project might contribute to gender equality. It appears that improvements in gender equality are implicitly assumed to result from the activities proposed in the project, particularly those that will be targeted toward women.</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>It is not clear from the PIF if gender is a significant barrier to participation. However, it is a very common social cleavage creating such barriers, and STAP strongly suggests the project team identify existing gender-based barriers to participation in the proposed processes and activities, and suggest ways of addressing these obstacles.</p>
<p>5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and</p>	<p>Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project’s control?</p>	<p>The risks are valid and comprehensive. However, the project appears too dismissive of the risk that communities will not take up the interventions.</p>

<p>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 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>This is a common occurrence, even in projects with participatory components, and STAP suggests the project consider carefully how it will identify such situations rapidly, how it might learn about the sources of low adoption and uptake, and the opportunities that might exist to pivot the project to address those sources.</p> <p>The PIF elaborates on a range of environmental and social risks, and presents reasonable approaches to addressing those risks. The project lays out the climate risks for the country and the project sites clearly in the narrative, and suggests that the participatory planning process will be aimed at interventions that promote community resilience in a manner that is durable in the face of these trends. Such a process should assess the sensitivity of interventions to climate change and its impacts. The project is aimed at building up the technical and institutional capacity needed to address climate risk and design resilience enhancement measures.</p>
<p>6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives</p>	<p>Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?</p>	<p>Yes, they are</p>
	<p>Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
	<p>Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
	<p>How have these lessons informed the project’s formulation?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
	<p>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?</p>	<p>This is not clear in the PIF, but the PIF itself is clearly informed by the work of earlier projects.</p>
<p>8. Knowledge management. Outline the “Knowledge Management Approach” for the project, and how it will contribute to</p>	<p>What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?</p>	<p>The project suggests that three major categories of knowledge will be produced and need management: evidence from the vulnerability assessments; impacts and outputs related to the interventions implemented in the two project sites;</p>

<p>the project's overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.</p>		<p>and improved scientific knowledge about climate change impacts in wadi ecosystems and adaptation options, which will be generated by the research program. Indicators and metrics are not discussed, but the PIF notes that details of this work will be addressed in the PPG phase.</p>
	<p>What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?</p>	<p>Plans include awareness campaigns and an online platform that disseminate all three categories of knowledge above, as well as policy advice to decision-makers and communications to researchers within and beyond the country.</p>

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>