

## STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

<b>Part I: Project Information</b>	<b>Response</b>	
<b>GEF ID</b>	11014	
<b>Project Title</b>	Enduring Earth: Accelerating Sustainable Finance to Achieve Durable Conservation	
<b>Date of Screening</b>	2 June 2022	
<b>STAP member screener</b>	John Donaldson	
<b>STAP secretariat screener</b>	Alessandro Moscuza	
<b>STAP Overall Assessment and Rating</b>	<b>Concur.</b> This is a well written proposal with a clear logic relating to the scaling out of a sustainable financing model that has been successfully implemented in a number of other countries. It is exciting to see such a scaling out approach being implemented in Africa and the testing of this approach in an arid area where durable conservation is affected by different pressures and must respond to different opportunities. The inherent risks associated with the project finance for permanence (PFP) approach are acknowledged and the project has built in deliverables that can be achieved even if more ambitious funding goals cannot be achieved. STAP is particularly interested in the learning mechanisms and platforms for south-south knowledge exchange that are proposed to see how these will contribute to scaling out and uptake of the PFP approach.	
<b>Part I: Project Information</b> <b>B. Indicative Project Description Summary</b>	<b>What STAP looks for</b>	<b>Response</b>
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes, the objective is clear and is aligned with the problem diagnosis.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	The components and activities are clearly laid out and support the project objectives. STAP also appreciated the use of a clear and well organized and consistent structure of project elements, which included a well written set of outputs and outcomes.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	The project outcomes are well described and comprise support for significant expansion of protected areas with sustainable financing, they are

		also consistently coherent with the project outputs and fit in well within the project components.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes, if the project activities are implemented correctly and the project outputs are delivered as described in the proposal then the achievement of project outcomes is likely to deliver Global Environmental Benefits.
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?	The overall products and services are well defined and described. Furthermore, as already observed, they are also well structured and coherent with the content of the outcomes.
<b>Part II: Project justification</b>	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
<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 problem is set out in a clearly structured way with sufficient justification and analysis. The theory of change narrative was very clear and based on a robust set of assumptions and considerations. The logical flow between various project elements was also very linear and coherent. However, we could not find a theory of change diagram included in the proposal or its annexes. <b>STAP recommends</b> that this be added to the proposal during the next stage of project design.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes, the barriers and threats are clearly identified and there is good background information on the status of biodiversity and the barriers that currently affect the durability of protected areas in Gabon and Namibia
	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?	The baseline is sufficiently described to provide an understanding of the status quo. It also provides very clear quantitative indicators to describe the existing levels of protected areas and other resources.

	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Yes. STAP understands from the project documents that a fuller analysis of current funding and funding gaps form part of the initial phase of the PFP process. In terms of learning and scaling out, it will be important to be able to compare the contexts and receiving conditions and it is assumed that these are built into the learning system. The document notes that an analysis of enabling conditions has already been undertaken.
	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;	N/A
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	Yes, the project relies on lessons learned from previous PFP projects and the experience of people involved in these projects.
	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?	The theory of change is clearly laid out and describes the six primary assumptions on which the intended change depends. This is one of the few projects that so clearly identifies the key assumptions.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	The project components and activities are set out in a sequence that builds on lessons learnt from other projects
	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?	See 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?	An adaptive management approach is included in the project design.
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the	GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?	Yes, if successful the project will contribute to 30x30 targets for protected areas with a focus on

baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing		important components of biodiversity in the focal countries
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	
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, and the GEBs are clearly described in various parts of the proposal including in a table showing their incremental value. The proposal includes clear quantitative measures (using ha of land and other relevant indicators) to define GEBs.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	This is a substantial investment but, if implemented successfully, it will secure durable conservation outcomes across a large area in line with 30x30 objectives. STAP therefore concluded that the scale of the investment is justified and proportional to the scale of projected benefits.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Yes.
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Yes, the project includes an output (output 3.1.2), which is entirely dedicated to implementing M&E activities. This includes a clear description of the methods and processes that will be used. The proposal also includes a clear set of core indicators, key performance indicators and project performance indicators.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	
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 proposal self identifies as a scaling out process, but it does include several innovative elements by extending the PFP concept into new geographic areas and, more importantly, areas with different biodiversity, social and funding challenges. This will require ongoing innovation and learning.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Yes, see above

	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Both. There is an incremental element in that the PFP approach has been tested elsewhere but is also includes a more transformational element relating to the specific arrangements that emerge in each country.
<b>1b. Project Map and Coordinates.</b> Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		The project proposal includes a clear set of geo-referenced maps.
<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. 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 list of stakeholders seems to be comprehensive and appropriate for the scale and scope of this project
	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?	Stakeholder roles have been adequately identified
<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	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	Yes, the project has taken gender risks and opportunities into account. It also includes a specific gender-oriented indicator (indicator 11) which is intended to measure the number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment. The proposal also includes a

<p>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>well written gender analysis section and will build a gender action plan in the next phase of project development.</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>No.</p>
<p><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>	<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> </ul>	<p>A wide range of risks have been identified with proposed mitigation measures. Given some of the concerns expressed about 30x30 by indigenous peoples (generally, not this project) it is appropriate that the project has included possible risks associated with the rights of indigenous people and the need to respect the rights of indigenous people to generate benefits from their wildlife. The project PIF also includes a well-reasoned climate risk analysis section, which is supported by a good range of data and evidence. However, the current version is also quite succinct and is presented in a table as one of several risk categories. Given the nature and</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	thematic subject of this project <b>STAP recommends</b> that the project implementing agency consider conducting a more detailed risk screening and analysis during the next stage of project development (i.e. PPG phase).
<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?	Yes, as noted earlier the project relies extensively on learning from previous PFP projects.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	See above
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Yes.
	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?	This is dealt with under learning and knowledge management below
<b>8. Knowledge management.</b> 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?	There is a general acknowledgement of the need for learning from other PFPs and for the exchange of lessons learned. The proposal mentions the intention to facilitate learning and south-south knowledge exchange. STAP regards this as crucial for ongoing learning and scaling out and would like to see what mechanisms are developed to support this.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	The project design is specifically aimed at addressing scaling out and is based on experience of other PFP projects.

Notes

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
<p><b>1. Concur</b></p>	<p>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.</p>
	<p>* 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></p>
<p><b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b></p>	<p>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:</p>
	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;</p>
	<p>(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.</p>
	<p>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>

<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>