

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
<p>GEF ID: 10859 Project Title: Marshall Islands Building Energy Efficiency Date of Screening: November 14, 2021 STAP member screener: Saleem Ali STAP secretariat screener: Sunday Leonard STAP’s overall assessment: Minor to be considered during project design</p>	<p>This IUCN project has approached decarbonization in a SIDS country, focusing on building energy efficiency, considering the high air conditioning usage in the Micronesian region. The project considers the energy flows analysis that has been undertaken by the government and presented in Sankey diagrams for the two towns where the project will be implemented. A series of NBS measures such as shading through trees and green roofs are noted alongside education and policy interventions.</p> <p>Major changes in energy infrastructure are not envisaged in this project. It may be worthwhile to see what efficiency may be obtained by incorporating battery infrastructure in areas to prevent the use of diesel generators during power loss as an additional measure of efficiency, especially since a significant portion of the PIF was dedicated to power production and supply in the Island.</p> <p>It is strange to note from the PIF that there are still projects investing in diesel generators on the Island. Maybe the policy aspects of this project can help address this. It is essential that countries are guided not to invest in technologies that will lock in CO2 emissions for the next decades.</p> <p>The theory of change diagram is too simplistic and does not follow the guidelines suggested by STAP. There needs to be a revision that notes outputs, outcomes, impacts, and a higher level of details in the steps. The revised theory of change should also present the underlying assumptions on which the pathway to the expected outcomes and impacts depends. See STAP guidance on developing theory of change at: https://stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer.</p> <p>Although the theory of change indicates that finance products for the private sector will be developed, the current PIF is vague on how continued finance for energy efficiency measures beyond the funds available through this project will be maintained. Component 1 states that finance issues would be addressed by mandating the use of energy-efficient appliances and a need to finance them. But mandates alone are not sufficient to achieve the change that will promote continuity and scale-up. We encourage the project proponents to review appropriate options, including business models and behavioral interventions that can help promote building energy efficiency. We encourage the proponent to review some of these publications related to this topic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cleary and Palmer, 2019. Energy-as-a-Service: A Business Model for Expanding Deployment of Low-Carbon Technologies. https://media.rff.org/documents/IB_19-09_EaaS.pdf • Wit et al. 2021. Innovation in Start-Up Business Model in Energy-Saving Solutions for Sustainable Development. https://www.mdpi.com/1996-1073/14/12/3583/pdf • Zhu 2020. Business models for energy efficiency – energy performance contracting. https://c2e2.unepdtu.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2021/01/business-models-for-energy-efficiency-energy-performance-contracting.pdf 	

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Di Santo et al. 2015. Emerging business models for energy efficiency in buildings. https://www.eceee.org/library/conference_proceedings/eceee_Summer_Studies/2015/3-local-action/emerging-business-models-for-energy-efficiency-in-buildings/2015/3-322-15_DiSanto.pdf/ <p>Beneficial climate change projection and impacts information were presented in Section 1a of the PIF, but the IUCN ESMS screening document provided is not as specific concerning climate risk to the project as STAP guidelines have indicated in the past. Climate change will influence energy use, building efficiency and can impact how nature-based solutions will be designed, especially in an Island country. We encourage the project proponent to conduct a detailed climate risk screening and develop management options during the PPG stage.</p> <p>There is also a new Island Policy lab sponsored by UNDESA and hosted by the University of Delaware, which could be a source of information and valuable point of connection for advice. https://sites.udel.edu/island-policy-lab/</p> <p>The proponents should also consider reading the following key papers as a resource:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kalim U Shah, Pravesh Raghoo, & Dinesh Surroop. (2021). An Institutional-Based Governance Framework for Energy Efficiency Promotion in Small Island Developing States. <i>Climate (Basel)</i>, 9(6), 95-. https://doi.org/10.3390/cli9060095 Raghoo, P., Jeetah, P., & Surroop, D. (2017). Lifelong Learning (LLL) for Energy Practitioners in Small Island Developing States (SIDS): The Pivotal Role of Education in Energy Efficiency and Demand Side Management. In <i>Climate Change Adaptation in Pacific Countries</i> (pp. 353–368). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-50094-2_22 		
Part I: Project Information B. Indicative Project Description Summary		
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes –areas defined with examples
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project’s objectives?	Yes. More is needed on the finance component of the project
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits? Are the global environmental benefits likely to be generated?	Yes – very clear metrics of GEB calculations are provided in an addendum.
Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project.	Yes, there are a series of outputs listed along with each outcome but these need to be incorporated into the theory of change.

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
	Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?	
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? Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references? 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?	Yes – provides rationale and country context
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly? Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits? Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project? 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; are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	Yes, and the outcomes are benchmarked with the baseline.
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change? What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Theory of change needs updating as noted

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives? • Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions? • Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes? 	
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing	<p>GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?</p> <p>LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?</p>	Noted
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	<p>Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?</p> <p>Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?</p> <p>Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?</p> <p>Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?</p> <p>What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?</p>	Yes,
7) innovative, sustainability and potential for	Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing,	Yes,

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
scaling-up	<p>technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?</p> <p>Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?</p> <p>Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?</p>	
<p>1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.</p>		Provided
<p>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.</p>	<p>Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?</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>	Yes – stakeholder mapping is included in project design and stakeholder satisfaction also in outcome goals.
<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>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p> <p>Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important</p>	Gender equity plan with clear set of question to be addressed and linkages with policies are provided.

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
<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>stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?</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>There is an IUCN risk management document which is attached though the formal GEF/ STAP climate risk screening could be further adopted.</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</p>	<p>Yes – there is listing of coordination prospects provided with public and private sector and donors.</p>

PIF	What STAP looks for	Response
	<p>generated by other projects, including GEF projects?</p> <p>Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?</p> <p>Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?</p> <p>How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?</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>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.</p>	<p>What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?</p> <p>What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?</p>	<p>Yes adequately provided</p>

STAP’s advisory response

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Concur	<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>
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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. <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>
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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.