

STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE

GEF ID	11250
Project title	Blue and Green Island Integrated Programme
Date of screen	June 1, 2023
STAP Panel Member	Blake Ratner
STAP Secretariat	Virginia Gorsevski

1. Summary of STAP's views of the project

The proposed program is well structured and built upon a sound analysis of system dynamics and needs.

The objective of the BGI-IP is to facilitate nature-positive development and reduce ecosystem degradation in SIDS by valuing nature and applying nature-based solutions (NbS) with specific application to the food, tourism and urban sectors. Despite the global nature of this IP and the widely varying contexts of individual SIDS, the PFD offers a detailed and well-documented description of the baseline, including main drivers of degradation, current landscape of investments, and what is needed to alter the current trajectory (integration of nature into development, NbS, and KM and scaling). The focus on horizontal and vertical integration with 'nature for human well-being' as the core principle increases the likelihood that the sum of this IP will be greater than the individual parts (i.e., the child projects).

The project is grounded in the 4 transformation levers identified by the GEF as well as connecting each of the components to specific actions aimed at scaling 'out', 'up', and 'deep' to increase the likelihood of achieving durable GEBs. The theory of change is generally sound; however, STAP recommends better articulating the linkages between the transformation levers and components and outcomes.

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*

- X 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 annex on STAP's screening guidelines.

The BGI IP ToC rests on the notion that by 1) supporting multi-sectoral integrated systems, NCA and valuation, NbS at scale, and private sector engagement and finance at the global, regional, national levels, and 2) by promoting regional and global coordination for collective action, exchange of knowledge, and private sector partnerships for finance, it will be possible for participating SIDS to achieve the IP's objective.

The program rationale is thorough and adequately describes the baseline situation in general for SIDS, recognizing that they are not homogenous and each face their own particular, context-specific challenges (and opportunities). However, broadly shared challenges facing key systems (nature, food, urban) are clearly described, as is the means by which the IP proposes to tackle them.

The baseline section is somewhat truncated – focusing on the inadequate 'silo approach' to decision-making; however, the subsequent components target this critical topic and enforce the notion of integration and the

centrality of nature for human well-being through improved valuation of nature, strengthened policy coherence, NbS at scale, etc. The country-specific information on baseline investments and alignment with initiatives, etc. is comprehensive. Information on stakeholder engagement provides a useful overview of anticipated roles.

Information on future scenarios is confined to climate change impacts, which while critical for SIDS, does not present the full picture and more information could be provided regarding other important dimensions of change. More information about how other global and/or regional trends (e.g. trade, regional integration, conflict, etc.) may impact SIDS would be useful (particularly in terms of the durability of proposed approaches in light of possible disruptions to tourism, food, etc.).

In terms of the project description, the theory of change (ToC) diagram is reflective of the project's overall breadth, and scaling ambitions and pathways are well integrated in the design. While the PFD effectively focuses on three critical components which respond well to the barriers listed, the way these components relate to and employ the transformation levers is unclear in the diagram (in contrast to the narrative text).

Component 3 re the global coordination platform will be critical to the success of this IP for collecting and sharing information and knowledge, managing, coordinating, scaling, advocating, etc. It will create a platform for collaboration and sharing of experiences between government counterparts and partners to generate knowledge, link experts, and develop partnerships. The outcomes for this component are appropriate (coordination, M&E, KML, TA, CB, etc.) and well described.

The proposed "KM & Solutions Sharing platform" described as an integral part of the global platform includes a welcome discussion of how it will build on and link up with existing KM and learning initiatives and platforms including the other relevant IPs related to food, plastics, etc.

The 'NBS Accelerator and Private Sector and Finance Facility' and the 'Global Technical Facility (GTF)' sound promising and potentially innovative. Figures 5 and 6 are helpful for understanding how the various facilities/initiatives relate to one another. Especially promising is the aim to link with related innovative finance initiatives led by a range of other agencies within and beyond the UN system, such as the 1000 Landscapes initiative and the Coalition for Private Investment in Conservation (CPIC).

The incremental reasoning is sound and essentially posits that without the IP's country interventions and collective action, these key economic sectors will continue to drive degradation of SIDS, likely exacerbated by projected increases in tourism, food demand and urban pressures.

Importantly, the design recognizes the positive as well as negative potential of development trajectories in each of the target sectors – elaborated in most detail in the case of tourism. This highlights the risks and importance of economic development choices in relation to environmental goals; the related strong emphasis on policy coherence is therefore especially welcome. Useful examples of associated country priorities for "cohesive multi-sectoral governance and policy framework" and policy coherence among the child project countries are provided. This suggests a good foundation for targeted exchange and learning among countries within the program and beyond.

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

Recognizing the quality of analysis and program design, STAP recommends the following modest points as areas for attention to refine design during the next phase:

1. Consider expanding the analysis of future scenarios to incorporate how other global and/or regional trends (e.g. trade, regional integration, conflict, etc.) may impact SIDS and the durability of planned outcomes.
2. In the theory of change diagram, specify how each component will selectively engage the transformation levers. This detail is outlined in the narrative but the diagram may be misconstrued to indicate that all levers apply to all components equally.
3. Stakeholder engagement: among global and regional initiatives and networks that can best be leveraged to achieve the program's scaling ambitions, engage in dialogue to identify the gaps within these and key areas in which the IP can contribute by strengthening capacity, connections, or policy influence.

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.

*categories under review, subject to future revision

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.)