

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10861
Project Title	Integrated Economic Development and Community Resilience (IEDCR)
Date of Screening	11 November 2021
STAP member screener	Ed Carr
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Concur.</p> <p>STAP welcomes the Project Integrated Economic Development and Community Resilience (IEDCR). The project will deliver adaptation benefits principally through building capacity for climate change adaptation planning and implementation, by 1) providing grants to improve infrastructure resilience and 2) mainstreaming climate change adaptation and resilience practices into sub-national/local planning. STAP particularly welcomes the detailed theory of change, the comprehensive detailing of risks, and the attention to gender issues in this project.</p> <p>While the project is mainly focused on poverty reduction and enhancing that central goal through increased climate resilience, since GEF funding is being utilized STAP would appreciate project efforts to encourage the consideration of nature-based solutions (NbS) in addition to grey infrastructure to achieve additional environmental benefits such as climate change mitigation and biodiversity.</p> <p>For example, the project notes that biodiversity is under threat, but it is only concerned with minimizing biodiversity loss as opposed to supporting recovery through habitat gains, etc.</p> <p>STAP also encourages the project to develop scenarios of future change that integrate likely climate changes with other stressors, such as those created by limited political</p>

	and institutional capacity, to better characterize the challenges the project will face during implementation and to ensure that project interventions result in the most effective and durable outcomes possible.	
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. The objective of this project is to “(i) improve climate resilient infrastructure and services in rural communities; and (ii) strengthen provincial government's responsiveness to citizen priorities” and it responds to the problems outlined in the PID regarding gaps in infrastructure and services in rural communities which are most vulnerable to external shocks including impacts of climate change.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project’s objectives?	Yes, the activities support the objectives. The project will work to operationalize the Solomon Islands Government (SIG) Policy Blueprint legislation and its Climate Change Policy through strengthening and implementing Ward Development Committees while also supporting medium term measures in the SIG’s fiscal stimulus package related to covid-19. Broadly speaking, these do support the project objectives. The project productively integrates development goals and adaptation goals and needs, preventing duplication of effort and clearly aligning adaptation funds from LDCF with the achievement of development objectives that will result in increased adaptive capacity over time.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	Yes. These include: improving rural communities’ access to infrastructure, improving the climate and disaster resilience of rural communities, and increasing government capacity to identify and respond to community needs. The outcomes are particularly focused on adaptation benefits through resilient infrastructure and mainstreaming climate

		adaptation planning at the local level. These project outcomes are intended to support larger development outcomes over the long term, including increased economic activity in rural areas, lower rates of rural poverty, improved access to services in rural areas, and lower vulnerability to economic and environmental shocks.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes.
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?	Infrastructure investments (e.g. water supply systems, coastal protection sea walls, run-off drainage systems and solar power systems), trainings, monitoring, plans, etc. All will contribute to the outcomes.
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	STAP welcomes the clear theory of change included for this project.
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?	Yes. A minor point: the problem statement and goal read as means to an end, but the end is not itself clear: that is, what do all the long-term outcomes add up to for people on the ground? The LDCF section of the PID is important, as it makes much clearer what the climate-related problems are.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes.
	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?	Somewhat. The current situation is well-described, and the extension of this situation into the future is present but not presented particularly cohesively or in terms of specific impacts on people and infrastructure. The PID offers two studies that effectively quantify the cost of climate change to the Solomon Islands' economy, but there is no

		<p>specific description of future trends that might explain why those impacts are coming/why they are significant.</p> <p>To some extent, this is understandable, as much of the work with LDCF funding is around capacity building for better local problem identification and solution design, but it would be good to have some sense of the expected magnitude of changes as this might direct some of the capacity-building efforts.</p>
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	The PID offers two quantifications of the projected economic costs of climate change in the Solomon Islands. However, it is not clear to what extent this project would reduce those costs, and therefore it is not clear exactly what the project benefits will amount to. This said, it is clear that the project will generate a benefit - the issue is that these benefits are not clear.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	The baseline itself is not very robust, at least in terms of justifying these costs. However, the magnitude of climate impacts on the economy, and the likelihood that this project will deliver some benefits that reduce these impacts, suggest that the costs of this project are supportable.
	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 outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	A TOC is provided that is well thought out and includes underlying assumptions. At the broadest level, the ToC is that providing support for capacity building at lower levels of government will improve everything from problem identification to intervention design, which in turn

		will contribute to the achievement of wider World Bank development goals in the Solomon Islands.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Successful training will lead to built capacity (including the hiring of needed staff), who in turn execute their jobs effectively and in the manner envisioned. With regard to climate, these efforts will result in reduced climate risk and vulnerability, which allows for the achievement of other development goals.
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Performance-based grants and incentives will result in climate-resilient investments in infrastructure and other sectors that are identified and implemented in partnership with communities and stakeholders. These, in turn, are expected to improve access to infrastructure, resilience to climate shocks and stressors, and government capacity to identify and respond to community needs. 2) Capacity building for provincial program coordinators will result in more adept, effective PPCs, which will result in greater climate resilience and climate-resilient investments in infrastructure and other sectors that are identified and implemented in partnership with communities and stakeholders. These, in turn, are expected to improve access to infrastructure, resilience to climate shocks and stressors, and government capacity to identify and respond to community needs. 3) Capacity building for disaster, climate, and environment officers will improve climate resilience and the transparency for implementing and reporting on interventions and the coordination, social accountability will be strengthened at the ward and community levels. This, in turn, is expected to improve access to infrastructure, resilience to climate shocks and stressors, and government capacity to identify and respond to community needs.

	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Yes. Assumptions are included in the TOC.
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	Yes, though the vast majority of these related to capacity within the government of the Solomon Islands. In terms of climate-related conditions, there is an awareness of these issues and a plan to work with relevant actors in the Solomon Islands to develop means of dealing with climate impacts, but no concrete plan at this time.
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?	Yes. This is a blended finance project whereby the LDCF resources will be used to support prioritized actions identified in the CCP, including financing a range of climate change adaptation investments, technical assistance to provide training and increase awareness around climate change risk and adaptation measures at the subnational level.
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?	There are adaptation benefits and they are likely measurable, but the PIF/PID does not provide a clear basis for doing so.
	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.
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	No. However, in the project timeframe it would be very difficult to develop any such method as capacity building can produce adaptation benefits directly and indirectly and do so over an extended period. The full value of the short-term adaptation actions of this project is therefore difficult to measure.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	During project preparation, they plan to draw on the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change,

		Disaster Management and Meteorology’s experience to enhance project resilience and reduce vulnerability to the impacts of climate change and natural hazards, including strengthening the resilience of small-scale infrastructure to be built under the project.
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?	Not particularly. The project does not claim that its use of LDCF funding is innovative, but does make a compelling argument for the use of adaptation funds to move the larger World Bank project forward. It is not clear to what extent the work on adaptation in this context is innovative, given the prior presence of adaptation projects in the country.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	There is little discussion of scale-up of climate change adaptation activities in the PID or PIF. There is a general claim that the project will scale up climate change impacts by mainstreaming climate change and risk reduction activities in its National and Provincial Sector Plans, Ward Development Plans, and more generally through various planning and decision-making processes.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Given the dire situation of the Solomon Islands vis-à-vis climate impacts on human health and well-being, transformational change is necessary to achieve long-term sustainability. That said, the project seems focused on incremental adaptation at this point.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		A map is included. The map does not point to any specific project sites. As the project references infrastructure, it would be good to see the potential location of that work (at times the PID references exposure of infrastructure to climate hazards, suggesting that there has been some thought about where the work would take place).
2. Stakeholders. Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	It is not clear if the stakeholders have been identified. A stakeholder table is not provided; however, a narrative details the government agencies and other stakeholders that will be involved in the project. The private sector will be engaged; however, specific details are lacking. The

<p>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>project notes that it will report to the PGSP Project Steering Committee, which is governed by a number of government ministries. The project plans to prepare a stakeholder engagement plan that will “include all stakeholders at all levels including national, provincial (provincial government), ward development committees and local level including leaders that represent the nine provinces selected.”</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 Project Steering Committee members will help govern the project and its activities. As other stakeholders have not been identified in the PIF/PID, it is not clear what their roles are. However, the PID does mention the importance of taking a bottom-up, community-informed approach to the project, so it is likely that stakeholders will be involved at least in consultations around problem identification and intervention design.</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</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Yes, the PID has a comprehensive discussion of gender differentiation and risks – and an impressive set of actions planned to address them, which draw on context-specific understanding and experience.</p>

<p>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>Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?</p>	<p>Yes. The Project will support the following activities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) monitor, report and progressively increase the minimum representation standards for women and youth in the WDCs and PPDCs. This will include the development and implementation of provisions, strategies and enforcement mechanisms to ensure the minimum standards are achieved in all locations. 2) Establish transparent participatory planning processes as part of updating the WDC's annual work plans to ensure that community needs and the priorities of vulnerable segments are represented and coordinated in an inclusive manner in the committee decision-making process 3) Include gender and youth disaggregated indicators and targets into the Results Framework <p>The project will also consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Increasing investment to the Ward Development Grants and stipulating that these micro-grants (or a portion thereof) be used to support vulnerable groups 2) Conducting additional gender and inclusion trainings

		3) Incorporating additional disability considerations into construction designs
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>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"> • 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 identified risks are both valid and comprehensive. These risks are outside the direct control of the project. There are social and environmental risks that could affect the project, but they are clearly identified and steps to address them are included in the PID.</p> <p>The project has not discussed how its objectives or outputs would be affected by climate change to 2050, so it is not clear if the impact of those risks has been assessed and addressed. It is also unclear if the sensitivity of the project and its outcomes to climate change and its impacts has been assessed.</p> <p>The project is designed as an effort to build technical and institutional capacity to address climate risk and vulnerability broadly, and therefore is likely to speak to at least some of 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?	No information on lessons learned.
	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?	The PID shows a clear ability to feed prior lessons into this project, and following the KM plan the lessons from this project will likely be relatively accessible to subsequent projects via the PFGCC or the PGSP Project Steering Committee?
8. Knowledge management. Outline the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project,	What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?	Key knowledge management work processes from which data will be obtained include: the annual WDC planning process; periodic field assessments of M&E officers; the field operations of PPCs

<p>and how it will contribute to the project's overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.</p>		<p>and/or Engineers based in the provinces; performance assessments, qualitative surveys and other reports required under the PCDF, which will be reviewed and analyzed to inform reporting and any corrective actions to be taken to ensure the Project's sustainability.</p>
	<p>What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?</p>	<p>At this stage, the plans are somewhat generic: project lessons will be disseminated through the Provincial Capacity Development Fund website as well as through regular quarterly and annual reports provided to stakeholders, including government agencies, NGOs, development partners, the private sector and academic institutions.</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>