

STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE

GEF ID	11708
Project title	Programme for innovation in climate adaptation and resilience building solutions (PARS)
Date of screen	27 November
STAP Panel Member	Jon Barnett
STAP Secretariat	Alessandro Moscuza

1. Summary of STAP's views of the project

This proposal is for an extension of an existing set of linked GEF projects (GEF ID 11567 and 11571) into two additional countries (Angola and Madagascar). As such the objectives, theory of change, benefits and modalities have already been deemed to have scientific and technical merit, as does the present PIF. These are included in the 'GEF-8 child project concept' document appended to the main PIF document.

Because the proposal is to extend the UNIDO Program for innovation in climate adaptation and resilience building solutions (PARS) family of projects into two further countries the justification for an additional PPG is clear. The project is also well aligned with GEF-8 and LDCF Objectives, as well as with country strategies.

STAP's overall assessment concluded that this project has scientific and technical merit, but has also identified a few minor areas for revision, which are further described in box 2 and 3 below.

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*

- 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 proposal provides a good if short explanation of the climate change problems and issues that are facing Angola and Madagascar and the importance of enabling micro, small and medium-scale enterprises (MSMEs) to adapt and contribute to adaptation across society. It is therefore very strong on **private sector engagement**.

This focus, along with its good consideration of gender equity and women's empowerment, aligns the whole project well with a **whole-of-society approach**.

The description of proposed project activities seems to be much better informed about and engaged with Madagascar than Angola. This is reflected across several different aspects, such as the discussions on the details about the MSME business environment and **project governance** for Madagascar (on page 14), which have no equivalents in the discussions of Angola. **Stakeholder engagement** activities and consultations have also been significant in Madagascar but more limited for Angola (though the transparency around this aspect is good for both countries).

The proposal to use the mid-term evaluation to assess effectiveness and recalibrate activities to achieve **Gender equality, disability and social inclusion (GEDSI)** objectives is very good.

The **theory of change (ToC)** is provided in the 'GEF-8 child project concept' document appended to the main PIF document, but there is no description or discussion of **baseline conditions** including any counterfactual hypotheses or scenarios (i.e. with and without the project) in either document.

The assessment of **risk** is comprehensive and well-considered, although there is no mapping of related policies and projects in either Angola or Madagascar, which potentially creates a risk of policy incoherence, and weakens claims of the need for this project in both countries. During the PPG phase, it would be good to include an inventory of related activities (if any) in each country in the final version of the proposal.

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

STAP has identified a few issues to be addressed during the PPG stage of project development:

1. Provide a description of baseline conditions with and without the project in each country;
2. Include a more detailed analysis of the MSME environment for both countries;
3. Enhance stakeholder input into the development of the PPG, particularly for Angola;
4. Provide an inventory of related policies and projects in both countries and the means to ensure coordination between different government actors and interventions.

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

Project rationale

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.)