

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10720
Project Title	Promoting cleantech innovation for climate action in Senegal
Date of Screening	November 23, 2020
STAP member screener	Saleem H. Ali
STAP secretariat screener	Sunday Leonard
STAP Rating	Minor issues to be considered during project design
STAP Overall Assessment of the project proposal	<p>This project builds on an earlier GEF project, Global Cleantech Innovation Programme (GCIP), to develop a series of incentives to spur entrepreneurship in clean technologies across Senegal. The project lays out a clear theory of change and has provided a good range of outputs to incentivize competitions and help build an innovation ecosystem around clean technologies.</p> <p>There could be greater clarity provided in terms of cleantech companies success linked to needs in the country. The PIF gives the example of solar company Oolu power but earlier suggests that among the most significant needs would be to have cleantech solutions for agriculture and irrigation delivery. There needs to be some more tangible linkage in terms of what sectors will be approached and how. Given that there is an existing UNIDO interface with the GCIP project, perhaps these issues are already addressed in some other needs assessment that may be referenced.</p> <p>Furthermore, the project proponent should provide information on any baseline on existing clean energy and agricultural innovation that has been done in Senegal that forms the basis for this project and give the confidence for promoting innovation in cleantech and agricultural technology in the country? It will be useful to provide examples of clean energy and agricultural technology innovations developed in the country but have not been able to scale-up because of the lack of support that this project seeks to provide.</p> <p>It will also be useful to provide more specifics on the activities to be implemented. The PIF talks about cleantech products, services, and business models, but no detailed information on these was provided. Without some idea of these specifics, it is difficult to understand how the expected GEBs from this project would be achieved. Furthermore, these specifics are needed to ascertain the project's innovativeness, sustainability, and potential for scale-up.</p> <p>As rightly noted, it can be challenging to calculate the expected avoided greenhouse gas emissions from this type of project. An extrapolation based on another project was used to calculate the target presented in the core indicator. However, we think it could be possible to estimate the avoided</p>

	<p>emissions if some specifics on the probable type of clean and agricultural technologies are known. An estimate of the avoided emissions can be derived by assessing the business as usual emissions scenario in the targeted sectors (up to 2030 or 2040, for example) and comparing with expected emissions from the alternative clean and agricultural technology solutions. This further highlights the need to have an idea of the specific innovative cleantech and agricultural technologies that already exist or are possible in Senegal.</p> <p>It is commendable that the PIF recognized that other co-benefits are possible from the project, including prevention of air pollution, improved water quality, and reductions in waste and material use. The project will also provide socioeconomic benefits include job creation, improved human health, and overall enhance human well-being. The proponent should endeavor to capture and account for these benefits.</p> <p>The PIF presents information on the current and projected climate change (temperature and rainfall) in Senegal up to 2060. It also identified the potential impact of climate change on some proposed interventions, particularly in the agricultural and energy sectors. Because the project will be addressing sectors that are highly vulnerable to climate change, it seems unlikely that the current climate change risk rating of "low" is correct. The lack of specifics of the proposed interventions also makes it difficult to assess the climate risk accurately. Therefore, we encourage the proponent to carry out a detailed climate risk screening of the project's planned activities and develop mitigation measures for identified climate risks.</p> <p>Overall a worthwhile effort. We recommend referencing the following publications: New report from International Energy Agency which focuses on Cleantech in North Africa and its efficacy https://www.iea.org/reports/clean-energy-transitions-in-north-africa Mathews, J. A. (2017). Global trade and promotion of cleantech industry: A post-Paris agenda. <i>Climate Policy</i>, 17(1), 102–110. https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2016.1215286</p>	
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
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	The project is aimed at facilitating cleantech entrepreneurship in Senegal linked to a UNIDO global program on this theme. The objectives are general supported

Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits?	The project description could benefit from more clear examples of clean technologies that have potential for domestic versus international markets success.
	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?	Adequately provided
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	Yes presented well
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?	Partially
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Decent risk assessment is provided, including COVID's impact on overall mobility and economic development.
	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?	Not really applicable in this case
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Yes - in earlier parts of the PIF with details on metrics.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Yes

	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;	Yes they are presented.
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	Yes - presented
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	Well-incorporated in design.
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	Yes – presented in detail.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Adequate theory of change provided
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	Each outcome in components is adequately linked to outputs though some more specifics on outputs would be welcome.
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Yes – with careful monitoring
	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
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?	Yes

	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	Yes
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
	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?	Yes
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Yes
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?	Yes – several partnerships with think tanks and NGOs are listed on page 20.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Yes
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Yes – this needs to be considered in terms of technology markets evolving rapidly.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Yes

<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>Yes</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>Provided in supplementary material</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 contribute to gender equality: access to and control over resources; participation and</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services. Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /td</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>Accounted for</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>Yes noted</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 generated by other projects, including GEF projects?</p>	<p>Well-coordinated</p>
	<p>Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?</p>	<p>Yes</p>

	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Partially noted in descriptions
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	Described
	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?	
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.	What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?	Good coverage in these sections
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	Standard reporting

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.
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	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:
	(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.