

REVISED STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE, OCTOBER 2022

GEF ID	11213
Project title	Generating opportunities for livelihoods and biodiversity through participatory governance of natural resources and the economic diversification of the communities of the central forest corridor of Honduras.
Date of screen	06 June 2023
STAP Panel Member	John Donaldson
STAP Secretariat	Alessandro Moscuza

1. Summary of STAP's views of the project

This proposal provided a good overview of the problem and issues to be addressed through the project activities, and a good description of project activities, including a good analysis of the problems to be addressed, as well as the barriers and enablers.

However, STAP screening revealed some technical elements and cross-cutting programmatic aspects that would benefit from further revisions, additions and corrections, these include: the description of OECMs, NBS and PES approaches to be deployed by the project, as well as the sections on risk and innovation.

In addition STAP has made some recommendations around the use of acronyms (i.e. for OECMS) and formatting (e.g. the theory of change diagram), which usually would not be identified as items of specific concern, but in this case were regarded to have a noticeable enough impact to deserve being mentioned. Further details about all of these have been provided 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 **project rationale** provided a good overview of the project objective and the issues affecting the target areas. It also provided a good assessment of the underlying context in Honduras, as well as the regional and global issues (e.g. climate change) affecting the region. The analysis of the problems to be addressed and the project justification were quite detailed and supported by a good amount of data and references. The analysis of key barriers and enablers was fair in terms of content but could have been organized using a clearer structure that separates and identifies the two elements more clearly.

The **project description** section used a very unusual format involving a very large font in bold characters, which made reading difficult, the theory of change (ToC) diagram was instead rather too small and quite difficult to read. The same was also quite basic and would have benefited from a more creative design, although it covered all the main elements and adopted a sound -if unimaginative- logical flow. The narrative description and explanation of the ToC was laid out very well and was very effective in explaining the logic for the intervention. Of particular

note was the way that the barriers, problems and solutions were weaved seamlessly into the narrative and combined with the assumptions to provide a very clear and detailed explanation of the rationale for the project and its expected results.

The approach proposed, which involved the use of a mosaic-based approach, as well as the combined use of OECMs and NBS could have great potential although no information was provided on the nature of these approaches. As a result, it is impossible to ascertain whether the intention is to develop and test novel approaches to OECMs or apply approaches that have been trialed elsewhere. A similar comment applies to NBS and the use of payments for ecosystem services (PES) where it is unclear whether this involves a novel approach or implementation of models that have been successfully applied elsewhere.

The size and scope of the proposed outputs and results was appropriate for a project of this scale and well aligned with the project scope and objective. The description of the components was adequate and complemented well the other related sections of the proposal, such as the description of the ToC and the project rationale.

The section on innovation was quite weak and listed a number of measures and approaches that could not be classified as innovative (e.g. use of sensors or computers or use of climate-smart agroforestry techniques). T

The section on stakeholder engagement covered the very basics but was otherwise quite weak as it failed to provide any details of an engagement strategy or plan and/or the specific roles that each category of stakeholders will cover.

Other important issues such as addressing power dynamics were not even mentioned. The description of potential risks and related mitigating actions was mixed. The identification and analysis of actual and potential risks is fine, but the description of proposed mitigating actions is generally weak and mostly reverts to listing project activities instead of specifically designed activities to address the risks identified.

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

1. The **use of the acronym for Other Effective area-based Conservation Measures (OECMs)** should be revised and corrected to ensure it is spelled correctly throughout the proposal and that either the Spanish or English version are used consistently throughout the document.
2. The **use of font and formatting** should be revised and corrected to ensure it is aligned with general standards for GEF proposals and is consistent throughout the proposal.
3. The **ToC diagram** should be reformatted to ensure it is legible, ideally the design and structure fo the ToC diagram should be improved and augmented to ensure that the (inter)connections between all the various elements are highlighted clearly and as effectively as in the narrative section.
4. The **reference to OECMs** should indicate whether the activities involve new approaches linked to the mosaic landscape approach of the project. If the OECMs are testing novel approaches, then it will be important to ensure that further project design includes elements aimed at rigorously testing the approach and identifying factors that contribute to its success.
5. The description of how **NBS and PES** will be applied should be clarified to explain whether this involves employing a novel approach or the implementation of models that have been successfully applied elsewhere.
6. **The section on innovation** should be revised to ensure that the proposed solutions and approaches are actually innovative.
7. **The description of proposed mitigating actions in the risk section** should be revised to ensure that the measures proposed are specifically designed to address the risks identified, as opposed to be a simple rephrasing and adaptation of project activities.

8. The proposed **socio-economic assessment** on pg. 33 (Risk section) should be changed to a conflict and fragility or socio-political assessment, which are much more relevant to the nature of the corresponding risk category.

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.)