

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response	
GEF ID	10410	
Project Title	Enhancing integrated sustainable management to safeguard Samoa's natural resources	
Date of Screening	18 May 2020	
STAP member screener	Rosie Cooney	
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski	
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Concur</p> <p>STAP welcomes this project from UNDP entitled “Enhancing integrated sustainable management to safeguard Samoa's natural resources.”</p> <p>Overall it is a clearly written and coherent proposal addressing an issue of critical importance for the biodiversity and livelihoods of Samoa. It could be strengthened through clarifying the theory of change (including articulating key assumptions), improving the climate risk screening, and explicitly articulating what lessons have been learnt (about what works and what doesn't) from previous projects and initiatives.</p>	
Part I: Project Information	What STAP looks for	Response
B. Indicative Project Description Summary		
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes, very clear and directly related.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	Outcomes are clearly described.
	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?	Generally yes, but it is not clear that outputs 2.2 add up to outcome 2(b). Restoration of ecosystem function would seem to require more than dealing with IAS and promoting local participation in conservation (e.g. addressing land degradation, deforestation, etc.)?
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	There is a clear narrative explaining the project logic. There is no graphic TOC to clearly demonstrate how project elements are linked in a temporal/causal sequence, which is a pity. However, the project logic is fairly simple and is clearly explained.
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, the problems are clearly laid out.
	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?	
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	A baseline that provided a quantitative assessment of the current situation, against which the alternative scenario associated with the production of GEBs can be contrasted, would be preferable. Here there is simply information given on the policy context of the intervention and an explanation of certain ongoing conservation/sustainable management

		interventions (it is not clear whether these are comprehensive).
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	See above.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Unclear.
	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;	
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	Overall the project is clearly building on lessons learned from previous (and ongoing) initiatives, although specific lessons from previous projects are not clearly drawn.
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	This is adequately explained in narrative, although see comments elsewhere re a graphic TOC. There is considerable overlap between outputs and outcomes across the different components, which could be easily conveyed in a graphic TOC.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	These are clearly explained, but see above. Re component 1, output 1.4, it is hard to understand how IAS prevention/detection could proceed on a cost-recovery basis – how would income be generated?
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	In general, the mechanisms of change are clear and plausible. Assumptions are not clearly spelt out – note that a clear TOC would enable this to be done. The STAP Primer on TOCs would be very helpful in boosting the project's TOC in future planning, particularly in identifying critical assumptions.

	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	No, this does not appear to be well articulated.
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, this is likely.
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	
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?	<p>These are not specified. It could be argued that the entire project is aimed at increasing resilience of social-ecological communities to climate change.</p> <p>However, it would be good to see specific examination of how the intervention and its durable benefits into the future can be made as resilient as possible to likely climate change impacts.</p>
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, there are innovative elements here, such as the catchment scale approach (innovative in this

		context) and shifting fundamental aspects of policy toward IAS.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Yes there is (e.g. p35) but this is only sketched out in very broad terms, without any detailed consideration of what might promote or impede scaling up.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	This project aims at transformational change, but shifting key elements of policy, capacity, practice etc in relation to IASs and the scale of management.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Yes.
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.	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Yes

	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?	Note the involvement of MNRE has been omitted in Table 1 (p38). Otherwise these are clearly laid out.
<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.</p> <p>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 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>	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	No, this is to be done at later stages of project development.
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	This is not clear at this stage.
5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and	Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?	The climate risk screening is not robust or comprehensive. While the projected climate impacts for Samoa are set out, the implications of

<p>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 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>these for the project’s outputs/outcomes have not been unpacked in any detail.</p> <p>The sensitivity/vulnerability to CC impacts is only briefly referred to at various points, and no resilience practices/measures appear to be considered in project design at this stage.</p> <p>While the whole project can be considered as increasing resilience to climate change, it is still important to carefully consider how the project’s planned interventions and its planned long-term benefits will be affected by climate change scenarios out until 2050.</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>Yes, to some extent.</p>
	<p>Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?</p>	<p>Clear lessons from specific projects have not been articulated, although there is clearly considerable learning from/building on past experiences and projects embedded here.</p>
	<p>Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?</p>	<p>In some cases (e.g. the WB/AF-UNDP project that led to development of the CIMs). Overall this could be considerably strengthened, however.</p>
	<p>How have these lessons informed the project’s formulation?</p>	<p>See above.</p>
	<p>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?</p>	<p>At this point these elements are not strong in the project design. While coordination with other projects is clearly laid out (p50), there is little analysis of what has worked/what has not in previous projects to inform this one.</p>
<p>8. Knowledge management. Outline the “Knowledge Management Approach” for the project,</p>	<p>What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?</p>	<p>Knowledge management is clearly a high priority for the project, which is welcome, although the plans at this stage remain rather general and high-</p>

and how it will contribute to the project's overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.		level. No indicators and metrics for KM are clear at this stage.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	See above – no specific plans are proposed at this point.

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.