

## REVISED STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE, OCTOBER 2022

GEF ID	11675
Project title	Strengthening national capacities for implementing the Enhanced Transparency Framework in Caribbean countries
Date of screen	27 November 2024
STAP Panel Member	Ngonidzashe Chirinda
STAP Secretariat	Sunday Leonard

### 1. Summary of STAP's views of the project

This project targets enhancing climate transparency in five Caribbean countries. The project's key strengths are that it aims to explore the integration of climate data management systems. It also aims to cover GHG inventories, climate finance and capacity building.

Stakeholder engagement and adopting a gender lens in designing different project activities are major strengths of the project. Significant data gaps that require extensive collection underpinned by long-term financial investments are a major challenge in the target countries. Since data sharing is already a problem at the national level, implementing the enhanced transparency framework at the regional level may face the same obstacles. Since successfully integrating diverse data sources, managing stakeholder expectations, and achieving long-term sustainability are nontrivial tasks, the proponents should explore strategies to proactively mitigate these challenges by developing effective coordination and engagement plans.

Another challenge is that the ToC relies significantly on assumptions. For example, the proponents assume sustained political will, consistent stakeholder engagement, and sufficient funding are all external factors the project team cannot fully control. Therefore, if these assumptions do not hold, the theory of change will collapse. The ToC could benefit from a more nuanced discussion of these challenges and the strategies to overcome them.

It is noted that the project is not focused on delivering GEBs, but putting in place the data and information that can enable that in the future.

*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 (400 words)

The project proponents identified and described the five target countries' challenges in measuring, tracking, and reporting climate change progress. The main barriers to overcoming these challenges are described. The proponents should pay closer attention to effective stakeholder engagement to improve data flows and management, which will be a critical factor in project success.

The proponents adequately articulate and justify the project's objectives within its context. They also clearly describe the linkages between interconnected baseline problems that hinder progress on climate commitments. If the project is not implemented, future scenarios are described, specifying that baseline problems will worsen, resulting in inaccurate data, poor decisions, and ineffective climate actions.

The ToC lacks details on specific strategies and mechanisms that will be employed to achieve change. For example, considering the potential resistance to change, how will the project promote buy-in among national and regional stakeholders?

Considering the vulnerability of the ToC to several key assumptions, the proponents may also need to consider a comparative analysis of alternative solutions and a more comprehensive risk assessment. The proponents should clearly describe the counterfactual scenario without GEF intervention to illustrate the project's added value.

The proponents have identified the key stakeholders in the target countries; however, they should provide details on their specific roles, responsibilities, contributions, benefits, and how the project will ensure their continued engagement for enduring GEBs.

The proponents should consider analysing synergies with existing initiatives and clarifying how they will avoid duplication but incorporate specific lessons from other ongoing and past projects.

*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**

In addition to the points raised in Sections 1 and 2, STAP makes the following suggestions:

- Consider including a clear inter-agency collaboration and communication strategy to ensure data sharing and quality control.
- Reflect on an approach for effectively integrating climate change information and data into national policymaking processes.
- Consider developing a comprehensive stakeholder engagement plan that results in genuine stakeholder ownership and participation at all project stages.
- The project proponents should reflect on ensuring long-term financial and institutional sustainability beyond GEF support.

*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.)