

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10575
Project Title	Coral Reef Rescue: Resilient Coral Reefs, Resilient Communities
Date of Screening	19 November 2020
STAP member screener	Blake Ratner
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Concur</p> <p>STAP welcomes this project from WWF-US on resilient coral reefs and communities. It is an ambitious, timely, and well-developed project concept. The scale of benefits is very well specified in relation to global trends so that benefits, if realized, will be clearly pivotal.</p> <p>The project provides an excellent summary of related multi-stakeholder initiatives (not just individual projects) that provide a foundation for joint action. There is an excellent presentation of data, with references, on trends and on the global importance of reef conservation. There is also a very clear specification of barriers, with global, cross-regional perspective.</p> <p>STAP finds that the project offers commendable, well elaborated thinking regarding the institutional, financial and social sustainability of the investment. The project explicitly uses climate projections as the basis for geographic targeting. It utilizes very good criteria for identifying target sites, integrating aspects of exposure to climate threats, livelihood and food security, capacity to adapt, and local stressors on coral reef health.</p> <p>Finally, STAP finds that the project has a good approach to identifying and synthesizing knowledge from a wide range of sources, not only from project implementation. However, indicators and metrics for knowledge management should be specified.</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?	Yes, well structured.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	Yes, clear.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Ambitious, but the alliance brings together very capable actors leveraging the latest science. Climate trends and economic drivers present primary challenges.
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?	Yes, well structured.
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
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?	Project logic very well substantiated.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Excellent presentation of data, with references, on trends and global importance of reef conservation. Very clear specification of barriers, with global, cross-regional perspective.
	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?	Yes, very well substantiated, building upon recent, completed SAPs. Excellent summary of related multi-stakeholder initiatives (not just individual projects) that provide a foundation for joint action.
	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;	
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	
	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?	Clear specification of causal pathways, rooted in action on capacity building and knowledge exchange, national planning, and mobilization of finance. Theory of change diagram shows good interconnections between first- and second-order outcomes targeted and relates these to key threats.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Well specified.
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	Well specified.
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Yes.
	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, with good recognition of need for adaptive management during implementation.
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the	GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?	Very well specified, contrasting with baseline scenario.

baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing		
	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. Good specification of additional co-benefits beyond IW targets, addressing biodiversity, local livelihoods, climate adaptation and carbon capture.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes, and very well specified in relation to global trends so that benefits, if realized, will be clearly pivotal.
	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?	Adequate for PIF stage; indicators and methodologies should be further specified prior to CEO endorsement.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Climate aspects well integrated in rationale and focus of activities.
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?	Explicitly uses climate projections as basis for geographic targeting. Very good criteria for identifying target sites, integrating aspects of exposure to climate threats, livelihood and food security, capacity to adapt, and local stressors on coral reef health. Commendable, well elaborated thinking regarding institutional, financial and social sustainability of the investment.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Excellent, clear specification of scaling strategies, distinguishing replication, financing, and influence on mindsets of decision makers.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Fundamental transformation, on an urgent time scale. Clearly articulated.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide		Global map identifies countries. Lacks geo-referencing at site level.

<p>geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.</p>		
<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>Impressive stages of consultation and alliance-building over the last 2 years described, including excellent integration of civil society stakeholders. Project builds directly on prior, innovative approaches spearheaded by CSOs and research institutes.</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>Well described.</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</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Excellent summary of gender barriers relating to division of labor, access and benefit sharing, including national-level overviews with good referencing. Planned Gender Action Plan usefully anticipates addressing gender divisions in resource management decision-making.</p>

<p>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>		
	<p>Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?</p>	<p>Yes, well described at this stage, including linkages to indigenous peoples where relevant.</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?</p> <p>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>Good specification of risks, potential consequences and counter measures. Distinction by level of risk would be helpful in addition.</p> <p>Detailed analysis of climate risks by country, well organized and referenced.</p> <p>Exemplary identification of Covid-19 risks and possible opportunities.</p>
<p>6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other</p>	<p>Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?</p>	<p>Consortium of lead organizations provides a strong foundation for knowledge generation and sharing.</p>

relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives		
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Good identification of other GEF-supported projects for coordination.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Yes, both institutional approach and data for targeting reflect prior lessons.
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	As above. Recognition of importance of cross-regional learning and scaling.
	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?	Yes, knowledge management aspects are well integrated.
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 approach to identifying and synthesizing knowledge from a wide range of sources, not only from project implementation. Indicators and metrics for knowledge management should be specified.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	Good, initial indication of methods and approaches to knowledge sharing, including MOOCs and tool libraries.

Notes

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
<p>1. Concur</p>	<p>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.</p>
	<p>* 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></p>
<p>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>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:</p>
	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;</p>
	<p>(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.</p>
	<p>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.</p>

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.