

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10702
Project Title	Community-based Management of Tanguar Haor Wetland in Bangladesh
Date of Screening	22 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 UNDP to promote community-based management of Tanguar Haor wetland in Bangladesh. The project is to be commended for its very clear and coherent design.</p> <p>In addition, the project provides an exemplary ‘situation analysis’ diagram linking components, specific barriers addressed, drivers and direct threats of wetlands degradation. An excellent theory of change diagram is provided, with specification of assumptions mediating achievement of both mid-term and long-term outcomes.</p> <p>Stakeholder engagement and participatory co-management approaches, linked to clear scaling pathways, offer good prospects for influence beyond the target site. There is very good specification of scaling approaches, and a good analysis of the multiple dimensions of sustainability of impacts. The project also provides a very sound analysis of multiple categories of risk, including those related to resource tenure conflict, and challenges in influencing the private sector towards pollution abatement.</p> <p>There is a good preliminary indication of a knowledge management approach. However, metrics of knowledge management (KM) performance should be identified prior to CEO endorsement.</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, very clearly.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	Yes. Very good specification of preliminary outcome indicators.
	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?	Yes, clear logic.
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?	Yes. Exemplary 'situation analysis' diagram linking components, specific barriers addressed, drivers and direct threats of wetlands degradation.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes, with good referencing.
	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?	Yes, clear integration of BD and LD aspects, as well as links to CW.
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Yes.

	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. Good indicators included in outcome descriptions above.
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	Yes, specific areas of lesson learning identified.
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	Aspects include co-management approaches, livelihood options, forest regeneration approaches and more.
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	Exemplary theory of change diagram provided, with specification of assumptions mediating achievement of both mid-term and long-term outcomes.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Very clearly articulated.
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	Very clearly articulated.
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Yes, with assumptions very clearly articulated.
	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 identification of intent to draw upon M&E to aid with mechanisms for scaling within the country.
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, with very clear quantification.
	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?	Includes plans to implement climate screening tool developed by World Bank.
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, stakeholder engagement and participatory co-management approaches, linked to clear scaling pathways, offer good prospects for influence beyond the target site.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Yes. Very good specification of scaling approaches. Good analysis of multiple dimensions of sustainability of impacts.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Given past trends, this is a fundamental transformation.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Coordinates included.
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.	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Yes, with appropriate further consultations planned. Private sector actors should be further specified.

<p>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>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>Adequate initial indication of roles.</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 decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services. Will the project's results framework or logical</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Very useful integration of past lessons on gender roles in knowledge dissemination and resource management. Good specified areas of focus for planned gender assessment, including access to decision-making and benefit sharing.</p>

framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd		
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	Yes, well acknowledged.
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>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? 	Very good analysis of multiple categories of risk, including those related to resource tenure conflict, and challenges in influencing private sector towards pollution abatement. Climate aspects integrated.
6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives	Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?	Yes, good linkages indicated.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Yes.
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	As noted.
	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, well addressed.
8. Knowledge management. Outline the "Knowledge Management	What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?	Good preliminary indication of KM approach. Metrics of KM performance should be identified prior to CEO endorsement.

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 plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	Well integrated in design.

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>

<p>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>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:</p>
	<p>(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.</p>