

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10567
Project Title	Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Cienaga Grande de Santa Marta
Date of Screening	November 29 2020
STAP member screener	Rosie Cooney
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Minor</p> <p>STAP welcomes this proposal from IADB to improve production practices, hydrological functioning, and conservation management in the Cienaga Grande de Santa Marta, a very important biodiversity hotspot.</p> <p>This is in generally a clear, well-written proposal integrating work from the governance to the practical on-ground level and from within National Parks to agricultural production areas. The activities and outputs target the problem and appear well-designed to achieve the desired impact, although there is considerable reliance on identification of effective incentives measures at a later stage that will be capable of shifting producers' practices.</p> <p>The problem statement would benefit from considerably more detail, and the project would benefit from a clear explicit theory of change and more detailed plans for knowledge management. There is very little evidence of learning explicit lessons from previous projects (GEF/non-GEF, within Colombia or elsewhere).</p> <p>The project offers several potential new innovations that could shift the basic dynamics within this social-ecological system, at least if maintained over sufficient time. The new governance regime and the approach of shifting the incentives facing primary producers represent policy and economic innovations in the system. Technological innovation will be used to facilitate and improve monitoring.</p>

	Overall, STAP finds that this is a very promising project with potentially very significant biodiversity benefits.	
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, it is clear, and directly responding to the stated problems.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes, these are clear and support achievement of the objectives.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	The outcomes are clear and support important biodiversity benefits.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes, this does appear likely.
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, the outputs are all contributing to the outcomes, and in general do appear to be sufficient to achieve outcomes.
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?	The problem statement is clear, as far as it goes, but it is very short. More detail on the problem would be very welcome. For example, there is very little on the socio-economic context – this is necessary to understand the drivers here.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	As above – these are clear, but give very little detail. More data and references would be welcome, particularly on the threats, the deeper drivers that have led to these, and the socio-economic aspects of this system.
	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?	N/A

2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Yes, there is a very clear description of other initiatives in the landscape over this period.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Yes, this is reasonably clear.
	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;	N/A
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	No, no clear lessons from other initiatives are presented.
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	As above.
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	There is no graphic or explicit TOC. This would be a very useful tool to assist participatory planning and the development of an MEL framework – STAP recommends consulting the STAP TOC Primer for guidance on developing one (https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer). There is a reasonably implicit TOC embedded in the description of the project components. However, a TOC would capture the many interlinkages between the components, and the sequential states that must be achieved in order to progress toward achieving the goal. For example, component 3 of the project (involving agreements with individual producers to change practices) depends on achieving parts of component 2 (e.g. the watershed-level agreements). A good TOC enables the high-level (and “messy”) complexity of the changes in the world that the project seeks to bring about to be graphically captured, enabling better communication among all project stakeholders about what the project is trying to achieve and how.

	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Broadly, governance will be improved, technical knowledge will be increased, on-ground conservation interventions will take place, and production sectors will agree to change practices.
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	These are clearly laid out. They rest heavily on incentive-based approaches to changing the behaviour of production sectors – it would be good to see some consideration of regulation of this sector and whether better enforcement is also going to be necessary to achieve these objectives.
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Mainly, yes, but it is unclear what the incentives will be for the production sectors to change their practices, which is critical for the project to achieve its objectives. Incentives are discussed but the form they'll take is left to later stages. This is a really crucial aspect of project design, particularly in terms of durability of outcomes (i.e. will the incentives for better practice persist beyond the project?), so its success will to a large extent rest on the project identifying/crafting appropriate incentive schemes (which is not a simple task).
	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 is not clear and could be strengthened.
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, at least if successful. The identified GEBs are over 83K ha of PAs with improved management, and over 500K ha of production land under improved, more biodiversity-friendly management.
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	N/A
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, see above.

	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes – this is a very important wetland area and the proposed benefits are persuasive in relation to the level of investment (\$8.2m).
	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?	This is considered under the Risks section, with an in-depth assessment to be undertaken at PPG phase.
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 innovations that could shift the basic dynamics within this social-ecological system, at least if maintained over sufficient time. The new governance regime and the approach of shifting the incentives facing primary producers represent policy and economic innovations in the system. Technological innovation will be used to facilitate and improve monitoring.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	The project states that there is potential for scaling; however, does not provide a plan.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	The project aims at more fundamental transformational change here – by shifting who makes decisions, how they are made, and the economic drivers of key decisions.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Map is provided
2. Stakeholders. Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Yes, this appears comprehensive.

<p>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>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>The actual producers themselves are not identified as key stakeholders (though their umbrella organisations are) – as their actions will be critical presumably, they should also be identified here with a clear role. Otherwise roles and how they contribute to project achievements are clearly laid out.</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</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>No, there is very little information presented here on gendered aspects related to the proposal, such as gender roles in these production sectors, gendered impacts of environmental degradation, gendered differences in access to natural resources or roles in decision-making. This is left to PPG phase. Otherwise, however, measures to address gender in the project do appear thorough.</p>

<p>control over resources; participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services. 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>See above.</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? 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>The risks identified are reasonably comprehensive. Another key risk perhaps is that incentives provided are not attractive enough to enough producers to shift behaviour enough to achieve desired outcomes.</p> <p>Climate risk is recognised, and the need to adopt resilience measures in the face of it addressed (relevant measures align well with the intended outcomes of the project intervention in any case). In depth assessment is stated to be carried out in PPG phase.</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>No, this is not evident. It would be good to see explicit analysis of relevant lessons learnt from other initiatives in Colombia or elsewhere that were aiming to achieve similar outcomes – what worked and what didn't?</p>
	<p>Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?</p>	<p>No, see above.</p>
	<p>Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?</p>	<p>As above.</p>
	<p>How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?</p>	<p>As above.</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?	No mechanism to feed lessons learnt from previous projects appears evident. Coordination between this project and several other GEF projects is referred to. While the proposal refers to distilling lessons learnt to guide project management and to inform the public, it is not clear how it will share lessons with future projects.
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?	This section is not very clear, with knowledge management activities remaining quite vague - needs work at PPG stage.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	There is very little detail here on this about exactly how results, lessons and experience will be shared with the many stakeholders.

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>