

REVISED STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE, OCTOBER 2022

GEF ID	12082
Project title	Integrated project to strengthen the resilience of vulnerable communities and ecosystems in a changing climate
Date of screen	13 May 2026
STAP Panel Member	Jon Barnett
STAP Secretariat	Alessandro Moscuza

1. Summary of STAP's views of the project

The proposal presents a relevant and generally well-justified LDCF investment to strengthen the resilience of vulnerable agricultural and urban/peri-urban communities in Dakar and the Niayes to recurrent flooding. It provides a convincing assessment of the baseline problem, including the interplay among changing rainfall patterns, rapid and poorly planned urbanization, wetland degradation, weak drainage, land-use pressure, and limited local capacity. The proposed focus on integrated water management, nature-based solutions, wetland and retention basin restoration, climate-resilient livelihoods, and green entrepreneurship is coherent and broadly aligned with the project context.

However, the proposal should be strengthened in several areas. The project summary should be shortened and clarified; the theory of change needs a clearer narrative; and the discussion of future climate, demographic, land-use, and sea-level-rise scenarios should be expanded. Component 2, which is central to the project's adaptation benefits, requires more technical detail on intervention selection, design, implementation, maintenance, costs, feasibility, and expected flood-risk reduction outcomes.

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.

The **Project Summary** presents a convincing rationale for the proposed LDCF investment that clearly identifies recurrent flooding in urban and peri-urban Dakar and the Niayes as a major climate-related risk, and appropriately links this risk to a range of geophysical and socio-environmental factors (e.g., changing rainfall patterns, rapid and poorly planned urbanization, degradation of wetlands and natural drainage functions, and the vulnerability of agricultural and flood-prone communities). However, this is also quite long and repetitive in places and would benefit from being shortened, as well as from more clearly distinguishing adaptation benefits from broader environmental, livelihood, and biodiversity co-benefits.

The **project objective** is relevant and generally well justified in relation to the system context described in the PIF. It appropriately focuses on strengthening the resilience of vulnerable agricultural and urban/peri-urban communities in Dakar and the Niayes to recurrent flooding, using integrated water management and nature-based solutions. However, it would also benefit from a clearer explanation of how the selected package of Nature-Based solutions (NbS), integrated water management, restoration, and livelihood interventions compare with other possible flood-management options, including grey infrastructure, relocation, drainage improvements, and

hybrid approaches, particularly under uncertain future rainfall, urban expansion, land-use pressure, and maintenance conditions.

The **Indicative Project Overview** is also broadly coherent, with components covering planning and governance, restoration of retention basins and wetland ecosystems, climate-resilient livelihoods and green entrepreneurship, and knowledge management. This structure responds to key drivers of vulnerability identified in the proposal, including unplanned urbanization, degradation of wetlands and natural drainage functions, weak integration of NbS into planning, and limited technical and financial capacity. However, it is not very clear when the actual implementation of restoration and rehabilitation will take place (component 2, page 7), who will do this, and where the significant co-financing (\$33,930,000) will come from. The project description is instead a bit repetitive and focuses more on capacity enhancement.

The **project outline** provides a good explanation of the problems to be addressed, their drivers, and, on this basis, a sound **rationale** for the proposed actions and their locations. Overall, this section of the proposal offers a good description of the current conditions on the ground and the risks posed by climate change. It is also informed by evidence, including good use of information about climate trends. The statement about the proposed exit strategy is welcome. The proposal does a good job of identifying related projects and programs, as well as synergies between them and this proposed project. Similarly, it has an extensive list of plans and policies that pertain to its activities.

The use of **future narratives** in the proposal is quite limited, with minimal exploration of how climate, social, demographic, and other factors/drivers may interact, and how the project's activities will be robust to different plausible futures. The influence of sea-level rise on the project sites is also not well considered.

The proposal identifies a relevant set of **barriers** to achieving the proposed adaptation outcomes, including fragmented governance and planning frameworks, limited technical and financial capacity to design and implement NbS, and weak access to capital for smallholder farmers. These barriers are consistent with the **baseline problem** described in the PIF, which identifies recurrent flooding, unplanned urbanization, weak drainage, wetland degradation, land-use pressure, and limited local capacity as key factors expected to continue increasing vulnerability in the absence of the project. However, the analysis is somewhat generic and could be more operationally specific, especially regarding strategies to address the identified issues. For example, as explained below, it provides little information about the local actors, their circumstances and livelihoods, and the possible incentives to engage with and support the project's activities.

It is good that the project includes an explicit discussion of sustainability (pg.22 para 59). However, greater recognition of the role of the people living in the flood-affected areas (i.e., 'stakeholders'), and whose livelihoods may change is needed, because ultimately, if the project does not meet these people's needs, they will not continue to invest in the practices the project seeks to promote. More information on who the affected populations are and what they do would therefore help. The same is true for women – what do they do, and how might the project undermine or enhance their well-being? Examples of the kind of nature-based activities and livelihoods these might enable would be very helpful for the full proposal. More information about the roles of various Ministries in Senegal and their potential mandates with respect to this project would be helpful for the full proposal, especially in light of the GEF's desire to achieve policy coherence.

The **Theory of Change** seems reasonable, but it needs to be supplemented with a more detailed narrative explaining the underlying intervention logic and preferred impact pathways. The **ToC diagram** is difficult to read and needs a clearer image.

The **component structure** is broadly coherent and reflects the main elements of the theory of change (i.e., planning and governance for NbS; restoration and rehabilitation of retention basins and wetland ecosystems; climate-resilient livelihoods and green entrepreneurship; and communication, knowledge management, and M&E). However, the level of detail across the components is uneven. **Component 1** provides a useful description of the proposed governance and planning interventions, including the establishment of local coordination

committees and community/institutional management associations. Currently, there is insufficient discussion of **Component 2**, which is the central investment component and the primary basis for the project's expected adaptation benefits. The PIF lists a range of possible NbS measures, including wetland restoration, revegetation, permeable surfaces, rain gardens, swales, watercourse rehabilitation, rainwater harvesting, and climate-resilient agriculture, but it does not yet provide enough technical detail on how these measures will be selected, designed, sequenced, implemented, maintained, and monitored in the specific hydrological, ecological, land-use, and institutional context of Dakar and the Niayes. The ambitious restoration and rehabilitation targets also require stronger justification, including evidence that the proposed interventions are technically feasible, socially acceptable, and likely to deliver measurable flood-risk reduction and resilience benefits. **Component 3** also provides a relevant rationale for supporting climate-resilient value chains, green entrepreneurship, and improved access to finance.

The project is based on a good assessment of **risks**, which can be used to inform simple scenarios about plausible futures, how the project might shift these toward better outcomes, and the risks that some scenarios pose to the project (see STAP brief on [Simple Future Narratives](#)).

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

-Revise the **project summary** to make it shorter, clearer, and more strategically focused, with a concise explanation of the climate risk, target beneficiaries, proposed NbS and integrated water-management approach, and expected adaptation benefits.

-Refine the **project objective** to present a clearer explanation of: i) why the selected integrated NbS and water-management approach is preferred over, and how it will complement alternative flood-management options, including grey infrastructure and relocation; and ii) to justify the proposed restoration and livelihood targets in light of future climate uncertainty, land-use pressure, and long-term maintenance requirements.

-Strengthen the description and technical justification of **Component 2**. The next iteration of this proposal should explain: the scientific and hydrological basis for the proposed NbS measures; the criteria for selecting sites and interventions; the expected flood-risk reduction and ecosystem-resilience pathways; and the arrangements for long-term maintenance and monitoring. It should also justify the scale of the proposed restoration and rehabilitation targets, clarify how urban/peri-urban flood-management interventions will be linked to wetland and agricultural resilience in the Niayes. (See STAP guidance on: [Enabling Elements of Good Project Design](#)).

-Provide greater detail on the proposed interventions, including their technical design, expected costs, sequencing, and implementation arrangements, and use this information to assess whether the project's proposed targets are realistic and feasible.

-Develop a small number of **simple future scenarios** that explore how climate change, including sea-level rise and flood risk, land-use pressure, ecosystem degradation, institutional capacity, and other drivers, may evolve. This should then inform the design and selection interventions that are robust across the plausible futures. The risk section could then be used to address residual risks that could impact implementation and durability. (For additional guidance, see: [STAP brief on Simple Future Narratives](#)).

-Clarify the roles, mandates, and coordination responsibilities of the relevant ministries and public institutions in Senegal, particularly in relation to flood management, urban planning, water resources, agriculture, wetlands, and ecosystem restoration. (See STAP guidance on: [Multi-stakeholder dialogue for transformational change](#)).

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.)