

## REVISED STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE, OCTOBER 2022

GEF ID	11467
Project title	Greening Transportation Infrastructure Development
Date of screen	17 January 2024
STAP Panel Member	Ed Carr
STAP Secretariat	Alessandro Moscuza

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

STAP had already review the concept for this Integrated Program (IP), as well as some of the proposals for child projects to be implemented as part of it. This second review confirmed STAP's initial assessment that the program is built on a solid theoretical framework and rationale and that the intervention is justified in the current context. STAP also believes that this IP has the potential to generate impact in an area of work that is arguably under-served and often overlooked.

STAP's assessment of the program concluded that all the elements of the proposal are generally sound but that there are a few aspects related to some of its elements (i.e. program objective, outcome 4.1 and 4.2, barriers, baseline, ToC, and risk) which could be improved. A number of specific recommendations have been provided to address these issues, which should be addressed at the PPG stage.

The overall assessment for the program was that this is based on solid scientific and technical reasoning and presents only **minor** issues to be addressed during project design.

*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 proposal opened with a very well-written **program summary**, which conveyed all essential information about the program's objectives, justification and rationale clearly and concisely, including additional useful information and data about global infrastructure trends, NbS and green/sustainable infrastructure.

The **program objective** was clear and concise but STAP identified a potential mismatch with the level of ambition that would be more appropriate for a program of this size, scale and duration and has suggested that this should be rephrased to emphasize that this can only make a contribution to advancing the transition towards sustainable transportation infrastructure. The description of the program components was sound and provided a good balance between different types of activities that complemented one another well. STAP identified some inconsistencies related to the inclusion of gender consideration in component 4, which was aimed at "*building capacity and know-how to support up-scaling of project results, including specific gender considerations*". STAP was not clear why scaling project results or building capacity would require gender specific considerations and has made recommendations to address these.

The **program rationale** is sound and is supported by a comprehensive array of data and evidence from verified/reputable official sources. STAP noted the use of a table to describe key threats to be addressed in the five country projects, which it regarded as a useful feature.

The description of the **barriers** was very comprehensive and thorough, and STAP positively noted that this included an analysis of how barriers can also affect the successful implementation of project activities and the achievement of intended results. However, STAP also suggested a revision to the phrasing of one of the barriers (i.e. lack of coordination or conflicting priorities) which could be strengthened by focusing more on 'policy coherence'.

The description of **baseline activities** covered a good breadth of institutions, but the actual description provided for each of these types of institutions was too generic.

The **theory of change (ToC)** for this program is very simple, which in a way is helpful as it provides clarity and streamlines key concepts. However, STAP found that the absence of some ancillary elements (e.g. barriers, drivers and enablers) introduced a weakness, which should be rectified. Likewise, it is also important for a ToC to include the assumptions that support the causal pathways to achieving the program objectives. Notwithstanding this, STAP's assessment is that the overall ToC provides a very adequate theoretical framework for the project going forward. STAP, has also made a few recommendation to address the aforementioned issues.

The **stakeholder engagement** and **knowledge management & learning (KML)** sections of the proposal were found to be adequate. With regard to the section on KML, STAP also noted that the design team has already considered and integrated STAP's advice and recommendations into this proposal.

The **risk section** of the proposal covered an adequate range of risk categories, which were all assessed to be relevant. The ratings assigned to each category were also appropriate in each case. The analysis of how risks may be realized and/or impact the implementation of project activities was adequate, but the description of the proposed mitigation measures related to several risk categories (i.e. environmental & social, macro-economic, strategies & policies, technical design, and institutional capacity) could be improved (see section 3).

On a more general level, whilst STAP recognizes that this IP will deliver important development benefits to people and countries that really need them, the program would also benefit from greater clarity regarding the net mitigation benefits that can be achieved realistically. STAP recognizes that as a result of this program there will be lower construction emissions and probably lower emissions from environmental degradation. However, improved infrastructure will almost certainly result in greater emission from the use of that infrastructure. STAP is cognizant of the fact that these emissions will be lower than would have been without this program, but that there will be an increase in greenhouse gas emissions nonetheless, and this needs to be incorporated in the GEB estimation.

*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

STAP recommends the following:

- The **program objective** should be rephrased as follows: "*To contribute to the advancement of the transition towards sustainable transportation infrastructure that safeguards and enhances key coastal, marine, and terrestrial ecosystems,*" as this would be more aligned with the right level of ambition for a program of this scope, scale/size and duration.
- Under **outcome 4.1**, STAP recommends that if the intent is to tailor some capacity building activities to ensure these are relevant to the needs of women and other socially-vulnerable groups, then this should be stated

clearly. If not, then the description should clarify how gender considerations are relevant to these activities. The same applies to **outcome 4.2**, communications strategies should be relevant to all groups in society regardless, and it is also not clear how or why the dissemination of GRID results needs to take into account gender equality considerations.

- The description of the **barrier** related to “lack of coordination or conflicting priorities” should be revised to ensure this is focused more directly on “policy coherence”. The project designers should refer to STAP’s paper on policy coherence (<https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/policy-coherence-gef>).
- The section on the **existing baseline** should be revised and expanded to include at least a couple of specific/concrete examples for each category and, where possible, also hyperlinks to actual documents.
- The ToC should be revised to add further details. For example, it is possible that “*Increasing resilience by planning for and maintaining ecosystem services that reduce climate risks and mainstreaming Nbs*” could happen, but that is a very long causal connection that needs unpacking.
- The **ToC** should be revised to include a set of verified assumptions that would need to be realized in order for the program to be successful. STAP also recommends to consider the inclusion of other ancillary elements (e.g. barriers, drivers and enablers) to the ToC diagram to provide a more comprehensive picture of the program as a whole.
- STAP recommends that the description of the proposed **mitigation measures** related to several risk categories (i.e. environmental & social, macro-economic, strategies & policies, technical design and institutional capacity) be revised to be more directly focused on what the GRID program will do if any of those risks are realized, as opposed to describing what could be done or what different implementing partners should do.
- STAP recommends that the program should consider measuring the net emissions benefits it produces over the program lifetime as a minimum and ideally over the lifetime of the actual infrastructure that will be built. This effort will help countries better assess how child projects fit into such things as their Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs).

*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.*

## 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.)