

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response	
GEF ID	10875	
Project Title	Using marine spatial planning in the Gulf of Guinea for the implementation of payment for ecosystem services and coastal nature-based solutions.	
Date of Screening	9 November 2021	
STAP member screener	Blake Ratner	
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski	
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Concur.</p> <p>Logical and innovative project concept that clearly lays out the main issues, root causes, and barriers that stand in the way of reversing worsening conditions. Presentation is exceptionally clear and concise.</p> <p>Builds on numerous existing, related projects in this area but not duplicative – rather, very specific activities (MSP and PES) to provide economic incentives for actors in key sectors (fisheries, tourism, extractive) to address barriers.</p> <p>User-financed PES scheme has the potential to be highly innovative (though careful research is needed to understand potential trade-offs and pitfalls).</p> <p>Local communities and private sector at the heart of stakeholder engagement (innovative for a GEF project).</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. The objective of this project is “to implement a regional mechanism for nature-based solution implementation for habitat restoration and

		<p>maintenance using payment for ecosystem services in the countries of Togo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana (Gulf of Guinea).</p> <p>The stated objective reflects the main thrust of the project. However, it could be improved by beginning with the goal of the project rather than the mechanisms for achieving the goal.</p> <p>For example, the outcome highlighted in the TOC is a good place to start. It states: “Enhanced coastal and marine habitat, provision of services and livelihoods in the three FCWC target countries.” The objective could therefore be re-written to say something like: “Enhance coastal and marine habitat in x countries through coordinated spatial planning (MSP), economic incentives (PES), and nature-based solutions..”</p>
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project’s objectives?	
Outcomes	<p>A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.</p> <p>Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?</p>	Yes. Nature based solutions in particular are meant to provide benefits to people, including adaptation to climate change.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes.
Outputs	<p>A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project.</p> <p>Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?</p>	Yes (MSP + PES + NBS)
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,	Is the problem statement well-defined?	Yes, and well differentiated between negative trends and root causes. Exceptionally clear and concise.

root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)		
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes, barriers are well described and categorized.
	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 in terms of past and ongoing relevant projects in this area. Data on environmental trends is also good at this stage.
	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;	N/A
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	N/A
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	N/A
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	The TOC is provided in a separate document. It is simple but clearly lays out the logic of the separate components and how they will combine to contribute to the overall outcome of "Enhanced coastal and marine habitat..." It could be improved, however, with additional information on underlying assumptions. See STAP Primer on Theory of Change .
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	MSP + PES + NBS

	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	Components are exceptionally well explained.
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Yes, although PES schemes are varied and complex and there are several barriers to PES effectiveness that should be carefully researched prior to engaging in discussions with stakeholders. See PES and the GEF (dated, but still relevant).
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	Not explicit.
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.
	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
	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?	The NbS envisioned for this project should in theory contribute to the project's increased resilience to climate change.
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. Though each of these components (PES, MSP, and NbS) are not new, they offer the potential to develop innovative solutions within the broader framework of the TDA/SAP and alongside numerous other ongoing, related projects in the region.

		There is promise of learning related to “the flexible mechanism of cooperative governance” proposed.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	The scaling up is embedded in this project; there is some discussion of how – if successful – lessons could be applied to other parts of Africa.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		A map is provided.
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.	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	This project effectively incorporates stakeholder engagement from the beginning and for each component. Notably, local communities and the private sector are the main focus of this project, which is appropriate given the focus. However, in addition to national institutions, it seems likely that local government will also need to play an important role if implementation of MSP, PES and NBS is to be effective.
	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?	Roles described for broad stakeholder categories.

<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 framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no/tbd</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Information is preliminary but appropriate with reference to community-level concerns. Further attention is suggested with regards to decision-making and governance.</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>Not yet explained.</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,</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 	<p>Yes. The risks are valid and comprehensive. However, each of the components – particularly PES schemes (e.g. leakage) – carry with them additional risks and should be considered separately.</p>

propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design	<p>2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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? 	Climate change impacts are noted as a medium risk with mitigation measures embedded in Components 2 and 3 of the project.
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.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	There is adequate recognition of previous projects and recognition that this project will build on lessons learned from previous and ongoing activities.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	
	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?	
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?	<p>KM will take a "two way sharing system" approach which seeks to learn from past and ongoing projects and also generate new knowledge from the results of this effort.</p> <p>Strong focus on the knowledge generated from local communities on fishing practices, ecosystem service management and carbon compensation.</p>
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	IW:Learn and LME:Learn

Notes

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
1. Concur	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.
	* 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>
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	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:
	(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, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.
	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.

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.