

### STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
<b>GEF ID</b>	10700
<b>Project Title</b>	Implementation of the Strategic Action Programmes and the National Strategic Action Plans for the Integrated Water Resources Management in the Puyango-Tumbes, Catamayo-Chira and Zarumilla Transboundary Aquifers and River Basins
<b>Date of Screening</b>	23 November 2020
<b>STAP member screener</b>	Blake Ratner
<b>STAP secretariat screener</b>	Virginia Gorsevski
<b>STAP Overall Assessment and Rating</b>	<p><b>Concur</b></p> <p>STAP welcomes this project from UNDP to implement the Strategic Action Programmes and the National Strategic Action Plans for the Integrated Water Resources Management in the Puyango-Tumbes, Catamayo-Chira and Zarumilla Transboundary Aquifers and River Basins.</p> <p>This is an International Waters project with exceptionally clear, articulated linkages to chemicals and waste, biodiversity, climate change and land degradation objectives. Beyond adoption of management plans, transformational change is required to achieve an enduring shift in incentives for resource use and protection. The project offers good consideration of financing strategies and institutionalization of capacity beyond the project period.</p> <p>The theory of change clearly presents alignment of actions to address barriers identified. Assumptions are indicated but not clearly identified with particular causal connections in impact pathways.</p> <p>Prior TDA, SAP and NSAPs entailed significant, recent stakeholder engagement. With the advantage of this foundation, preliminary indications of expected</p>

	<p>stakeholder roles are adequate, but these should be further developed prior to CEO endorsement.</p> <p>The project provides a very good articulation of mitigating measures to address multiple external shocks potentially affecting project implementation (including but not limited to COVID-19).</p> <p>Prior to CEO Endorsement the project should consider additional risks related to private sector actions, including inadequate incentives to realign patterns of private investment and resource use.</p>	
<b>Part I: Project Information</b> <b>B. Indicative Project Description Summary</b>	<b>What STAP looks for</b>	<b>Response</b>
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.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	Yes.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes, building upon prior TDA-SAP.
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, clearly structured.
<b>Part II: Project justification</b>	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
<b>1. Project description.</b> <b>Briefly describe:</b> 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that	Is the problem statement well-defined?	Yes, very clearly presented.

need to be addressed (systems description)		
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes, with good data and 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?	
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, very thorough on basis of prior TDA-SAP.
	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;	
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	Theory of change clearly presents alignment of actions to address barriers identified.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Very clearly structured.
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	Very clearly structured, with quantified output targets.
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Assumptions are indicated but not clearly identified with particular causal connections in impact pathways.

	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, M&E and capacity building approaches oriented towards adaptive management.
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?	Rationale is well stated.
	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, with advantage of past investments to build upon.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Yes, with additional co-benefits well articulated.
	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?	Incorporation of climate modeling into plans for basin management clearly indicated. Climate risk screening annex provides good foundation for assessing particular risks to specific site interventions.
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?	IW project with clearly articulated linkages to CW, BD, CC, LD objectives. Potential innovations are evident in capacity building approaches, including Binational Water School, as well as integration of gender and youth elements in Gender and Intergenerational Training Plan.

	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Yes, with good consideration of financing strategies and institutionalization of capacity beyond project period.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Beyond adoption of management plans, transformational change required to achieve enduring shift in incentives for resource use and protection.
<b>1b.</b> Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Map provided; geo coordinates missing.
<b>2. Stakeholders.</b> 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?	Prior TDA, SAP and NSAPs entailed significant, recent stakeholder engagement. With the advantage of this foundation, preliminary indications of expected stakeholder roles are adequate, but these should be further developed prior to CEO endorsement.
	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?	Includes plans for industry roundtable focused on pollution reduction.

<p><b>3. Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment.</b> 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>Very good, specific data presented on low rates of women’s participation in management roles (administrative boards, basin councils, etc.). Preliminary indication of plans are appropriate.</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>Yes, clearly with regards to management decisions. Addressed through capacity building, IWRM decision-making and mainstreaming actions in anticipated Action Plan.</p>
<p><b>5. Risks.</b> Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being</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>	<p>Very good articulation of mitigating measures to address multiple external shocks potentially affecting project implementation (including but not limited to COVID-19). Consider additional risks related to private sector</p>

achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?</li> <li>• Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?</li> <li>• What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?</li> </ul>	actions, including inadequate incentives to realign patterns of private investment and resource use.
<b>6. Coordination.</b> 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, with clear institutional mechanisms indicated.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes, very clear identification of related initiatives and relevant linkages in the Baseline subsection.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Yes, building upon multiple insights from prior TDA, SAP, NSAP activities.
	How have these lessons informed the project’s formulation?	Prioritization of goals and activities.
	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.
<b>8. Knowledge management.</b> 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?	Knowledge management activities are well integrated in project design. Metrics for knowledge management performance should be developed prior to CEO endorsement.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	Good specification of plans for binational platform, in addition to typical IW:LEARN participation.

Notes

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
<p><b>1. Concur</b></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 <b><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></b></p>
<p><b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b></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><b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b></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>