

Part I: Project Information		Response
GEF ID		10172
Project Title		Towards the Transboundary Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) of the Sixaola River Basin shared by Costa Rica and Panama
Date of Screening		15-May-19
STAP member Screener		Ratner, B.
STAP secretariat screener		Zommers, Z.
STAP Overall Assessment		Minor Issues
		The project description suggests a reasonable likelihood of improving transboundary governance, though magnitude of benefits depends critically on success in scaling particular innovations within the basin and beyond. Lacks quantification of baseline scenario from which to measure future change. Good, preliminary description of dimensions of sustainability, including social and financial aspects, which should be elaborated during full project preparation. Planning for climate change impacts needs to broaden beyond flood risks. Knowledge management plans should indicate how learning processes and adaptive management will be supported, ideally in relation to an explicit theory of change.
Part I: Project Information	What STAP looks for	Response
B. Indicative Project Description Summary		
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes. Project seeks to strengthen transboundary multi-stakeholder action in Sixaola River Basin to restore riverine and coastal ecosystems, reduce pollution from agriculture and reduce risks from hydrometeorological disasters.
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.	Planned effects include increased understanding of challenges, increased forest cover, land management and water quality, capacity of communities to response to floods strengthened, improved knowledge.
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Reasonable likelihood of improving transboundary governance, though magnitude of benefits depends critically on success in scaling particular innovations within the basin and beyond.
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?	Well organized and coherent in relation to targeted 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?	Yes. Good use of tables to describe threats and barriers.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	
	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?	Thorough description of related project investments. Lacks quantification of baseline scenario from which to measure future change, but gaps are noted as part of rationale for TDA.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	
	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 and mechanisms of change are implied rather than explicit.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Good linking of project elements to particular barriers.
	· What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	
	· Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Given the long history of projects in the area, some focusing on transboundary management, additional value of this project investment should be more clearly specified.
	· Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	

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?	Reasoning is plausible. Good specification of contributions to Aichi targets.
	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, and are they measurable?	Description of GEBs is very general, without an indication of the magnitude of benefits from which to judge their value.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Indicators not provided.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's 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?	No particular indication of innovation within the TDA approach. Other descriptions such as "innovative approaches to institutional design and stakeholder participation" are too vague to evaluate.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Good, preliminary description of dimensions of sustainability, including social and financial aspects, which should be elaborated during full project preparation.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	The value of pilot interventions depends very significantly on actions taken to increase the likelihood of scaling. For example, reducing agrochemical run off, wastewater treatment or silting will likely need large scale interventions around the basin, beyond the scope of the project investment. Similarly, the PIF notes that problems with early warning systems include lack of models as well as the need for equipment provision and renovation; these will need to be addressed to achieve impact at scale.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		

<p>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.</p>	<p>Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?</p>	<p>Adequate description of stakeholders, but roles are focused on preparation stage. No indication of how stakeholder engagement will address barriers. To specify during project preparation.</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>Given the importance of banana production, it would also be good to further elaborate planned private sector partners and their motivations for participating</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 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>Limited and generic. Should relate more specifically to project objectives and barriers. (Also mentioned among risks below.)</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>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?</p>	<p>Risks appear valid but incomplete and also focused mainly on project implementation as opposed to risks that could undermine scaling of outcomes and benefits</p>
	<p>Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?</p>	
	<p>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? 	<p>Climate change mentioned but only in terms of floods. Will climate change also impact agricultural production or forest dieback, etc., in the area? This is predicted to be a risk for central American forests. For example, the IPCC Special Report on 1.5 degrees notes that, "Warmer and drier future conditions at 1.5°C and 2°C suggested an increase in fires, drought, pathogens and insect activity, which will lead to forest dieback. Some tropical and temperate forests retreated because of increased aridity, while savannas expanded. Particularly vulnerable regions are Central and South America . . . With a global warming of close to 1.5°C in 2050, a biomass decrease of 20% is projected for tropical rainforests of Central America." Project design should ensure these risks are addressed in the SAP.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures? 	
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?	Description of related initiatives appears incomplete and gives no indication of rationale or focus of coordination.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Some indication of lessons provided earlier under description of "International Cooperation." More specific identification of key lessons will be critical to ensure this project builds upon others and avoids similar pitfalls
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Many other initiatives are relevant. For example "Climate Change Governance Capacity: Building Regionally and Nationally Tailored Ecosystem-based adaptation in Mesoamerica" focused on optimizing transboundary water resources management. Project preparation should further articulate how the proposed project will layer and integrate outcomes and outputs with ongoing or completed initiatives.
	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?	Brief description of KM plans focus on documentation and online sharing, with no clear indication of how learning processes and adaptive management will be supported. Good mention of cultural adaptation and accessibility in indigenous languages.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	
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>	