

Part I: Project Information		Response
GEF ID		10173
Project Title		Climate Resilient Urban Development in the Pacific
Date of Screening		29-May-19
STAP member Screener		Toth, F.
STAP secretariat screener		Zommers, Z
STAP Overall Assessment		Minor issues
		<p>The STAP notes that this is a program framework document, which states that there are child project PIFs for each country. However these have not been reviewed as the information is missing. It is difficult to evaluate whether this will really build urban resilience when little is known about what is planned in each country. Further LDCF funds are often only supplemental to a much larger investment. It is nice to see the two funds working together but the project team should more clearly articulate the exact added value of the GEF funds.</p> <p>Overall, STAP welcomes the comprehensive approach to making various components of the urban infrastructure climate-fit in a coordinated manner (e.g. water supply together with sanitation and wastewater management), and especially embedding climate adaptation in urban and land use planning. By adopting this approach, and building on other investments, results of the baseline projects would be significantly enhanced and become more effective. The diagnosis and the proposed cure are properly described, the investments and their outcomes convincingly argued – their framing in a simple but logical theory of change is particularly valuable.</p> <p>However, as stated, with the information provided in the specific document, it is difficult to evaluate the plans for each country or identify which activities GEF will specifically fund as compared to investments by GCF. For example, on page 20, it is noted that the project contributes to LDCF Outcome 1.1 (Technologies and innovative solutions piloted) and then lists a solar-powered desalination plant. Yet this is funded by GCF and not LDCF and should therefore not be included as evidence of technology transfer. As the projects are further developed, STAP encourages the project teams to develop a specific Theory of Change for each country, which articulates outputs and outcomes.</p> <p>A few additional items are mentioned below that should be improved to ensure a truly successful implementation of this project. They include options for on-the-fly course corrections should be conceived. The local value and benefits of the project are discernable, but it would be equally important to identify expected global environmental benefits and quantify them in terms of a few core indicators; a more systematic search for different types of innovations and the benefits of their coordinated implementation; a more comprehensive risk assessment and management plan; and an overarching knowledge management concept and a systematic KM plan. Finally, STAP encourages the project team to consider both hard and soft infrastructure or ecosystem based adaptation approaches.</p>
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 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.	Properly described.
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	Yes
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Reasonable likelihood
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
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	A simple but well-conceived theory of change is presented, supported by a chart. More detailed theory of change could be provided for each country as the activities are rather different.
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
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes
	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?	Yes
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?	Feasible basis, but no data for quantifying benefits.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Yes
	For multiple focal area projects:	Yes
	are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators;	Yes
	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?	Reports, evaluations, consultations.
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	A concise theory of change is presented.

	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	The planned outputs support the intended outcomes according to the schematic ToC, and thus achieve the aims specified for the individual components. The chart provides a useful overview of the ToC.
	· 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?	Yes
	· Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	No such concerns are presented. They should be considered and proper fallbacks developed. The presented theory of change could serve as a useful framework for this kind of contingency planning.
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?	Likely yes
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	Yes
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?	Some GEBs may well emerge, but the focus here is on local / regional resilience enhancement. Quantifying a few GEBs with core indicators would be desirable.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Benefits are plausible; investments are compelling, especially with a view to the currently rapidly worsening situation.
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	No. Beneficiaries are limited to the targeted urban areas. GEBs should also be estimated
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	No.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Human and institutional capacity building, soft and hard infrastructure investments.
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?	Innovative aspects include: integration of climate resilience building into urban land use planning and infrastructure development; coordinated GEF and GCF action; some technological and institutional innovation.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	No.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Given the prevailing negative trends, major transformational change will be required: bad drivers should be eliminated to stop degradation, and then capacity and infrastructure improvements implemented to further enhance resilience to current and future climate.

1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		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?	Yes
	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 properly designed
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	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	Improving gender equality is repeatedly mentioned as an objective of the project. Gender risks and opportunities are identified, possible response measures mentioned, but not much information is provided about them.
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	No such hindrances are mentioned.
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	Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?	Very few (four) risks are mentioned. They are valid and most are outside the project's control.
	Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?	Yes
	For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:	

	· 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?	Climate risks are severe, but the central objective is to reduce vulnerability to them.
	· Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?	Yes, a sensible initial impact assessment is presented, but more would be desirable in the next project development step.
	· Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?	Yes, they serve as starting point.
	· What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?	A promising plan is presented to address these issues
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?	Yes
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Yes
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	Reports, project documents and evaluations, consultations.
	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
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?	Many present-day communication channels (from blogs to conventional publications) are mentioned. Diversity is useful for reaching different kinds of audiences, but an overarching KM concept and a systematic KM plan would be needed to maximize knowledge dissemination.
	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	
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.	