

Part I: Project Information		Response
GEF ID		10177
Project Title		Promoting Climate-Resilient Livelihoods in Rice-Based Communities in the Tonle Sap Region
Date of Screening		May 23 rd , 2019
STAP member Screener		Toth, F.
STAP secretariat screener		Zommers, Z.
STAP Overall Assessment		Minor issues
		<p>The project intends to address weak climate resilience in the most important rice-growing region of Cambodia. The proponents observe that, despite many recent activities, the rice-growing communities in the region are still vulnerable to climate variability now and will be increasingly vulnerable to climate change in the future. Making rice-growing more robust in various ways (weather forecasting, technology and cultivar innovations, value chain improvements etc.) and diversifying income sources beyond rice are two independent and important ways to reduce excessive dependence on rice and thus enhance climate resilience.</p> <p>The PIF is well-conceived, and presents the project justification and most components properly. STAP recommends some improvements to strengthen project design, which will also facilitate implementation. These include: a theory of change with related contingency planning, specifying results in the form of more quantitative indicators, innovations (their nature, sources and complementarity) beyond those mentioned, risk assessment and management, and knowledge management. Rice paddies are an important source of atmospheric CH₄ (Cheng-Fang et al 2012), as well as other greenhouse gases. According to Cheng-Fang et al. (2012) the amount of CH₄ emitted from wetland paddy fields accounts for 10% to 20% of the total CH₄ emissions (i.e. 50 Tg yr⁻¹ to 100 Tg yr⁻¹). The project should include mitigation measures to reduce possible negative environmental impacts from GEF-related activities. Mitigation is briefly mentioned but should be considered further in the PPG stage. Additionally, the project team could consider examining ways to combine access to credit with extension services or early warning, for example through digital financial services (See the work of UN Capital Development Fund which has produced publication on Cambodia).</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?	Proper description. Yes.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.	Properly presented.
	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?	Good description. Yes.

Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	No proper theory of change presented.
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?	Yes, feasible basis for the planned activities, but no data for quantifying benefits.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Yes, robust.
	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;	Yes
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	Yes
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	In the formulation of activities and investments
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	No proper theory of change is presented. The planned outputs can be expected to lead to the intended outcomes and thus achieve the aims defined for the components.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Taken together, the four components constitute a plausible logical framework, although not as valuable as a full-blown theory of change.
	· 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, although they should be considered and proper fallbacks developed. Tying the specified sequence of actions and events together in a theory of change would also enable 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?	Yes
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	Yes. In fact, the incremental activities will significantly enhance the results of the baseline activities.
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?	GEBs are plausible but not specified. And, not one core indicator is named, let alone quantified. This should be supplemented.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes.
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	GEBs are not defined. Outcomes are mostly defined in terms of regional results.
	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?	A range of complementary activities that increase resilience in various ways.
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?	Tackling climate vulnerability from several angles simultaneously by complementary actions is a novel approach in the region, as most of the earlier projects have focused on single aspects and issues. Intentions to introduce different innovations are mentioned across the project components. Linking innovations with incentive mechanisms seems to be a meaningful way to channel benefits to the producers.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	The two-track way of making rice production more robust and fostering other income sources gradually is a promising way to enhance the climate resilience of the targeted communities over the long term.
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 and meaningfully combined
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 mentioned several times as an objective of this project. Gender risks and opportunities are identified, possible response measures mentioned, quantitative targets defined for benefiting women in training and capacity building activities. The PIF notes that woman compose 60% of the agricultural workforce but then the project only requires 40% female participation in Component 2 and 3. Could this be increased to 60% to reflect the true gender balance in the agricultural sector?
	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?	The identified risks are valid and cover a broad range; 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?	Yes
	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?	KM actions are part of each component and Component 4 is explicitly devoted to KM. A series of useful ideas are mentioned, but they should be organized into a purposefully designed KM system to foster its proper implementation.
	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.	