

Part I: Project Information		Response
GEF ID	10182	
Project Title	Integrated Transboundary River Basin Management for the Sustainable Development of the Limpopo River Basin	
Date of Screening	5-Dec-19	
STAP member Screener	Blake Ratner	
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski	
STAP Overall Assessment		Minor issues to be considered during project design: STAP welcomes the project entitled "Integrated Transboundary River Basin Management for the Sustainable Development of the Limpopo River Basin" from UNDP. This is a fairly standard IW project design for TDA and SAP. STAP finds it very helpful to see a Theory of Change diagram included, with links between barriers and actions noted, and assumptions briefly indicated. Development pressures and livelihood / human security implications of current development trends are severe, meaning that there is an urgency to move from analysis and planning to sustained action. Stakeholder analysis is inadequate regarding civil society and private sector roles. Gender analysis is planned but the current document fails to identify key risks and opportunities. Knowledge management is emphasized but the approach not adequately specified.
<b>Part I: Project Information</b>		
<b>B. Indicative Project Description Summary</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, fairly standard for IW TDA & SAP, including minor implementation pilots
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.	Heavily focused on analysis and planning
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	Only if these lead subsequently to sustained, effective management actions
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Difficult to judge at this early stage
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, though outcomes are framed modestly
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
<b>1. Project description. Briefly describe:</b>		
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?	Immediate and root causes well specified
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes, with adequate data for this stage, given TDA is planned

	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?	Prior initiatives at regional and national levels summarized
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Preliminary
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Adequate for this stage
	For multiple focal area projects:	n/a
	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?	ToC diagram included, with links between barriers and actions noted. Assumptions briefly indicated.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	
	· What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	Linkages between capacity, analysis and planning well stated
	· Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Assumptions include state capacity, commitment, stakeholder engagement
	· Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	Strong recognition of capacity constraints
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?	Depends significantly upon ability of SAP to attract required investment, policy action and implementation.
	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?	Yes, but targets for improvement resulting from IWRM have not yet been identified.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes, potentially
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	Yes, in relation to standard IW targets

	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Not yet
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Risks acknowledged and integrated
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?	Not obviously; attempts to apply Source-to-Sea framework, noted as new for the basin
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Selection of pilot implementation efforts indicates a scaling logic
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Longer-term, sustained changes require fundamental transformation, particularly noting the already severe human risks from current trends
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		
<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?	Inadequate detail re plans for civil society and private sector engagement
	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?	Not clearly addressed, particularly with regards to efforts that move beyond government-led planning
<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. 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?	Very preliminary; indicates Gender Analysis and Action Plan anticipated but does not identify key issues
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	Not yet specified

<p><b>5. Risks.</b> 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>Political and coordination risks recognized; Key risk of development pressure and continued water / ecosystem degradation noted and appropriately ranked as high.</p>
	<p>Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?</p>	<p>Yes; requires more attention to private sector roles and livelihood stress</p>
	<p>For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p>	
	<p>- 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>	<p>Noted as high risk</p>
	<p>- Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?</p>	<p>Noted but not assessed in detail; part of the planned TDA</p>
	<p>- Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?</p>	<p>Anticipated as part of TDA</p>
	<p>- What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?</p>	<p>Anticipated as part of TDA</p>
<p><b>6. Coordination.</b> Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives</p>	<p>Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?</p>	<p>Links to regional initiatives and IW:Learn noted</p>
	<p>Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
	<p>Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?</p>	<p>Requires further development prior to CEO endorsement, especially regarding lessons from other IWRM efforts in the subregion</p>
	<p>How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?</p>	<p>Not obviously</p>
	<p>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?</p>	<p>Links to regional body (SADC) noted</p>
<p><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.</p>	<p>What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?</p>	<p>KM emphasized, including links among river basin organizations. But approach to KM not yet specified</p>
	<p>What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?</p>	<p>Not specified, beyond online sharing.</p>
<p><b>STAP advisory response</b></p>	<p><b>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</b></p>	
<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>	
<b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	<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>	
<b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b>	<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>	