

<b>Part I: Project Information</b>		<b>Response</b>
<b>GEF ID</b>		10193
<b>Project Title</b>		Fostering Water and Environmental Security in the Ma and Neun/Ca Transboundary River Basins and Related Coastal Areas
<b>Date of Screening</b>		15-May-19
<b>STAP member Screener</b>		Ratner, B.
<b>STAP secretariat screener</b>		Zommers, Z.
<b>STAP Overall Assessment</b>		Minor Issues
		Good analysis of current context and barriers, including explicit framing regarding water security and environmental security. Logical indicative project design. Likelihood of outcomes depends significantly upon quality of stakeholder engagement and commitment, including private and public sector investments. Assumptions, risks, and implementation mechanisms to learn and adapt should be elaborated as part of full project development. Description of stakeholder roles appears inadequate to deliver innovation in design of interventions and transformation in institutional relationships, or to ensure durable outcomes. This requires significant attention during full project design, in the noted "stakeholder engagement plan." See additional notes below.
<b>Part I: Project Information</b>	<b>What STAP looks for</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>B. Indicative Project Description Summary</b>		
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes, this project seeks to enable transboundary cooperation and action in Ma and Neun/Ca river basins and coastal zones.
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.	Yes, as no other transboundary management programs exist on these rivers, outcomes could be of significant environmental benefit.
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	
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?	Outputs are appropriate and coherent. Likelihood of outcomes depends significantly upon quality of stakeholder engagement and commitment, including private and public sector investments.
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?	Yes. Good explicit framing regarding water security and environmental security.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes, with quantification of trends.

	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?	Yes, with good treatment of land use, infrastructure, ecological and governance dimensions.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Additional quantification will be required.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Adequate.
	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;	N/A
	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?	A theory of change is not provided but the logic of activities, outputs and outcomes is clearly organized and well formulated.
	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?	Change mechanisms not explicitly stated but significant planned investment in intergovernmental cooperation, institutional strengthening, awareness building suggest plausible pathways to outcomes, despite significant institutional obstacles.
	· Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Assumptions, risks, and implementation mechanisms to learn and adapt should be elaborated as part of full project development. Note: Figure 1 Intervention logic not visible.
	· 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 clear but remains very general.
	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?	Appropriate to GEF IW focal area mandate. Biophysical aspects clearly measurable; institutional aspects require specification of progress indicators.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes, plausible but with high risks given low level of prior cooperation documented.
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	Yes, in general terms.
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Indicators are lacking.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Appropriate integration of climate trends; will require further specification during full project development.
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?	Ambition to integrate environmental security framing into TDA-SAP is welcome; questions remain on what this will mean in practice.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	IW:Learn integration noted, but otherwise no apparent plans for scaling within the countries and region; these would be good to specify.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Objectives suggest the need for transformation in basin-level planning and decision-making; not yet clear how this will be pursued and sustained after the project period. For example, will working groups be institutionalized after the project? How will pilots such as early warning systems be scaled up? How will the project catalyze follow-on investments?
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?	Yes, detailed description provided. Very heavily focused on government agencies, while plans for engaging national and international CSOs appear cursory (e.g., invitation to annual stocktaking meeting). Only survey and focus groups indicated as mechanisms for engaging ethnic minorities, the vast majority of the population in the basins.
	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?	Description of stakeholder roles appears inadequate to deliver innovation in design of interventions and transformation in institutional relationships. Requires significant attention during full project design, in the noted "stakeholder engagement plan." This should also integrate plans for private sector engagement.

<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. 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>Yes, detailed consideration, but much of the background information appears outdated and not particularly focused on the project scope. Need to clarify more specific obstacles in relation to areas of project intervention.</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>Project approach distinguishes well between appropriate elements of gender mainstreaming, training and policy integration</p>
<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>Inadequate, and very preliminary.</p>
	<p>Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?</p>	<p>No mention of institutional risks beyond high-level political will, nor aspects concerning scaling and transformational change. Discussion of barriers noted that key agencies "do not currently have sufficient regulatory power or adequate budget" but it is not clear how this risk will be mitigated.</p>
	<p>For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p>	
	<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> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?</li> </ul>	
<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>No indication of learning from other basin management projects, which is essential, particularly given the long record of application of the TDA-SAP approach within the GEF portfolio in other basins.</p>
	<p>Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?</p>	

	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	
	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?	
<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?	Some appropriate elements indicated, but description is inadequate to assess. No indication of metrics.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	
<b>STAP advisory response</b>	<b>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</b>	
<b>1. Concur</b>	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.	
	<i>* 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 "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>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	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.	
<b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b>	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.	