

Part I: Project Information		Response
GEF ID		10199
Project Title		Improving Water Availability in The Gambia's Rural and Peri-Urban Communities for Domestic and Agricultural Use
Date of Screening		29-May-19
STAP member Screener		Toth, F.
STAP secretariat screener		Zommers, Z.
STAP Overall Assessment		Minor issues
		Water supply is a serious problem in the targeted region already under current climatic conditions and is likely to deteriorate under climate change. This project seeks to strengthen water supply infrastructure (e.g. water source points and schemes for agriculture and domestic use), increase awareness, improve technical capacity for water management planning, strengthen community level water and development committees. Efforts to improve domestic and agricultural water supply in combinations may have some benefits, although the quantities are at different orders of magnitude and quality requirements are also rather different. During the planning stage, it would be useful to assess the pros and cons of the intended combined strategy and further articulate how agricultural vs domestic water use needs will be addressed. The presented project structure is solid; it provides a good framework for building on the baseline projects and for implementing complementary activities and investments. Indeed, given the previous work by the projects in the baseline scenario, the proposed project could act as a catalyst, greatly improving climate resilience. Most project components and actions are well argued and clearly presented. However, a few items would require improvements to make the project design more robust and its implementation easier. These items (see also below) include: a theory of change with related contingency planning, specifying results in the form of more quantitative indicators, innovations (their nature, sources, complementarity) beyond those mentioned, risk assessment and management, and knowledge management. It is not clear that the indicators listed in the PIF are relevant to this project.
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; activities support objectives.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.	Clearly described.
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	Yes
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes
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?	OK
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	Reasonable likelihood.

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?	No formal theory of change is presented.
	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, integrative approach may have benefits.
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 for investments in the alternative scenario, 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:	
	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?	Reports and evaluations of earlier projects; direct communication.
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	No formal theory of change, regrettably.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	The planned actions and outputs (Table in Part I B) can be expected to lead to the intended outcomes and thus achieve the aims specified for the individual project components. Taken together, these components constitute a reasonable logical framework, although not as valuable as a full-blown theory of change would be.
	· 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?	Properly described.
	· 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. Tying the specified sequence of actions and outputs 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?	Some GEBs may well emerge, but they are not specified in any form. Are 0 and 0.00 presented in Part I E the best estimates of core indicators as achievements of this project?
	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?	GEBs are not specified; focus is on local / regional benefits
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	No
	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?	The main objective is to increase the climate resilience of the targeted region through various actions and 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?	Somewhat surprisingly (in the late 2010s), several baseline projects plan investments without or with very little consideration of climate change. Under these conditions, the project is innovative, because it intends to explicit improve the climate resilience of those investments. Only a few innovative elements are mentioned, but there is no indication of how they will be scaled up.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Drivers of degrading trends need to be eliminated and this requires transformational changes, otherwise mounting future socioeconomic and environmental pressures may swamp the project's achievements.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	STAP appreciated discussion of financial and operation sustainability of the water systems. This should further be explored during the project preparation phase to ensure that water supply systems can be maintained after the project finishes.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Provided. It would be useful to have further information on specific locations and if this overlaps with infrastructure provided in baseline projects
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 are properly conceived. During the project preparation phase further consideration of private sector roles may be warranted. It is stated that they will help implement certain activities related to infrastructure. How will the partners from the private sector be chosen? A transparent system of procurement or selection should be identified and further elaborated
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 the project. Gender risks and opportunities are identified, possible response measures mentioned, but little 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?	The identified risks are valid but their scope is somewhat limited (7 in all); 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 the starting point.
	· 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?	Yes. A GEF project implemented by UNEP is mentioned and collaboration will be sought.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Properly
	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?	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?	The importance of KM is acknowledged but this PIF does not provide an overall KM plan at all. The ideas presented under Point 8 are useful but they are somewhat simplistic and need substantial improvement to allow all results and benefits of the project to spread and scale up.
	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.	