

Part I: Project Information		Response
GEF ID		10207
Project Title		Building climate resilient livelihoods in vulnerable landscapes in Bangladesh (BCRL)
Date of Screening		28-May-19
STAP member Screener		Toth, F.
STAP secretariat screener		Zommers, Z
STAP Overall Assessment		Minor issues
		<p>This project focuses on an extremely climate sensitive country, Bangladesh, where repeated disasters frequently amount to front-page news. It takes an integrated landscape approach to managing key natural resources (agricultural land, water, forests) which are usually covered separately by projects. This integrative treatment allows the consideration and implementation of a broader range of management options that might support and complement each other and are likely to lead to more efficient and more effective outcomes. Given the diversity of possible activities, STAP believes the project would benefit from a strengthened Theory of Change, that clearly articulates how the activities listed – which range from early warning systems to livelihood activities and financial support – will clearly result in increased resilience in each of the landscapes listed. As detailed in the PIF, Bangladesh has many adaptation and disaster risk reduction projects, led by the government, civil society and research organizations such as ICCAD. Indeed, “the government has invested more than 10 billion dollars over the last 3 decades to make the country climate-resilient”. Due to this laudable commitment by the government, Bangladesh is a world leader in adaptation. It is therefore strongly recommended that the project team clearly identify how this project will fill gaps or build on the already innovative work in the country. Further, justification should also be given for the choice of landscapes and how the project will truly use a landscape approach, tailoring action around landscape preservation or restoration, which are listed as indicators. In this context, the work on the Early warning system (2.1.2), seems out of place. Questions that should be answered include: Who are the users of the EWS? What hazards will be included in the combined system? How will it build on current systems? How will it be maintained after the end of the project? How will it add value to existing early warning systems in the country? Other items that require improvements include: specifying results in the form of more quantitative indicators, innovations (their nature, sources, complementarity) beyond the few mentioned, risk assessment and management, and knowledge management.</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?	Some GEBs may emerge, but focus is on national and local benefits.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	GEBs are possible, but they are not specified.

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?	Proper descriptions. But unclear if outputs will contribute to outcomes. The project should further justify and elaborate why the outputs are needed, how these relate to the landscapes selected and how they will deliver resilience. STAP recommends using the RAPTA guidelines to further design the project: http://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/RAPTA%20Guidelines%20-%20High%20Resolution.pdf
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	No formal theory of change. STAP strongly recommends that this is developed. See recommendation above with further details of how to develop a Theory of Change.
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. The integrative approach is likely to enhance efficiency and effectiveness. An important strength of the proposed project is its integrative approach overarching several single-issue baseline projects.
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?	Baseline is a feasible basis but no data is provided 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?	Thorough information gathering and utilization
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	Regrettably, no formal theory of change is presented.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	The planned outputs may lead to the intended outcomes and thus achieve the aims specified for the individual components. But they may not. Further, it is not clear that they will achieve landscape resilience which is the purported project objective. Many of the outputs or indicators are at the national or community level rather than the landscape level.
	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. 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?	Some GEBs may well be generated
	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 are possible, but not a single core indicator is quantified. This leaves some uncertainty about GEBs and should be corrected.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Given the severity of climate vulnerability in the targeted region, the national and local benefits are compelling.
	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?	A range of institutional, technological and other improvements will be implemented.
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?	It is difficult to detect noteworthy innovations beyond the project design that is somewhat innovative as it combines various aspects and levels of climate change adaptation. The combined treatment of agriculture, water and forestry in adaptation counts as innovation in this region, as does the diversification of agricultural activities, but little is presented about other types of intended innovations.
	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 institutional reforms at the national and regional scales raise hope for a profound transformational change that might lead to durable improvements in resilience to climate vulnerability and change.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Provided

<p>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.</p>	<p>Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
	<p>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?</p>	<p>Roles properly designed.</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Improving gender equality is declared 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.</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>No such hindrances are mentioned.</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?</p>	<p>The identified risks are valid but their scope is somewhat limited (5 altogether); most are outside the project's control. STAP welcomes the probability and impact rating provided but a scale for these ratings would have been useful.</p>
	<p>Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?</p>	<p>Yes</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>Climate risks are severe, but the central objective is to reduce vulnerability to them.</p>

	· 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; sources are listed as reference material.
	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 is one of the weak points. Useful ideas are presented in a short paragraph under Point 8, but a lot more would be needed. No overall KM plan is presented. The ideas presented under Point 8 are useful but they are mediocre and need substantial improvements to allow all results and benefits of the project to be disseminated and scaled 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.	