

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

| Part I: Project Information | Response |
|---|--|
| GEF ID | 10320 |
| Project Title | Strengthening the climatic resilience of the drinking water sector in the South of Haiti |
| Date of Screening | 14 May 2020 |
| STAP member screener | Ed Carr |
| STAP secretariat screener | Guadalupe Duron |
| STAP Overall Assessment and Rating | <p>Minor issues to be considered during project design.</p> <p>STAP welcomes UNDP’s project “Strengthening the climatic resilience of the drinking water sector in the South of Haiti”. The project aims to strengthen capacities, tools, infrastructure, and systems to make water supplies resilient to climate change. The problem statement, with regard to access to adequate safe drinking water, is well-defined and supported with evidence. Furthermore, the climate change projections are clear and STAP appreciates that they represent a range of possible outcomes.</p> <p>The PIF is hampered by the lack of data on the connection between the climate, particularly precipitation, and water availability. While it is clear that precipitation impacts both, the extent to which it does, and therefore the likely extent to which future changes will create new stresses, is not quantifiable (aside from a single estimate). STAP suggests that at the PPG stage the project attempt to gather more data about this critical connection between climate and water supply to ensure project activities are targeted to the most effective points of intervention.</p> <p>In addition, STAP recommends developing a theory of change and identifying the assumptions that underlie the outputs and outcomes. Monitoring the process of change will help validate the assumptions that are embedded in the PIF.</p> <p>Below, STAP describes further its recommendations.</p> |

| Part I: Project Information B. Indicative Project Description Summary | What STAP looks for | Response |
|--|--|--|
| Project Objective | Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis? | Yes, it is. |
| Project components | A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives? | <p>The project will conduct participatory community-level vulnerability analysis related to water access, while simultaneously building capacity in the government to take up, understand, and act on the results of this analysis. The vulnerability analysis will inform a participatory approach to the identification of local actions around water management, including changes to and strengthening of local governance structures and the introduction of mechanisms for water pricing to facilitate the maintenance of water facilities. Once this work has made the sustainable implementation of interventions viable, the project will put in place concrete actions and investments to address the identified vulnerabilities.</p> <p>Broadly speaking, these activities do support the project's objectives.</p> |
| Outcomes | A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits? | The expected effects are not distinguished between short- and medium-term, but focus on increased resilience to climate change impacts by addressing climate-related vulnerabilities to the drinking water supply. This is an adaptation benefit. |
| | Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated? | Adaptation benefits are 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? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A vulnerability assessment • Capacity-building materials for government at scales from the community to the national • Concrete interventions that address specific vulnerabilities for communities in southeast Haiti. <p>The sum of the outputs will contribute to the outcomes.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Part II: Project justification</p> | <p>A simple narrative explaining the project’s logic, i.e. a theory of change.</p> | <p>According to the PIF, the project will build household resilience to climate change impacts by improving the drinking water supply in the South-East Department of the country. While the theory of change appears to be that the drinking water supply will be strengthened through both increased capacity and knowledge and through concrete resilience measures, it is less clear how the improved drinking water relates to increased resilience. STAP suggests the project specifically articulate how the project’s efforts to address vulnerabilities in the water supply will result in greater resilience – what will these communities be more resilient to? How does the water supply contribute to that resilience?</p> |
| <p>1. Project description. Briefly describe: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)</p> | <p>Is the problem statement well-defined?</p> | <p>The problem statement, with regard to access to adequate safe drinking water, is well-defined and supported with evidence. Further, the climate change projections are clear and STAP appreciates that they represent a range of possible outcomes. The PIF is hampered by the lack of data on the connection between the climate, particularly precipitation, and water availability. While it is clear that precipitation impacts both, the extent to which it does, and therefore the likely extent to which future changes will create new stresses, is not quantifiable (aside from a single estimate from UNDP). STAP suggests that at the PPG stage the project attempt to gather more data about this critical connection between climate and water supply to ensure project activities are targeted to the most effective points of intervention.</p> |
| | <p>Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?</p> | <p>Yes, they are, with the exception of the connection between precipitation and water availability mentioned above.</p> |
| | <p>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-</p> | <p>Does not apply</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | defined, and can it only be supported by integrating two, or more focal areas objectives or programs? | |
| 2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects | Is the baseline identified clearly? | <p>The baseline is as well-defined as it can be, given the absence of data on the connection between climate conditions and water availability. The PIF is forced to assume that changing climate conditions will impact water availability, but cannot quantify these potential changes. Therefore, the description of existing work in the baseline is more detailed than the likely outcomes of this baseline for water availability. This is a challenge, as understanding this connection is central to addressing one of the key barriers targeted by this project – for example, the PIF states that “Existing and proposed water supply systems will fail to meet local water needs if the impacts of CC on runoff rates, spring yields and aquifer levels aren’t taken into consideration. Communal water fountains may become redundant if they depend on springs that dry up under the expected droughts conditions. Additionally, the capacities of reservoirs and tanks designed on the basis of the current dry season durations are likely to prove themselves inadequate when dry seasons become prolonged as a result of CC and wells may dry up if their depth was calculated without taking into account expected future falls in water table levels.” All of this is true, but currently none of these measures seem readily available. It is not clear that the project can remedy this problem at the PIF level, but STAP recommends an effort to better understand the connection between precipitation, temperature, and water availability in the project area at the PPG stage.</p> |
| | Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project’s benefits? | <p>The baseline does not provide a feasible basis for quantifying benefits, such as the change in the number of people with access to safe drinking water, or the amount of safe drinking water that is available. It is reasonable to assume that the project will improve both of these measures against the</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | baseline, but give the knowledge gap outlined above, quantifying those improvements will be difficult. |
| | Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project? | Given the knowledge gaps claimed in the PIF, the baseline is as robust as is reasonable to expect, and the assumption that the project would improve access to safe drinking water against the baseline seems reasonable. |
| | 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; | Does not apply |
| | are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and | Does not apply |
| | how did these lessons inform the design of this project? | Does not apply |
| 3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project | What is the theory of change? | There is no succinct theory of change in the PIF. The assumption appears to be that with appropriate data and governmental capacity, it will be possible to conduct a participatory vulnerability assessment that can be taken up by the government and addressed through investments in infrastructure and other interventions, which will result in increased resilience of the quality water supply in the project area relative to the baseline. STAP recommends the project develop a clear theory of change to make its assumptions transparent, and the relationship of its proposed activities and goals clear. The project team can rely on STAP's primer for developing the theory of change: https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer |
| | What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes? | The project will draw upon existing data to inform the design of participatory community-level vulnerability analysis related to water access. At the same time, the project will build capacity in the government to take up, understand, and act on the results of this analysis. These actors will then use the vulnerability analysis to inform a participatory approach to the identification of local actions |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | | around water management. These actions will include substantial changes to and strengthening of local governance structures, as well as the introduction of mechanisms for water pricing to facilitate the maintenance of water facilities. Finally, the project will implement concrete actions and investments, such as reforestation of water sources and deepening of wells, to address the identified vulnerabilities. |
| | What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives? | See above |
| | Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions? | Some mechanisms of change seem plausible, but others seem to require substantial assumptions. For example 1) why would the government respond to concrete data regarding climate stress on water, if there is already stress and it is not being addressed? 2) If there is no data on how changes in precipitation and temperature will impact water sources, how will it be possible to conduct a valid vulnerability analysis? 3) The project seems to assume that communities will willingly shift governance practices, and willingly accept pricing on water, but does not point to any possible issues with either. |
| | Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes? | While the problem description presents a range of possible climate futures for the project, the alternative scenario does not take these up and therefore does not address the changes that might have to be made to the project during implementation. Further, the assumptions about the feasibility of the social and governance changes expected suggest the need to assess the ways in which the project may have to adapt its activities to achieve its goals if these changes prove difficult or incomplete. STAP suggests the project would benefit from the consideration of a range of climate scenarios, and outcomes of social change/ governance change programming, to identify |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | | potential adaptations that might be needed to ensure the project achieves its goals. |
| 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? | Does not apply |
| | LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change? | The proposed activities, if executed as planned, will reduce the vulnerability of the water supply and people's access to quality water, build adaptive capacity in the water system, and increase the resilience of that system to climate change. |
| 6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) | Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits, and are they measurable? | Yes, these are adaptation benefits, but as noted above, measuring these benefits will be challenging because of key knowledge gaps around water supply recharge and precipitation. |
| | Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment? | The scale of projected benefits is reasonable. |
| | Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined? | The adaptation benefits are explicitly defined. |
| | Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation? | The measurement is focused on number of beneficiaries, but as noted above it will be challenging to develop measurements of impact on water availability and quality relative to the baseline without more knowledge of water supply recharge. |
| | What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change? | See discussion of adaptation required during project implementation above. |
| 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? | The project's claims to innovation lie in several areas: 1) Its multi-sector approach, including working with actors beyond the water sector. This is not that innovative an approach, but it is appropriate to the project. 2) Its use of low-cost, locally appropriate technologies. The technologies employed might be innovative in this specific context, but this approach is not particularly innovative (but again, is appropriate). |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | Therefore the project is not particularly innovative in a global sense, but does appear to have the potential to introduce innovations in approach to the Haitian context. |
| | Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors? | The project suggests that its measures will be replicable in Haiti because the issue of water access and climate change is pervasive. The project activities aimed at capacity-building for climate-change related planning and management suggest that such scale-up would be an inherent part of the project. |
| | Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability? | Most of the project focuses on incremental adaptations to water management practices, but the activities around shifts in local governance and water pricing may introduce transformational changes to the lives of those in the project communities. |
| 1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place. | | The PIF provides a map of Haiti, and a map of the Sud-Est where the project will take place, but states that geo-referenced information for specific project sites will be provided at the PPG stage. STAP's earth observation guidance is a resource the project team can use to specify the geo-referenced information (see page 64): https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/GEF%20EO%20Mainstreaming%20March2020%20Final%2020200331-v3.0.pdf |
| 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 | Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers? | The list of stakeholders to be engaged is extensive and, at least on the side of organizations, is likely comprehensive. The PIF also notes that youth and women will be key stakeholders requiring special engagement. However, there is little discussion of engagement with community members beyond water committees, which the PIF notes are of varying organization and effectiveness. Given a goal of the project is to improve the well-being of the people using the water resources to be protected, STAP suggests the project explicitly consider how it will engage with communities beyond water committees, and how it might |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>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>identify other relevant marginal groups in these communities (beyond women and youth) whose viewpoints and experiences might provide important information for the project.</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>The roles of the stakeholders are not well-defined in the PIF. Many of the organizations seem to be included as recipients of training and capacity-building, but not as sources of information or direction for the project. STAP suggests the PIF more clearly articulate the roles of the different stakeholders mentioned in the alternative scenario, with particular attention to how their roles will contribute to project design and the achievement of project outcomes.</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.</p> | <p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p> | <p>The PIF identifies gender-differentiated risks and opportunities, as well as preliminary response measures. The focus on GBV, while important, is not well-connected to the project narrative. It is not clear if GBV might be an outcome of the project unless carefully implemented, or if the reduction of existing GBV is part of the project goals. STAP recommends this be clarified, and if GBV reduction is a project goal, it needs to be raised in the problem statement, the baseline, and the alternative scenario.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /td | | |
| | Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed? | The PIF does not make this clear. It might be that the references to GBV are about the hindrances to participation that women face, but it is not clear in the PIF. |
| 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>Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control? Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?</p> <p>For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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? • Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed? • Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with? • What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures? | The risks listed do not include any consideration of environmental events or trends. For example, there is no consideration of the impact of a hurricane on the project, despite Haiti's exposure to this hazard. Further, there is no consideration of how climate extremes related to larger patterns of variability might impact the project. While the project is intended to address the risks climate change poses to quality water access, it does not address the risks of climate events or variability on the project itself. STAP recommends the project carefully consider such risks, assess the sensitivity of the project to them, and propose means of addressing them. |
| 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? | Lessons from baseline projects (DINEPA/AECID/UNDP and UNDP/LDCF project on adaptive capacities) will inform the development of component 3. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | 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? | While highlighted as important to the project and its goals, the approach to knowledge management is unclear in the PIF. Generally, the PIF mentions emphasizing systemization (but it is not clear what would be systematized) and the generation of dissemination instruments (though none are named). The PIF mentions identifying lessons and creating dissemination instruments both within the project, and in partnership with national universities and NGOs. STAP suggests the PIF clarify what is to be systematized, and more clearly articulate some examples of the dissemination instruments envisioned. |
| | What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience? | See above. |

Notes

| 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. |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</p> | <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> |