

**STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects**

<b>Part I: Project Information</b>	<b>Response</b>	
<b>GEF ID</b>	10344	
<b>Project Title</b>	Improved Financial Sustainability and Strengthened Resilience of Protected Areas Through Development of Sustainable Recreation and Partnership with Private Sector	
<b>Date of Screening</b>	20 May 2020	
<b>STAP member screener</b>	Rosie Cooney	
<b>STAP secretariat screener</b>	Virginia Gorsevski	
<b>STAP Overall Assessment and Rating</b>	<p><b>Minor</b></p> <p>STAP welcomes this project from UNEP to address the challenges of climate change and inadequate financing for protected areas in Bosnia-Herzegovina, through targeted management interventions and boosting PA financing through tourism.</p> <p>Generally speaking, STAP finds that the project is sound and well-structured, with interventions well-targeted to threats. The reliance on tourism requires careful evaluation given the crisis facing tourism globally. The project could be much more clearly-written: there is much vague language, repetition, or material that would be better placed in different sections. In a number of areas project plans have left much detail to the PPG phase. A robust explicit theory of change is an important step in planning – see <a href="#">STAP Primer on Theory of Change</a>.</p>	
<b>Part I: Project Information</b> <b>B. Indicative Project Description Summary</b>	<b>What STAP looks for</b>	<b>Response</b>
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	The objective is stated as “To achieve practical PA management improvement and better biodiversity status through strengthened resilience of key biodiversity values to climate change

		impact and increased revenues from sustainable recreation.” While the objective emerges clearly in the project, it could be expressed much more simply and directly e.g. Improve biodiversity conservation through increasing the resilience of PAs to climate change and strengthening their financial viability. This objective does respond clearly to the expressed problem statement, although the adequacy of the problem diagnosis is unclear (see below).
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project’s objectives?	There are two components: in PAs, reducing vulnerability to and resilience against climate change; and developing and testing mechanisms for increasing PA revenues from sustainable tourism. These directly support the project’s objectives.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	The outcomes are clearly described and logically linked to achieving the project objective.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes, this appears likely.
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, the outputs appear to add up to the outcomes, with some assumptions. The assumptions should be clearly unpacked – see below under TOC. A key relevant assumption is that tourism demand will return to high levels after the pandemic threat subsides – this should be clearly articulated, as well as how the project will adapt if this does not prove to be justified.
<b>Part II: Project justification</b>	A simple narrative explaining the project’s logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
<b>1. Project description.</b> <b>Briefly describe:</b> 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation	Is the problem statement well-defined?	The problem statement is not particularly clear or well-developed, although the key points emerge strongly. The pif indicates a full assessment of threats/root causes etc has not been done and will

problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)		be done at a later stage. Threats are mainly taken from country reports to various Conventions.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	The key threats described are climate change impacts (fire, drought, floods etc), unmanaged tourist development, with barriers (presumably to effective conservation) being low PA coverage (relative to conservation values) and inadequate financing. Growing tourism is highlighted as a key opportunity - although this is presumably thrown into question by the Covid-19 pandemic - with potential currently limited by inadequate tourism management, infrastructure, accommodation facilities; weak connections within and across sectors; low global image; and few nature tourism products.
	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?	
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	The baseline makes the insecure funding arrangements for PAs clear. There are some confusing statements here. At one point the text says “the current coverage and configuration of the PA network makes it extremely vulnerable to an increasing number of natural hazards”, but it is not clear what this is talking about, as elsewhere it seems it is the management capacity and financing of PAs that make the PA system vulnerable to natural hazards.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project’s benefits?	Reasonably.

	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;	
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	No, this could be considerably strengthened. No specific lessons from other projects are described, although reference to a number of other projects are made.
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	See above.
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 explicit TOC, although there is an implicit narrative TOC. STAP strongly recommends developing an explicit TOC (through a participatory process involving key project stakeholders). This allows clear representation of project logic that is not captured in narrative of the two components, including the dependence of some outputs/outcomes on achievements of other ones (in the same or the other component), the contribution of some outputs to multiple outputs, and identification of key project assumptions. Given the reliance of this project on resumption of tourism, an industry currently in crisis, clarifying assumptions plus how the project will respond if these do not prove true is essential.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	This is fairly clear.
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	As above.
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	The mechanisms of change are possible, but as highlighted above there is a need to articulating underlying assumptions that underpin whether the project will achieve its goals or not.

	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, this is not clear.
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?	Yes, this case is clearly made.
	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/adaptation benefits, and are they measurable?	Yes they are GEBs. Some are rather unpredictable but some at least are measurable.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Yes
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Yes e.g. through METT
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	The project is squarely targeting understanding of vulnerability of PAs to climate change and increasing their resilience.
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?	There are some strong innovative elements here that could shift the functioning of the system, including PA management that explicitly addresses climate risk, tourism business models based on PAs, and introducing concessions into the BH PA system.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Yes, there are clear plans for this that appear feasible and well thought-through.

	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	The project's proposed changes are more incremental than transformative, although if the tourism financing model works and is scaled up it could be powerfully transformative.
<b>1b. Project Map and Coordinates.</b> 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?	This appears clear and well thought-through, with good engagement of civil society. It will be priority in further project planning to engage local communities around PAs.
	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?	See above.
<b>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.</b> Please briefly include below any gender dimensions	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	Gender differentiated access to economic and empowerment opportunities, particularly in rural areas, has been identified as an issue and a

<p>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.</p> <p>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>Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no/tbd</p>		<p>number of response measures have been identified.</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>Potentially – see above.</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</p>	<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"> <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>	<p>Identified risks appear valid, although response measures are largely deferred to PPG phase. A major risk is related to the future of tourism, as outlined above – this needs careful evaluation before the project proceeds. Addressing climate risk in a focused and detailed manner is a key priority of the project.</p>

further developed during the project design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?</li> <li>• Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?</li> <li>• What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?</li> </ul>	
<b>6. Coordination.</b> 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?	This could be considerably strengthened. While it is excellent to see careful articulation of previous/ongoing projects, it is less clear what lessons are being learned from them for this project. What has worked and what hasn't? It would be good to see some clear and specific learnings from previous initiatives.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	
	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?	While there are some clear plans for sharing lessons learned from this project, it would be good to see careful learning of lessons from previous initiatives.
<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?	Plans are at an early stages in this respect, with little specific identified here.
	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. <b>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.
	* 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>
2. <b>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.

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