

Part I: Project Information		Response
GEF ID		10377
Project Title		Reducing vulnerability and increasing resilience to climate change through promoting innovation, transfer and large-scale deployment of adaptation-oriented technologies in priority agriculture value-chains and creating jobs
Date of Screening		
STAP member Screener		Graciela Metternicht
STAP secretariat screener		Guadalupe Duron
STAP Overall Assessment		<p>Minor issues to be considered during the project design. Minor issues to be considered during the project design. STAP acknowledges UNIDO's project on reducing vulnerability and increasing resilience to climate change through innovation, transfer and large-scale deployment of adaptation-oriented technologies in priority agriculture value-chains in Congo DR. The project objective aligns with the LDCF programme's objectives. While the project narrative and description of the components presents a coherent argument for this project, STAP is concerned by the lack of references that are needed to support the multiple assumptions. In this regard, STAP strongly recommends for this highly innovative project to develop a theory of change, with clear underlying assumptions that require validation during the project implementation. The theory of change can also assist develop impact pathways, which are needed to ensure the components and activities map against the outputs and outcomes. STAP also recommends describing further the activities in the project document (Annex D is mentioned as describing the activities, but it was not included in the project documentation.) Additionally, the project also can benefit from a resilience assessment using approaches such as the Resilience, Adaptation Pathways and Transformation Approach (RAPTA) (https://research.csiro.au/eap/rapta/) RAPTA can help analyze the targeted social-ecological system, and help assess how initial impact pathways from the theory of change perform in different scenarios. This assessment is important as climate stressors and risks, as well as other non-climate factors (e.g. conflict), may provoke uncertainty and disrupt the project's trajectory. Additionally, STAP suggests considering component 3 of the project as the first component to ensure the proposed project interventions (under current Component 1 and 2) are closely linked with the local context and respond to the national climate change adaptation process. STAP is available to offer further advice during the early stage of this project development, including identifying an expert, and reviewing terms of reference, that can assist with a resilience assessment. A minor point, STAP notes several repetitions in the text, which it recommends be edited in the final document (e.g. "During the PPG phase a detailed mapping... is repeated in pages 36,42 and 44)".</p>
Part I: Project Information		
B. Indicative Project Description Summary		
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	The project presents the current situation of the Congo DR and its impacts current and future to climate change, and hence the need for this project. The objective aligns well with the problem stated.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Page 34 states the project will be implemented through four proposed project components. The detailed overview of expected project outcomes are included, with description of outputs; however Annex D with indicative activities is not included. Hence it is not possible to know if the planned activities support the project objectives.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.	Pg 353 includes a table with specific identified adaptation-oriented technologies and service innovations for the 3 sectors identified: energy, water and agriculture, and the foreseen impacts in the short medium and long term

	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	To a certain extent. Section 1.A.6 (pg 43) states the project will support the development of clean and climate smart technologies in the following areas: i) rural and urban energy supply; ii) water management; natural resource management including forests and water bodies; agricultural value chains and v) climate data. The project will therefore ultimately build and increase the resilience of urban and rural communities to climate change. There are estimations of the number of ha that it will contribute to sustainable land management, and land that is impacted through sustainable and resilient land management (because of the technologies to be adopted) The project developers also claim that innovative financial instruments and investments models WOULD be enabled to enhance climate resilience, though there is a lack of specification on how this will be attained.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Adaptation benefits mentioned may be attained if during the project development a good theory of change is included that can link the desired vision with the type of investments to be done, underlying assumptions and careful consideration of external and internal factors that may influence attainment of the project outcomes. The STAP recommends revisiting the narrative of this section and to include additional indicators and metrics that can serve to assess if the claimed benefits are to be achieved (ie. project evaluation phase).
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?	The project contains an overall description of the project components that in certain components lacks the level of detail in the description of products and services to ascertain whether the sum of the outputs are likely to contribute to the expected project outcomes. The project presents several adaptation measures that are important for the priority sectors of water, energy and agriculture. However, it is not clear if all the examples cited (table of page 20) will be implemented. The document simply states ‘the project seeks to identify suitable and innovative technologies and services that address increased climate change vulnerability and associated energy, water and food insecurity (pg 20)’. STAP recommends that during the project development phase such technologies and services be identified and assessed for their ‘context-based feasibility’ (is this the best services/practice for this socio-ecological system)?
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project’s logic, i.e. a theory of change.	There is not theory of change, rather statements of the desired vision: pg 20 (“the project seeks to address increased energy, water and food insecurity caused by enhanced climatic hazards through the delivery of adaptation-oriented technology and services innovations and solutions appropriate to the local needs and requirements. Ultimately these technologies will ensure climate proofing of energy and water infrastructure, as well as improve agriculture production, processing and storage capacities”; and pg 32 (proposed alternative scenario): the project seeks to deliver innovation, transfer and large-scale deployment of adaptation-oriented technologies and services as well as boost job creation in order to reduce vulnerability, enhance resilience and the adaptive capacity of the vulnerable segments of the population including women, youth, smallholder farmers, small entrepreneurs and micro, small and medium enterprises, in rural and urban areas of the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). This will be achieved through a two-fold approach including transformation of innovative climate adaptation technologies and business models through catalyzing private sector (MSME) engagement, and development of innovative financing mechanism for large-scale deployment of climate adaptation-oriented technologies and solutions to build resilience of vulnerable groups. The STAP recommends a theory of change be prepared with underlying assumptions; activities; investments for those activities; who will be doing the activities to lead to the expected outcomes, and the consideration of external and internal factors that may affect the delivery of outputs. The team could use Figure 6 'demonstration of the project intervention strategy for agro-value chains' to develop the ToC.
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, there is a good formulation of the problem, though it lacks data and information to back up the arguments.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Barriers are identified and described, though once again, data and information to substantiate the claims are absent

	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?	Not applicable.
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	All relevant projects are identified in the baselines section; and their relevance to this project explained. It is not clear for STAP what contribution/links can be developed with the US\$166 million project on urban water supply funded by the World Bank.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	The description of the baseline and associated baseline project contains very good elements, however the STAP suggests the narrative be strengthened to facilitate quantification of the project expected benefits
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the additional cost reasoning for the project?	The baseline presented is robust to support the reasoning on additionality; however STAP suggest that indicators be developed to better support the narrative the project document contains at present.
	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;	Not applicable.
	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?	The project describes some lessons from other projects, for instance, in page 27 the examples of successful business models of climate adaptation. STAP encourages to conduct a 'landscape mapping' of other GEF funded projects that have concluded, searching for good lessons and best practice that could be transferred to 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?	see above.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	STAP suggests that the team of UNIDO considers moving component 3 to be the first component of the project, followed by the current component 1 and 2. STAP thinks that this sequence of events is more likely to lead to the desired outcomes.
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	Unfortunately STAP could not assess this part because annex D (list of activities linked to outputs) is missing.
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	The project lacks underlying assumptions that are to lead to the desired outcomes. Because a theory of change has been developed it is not possible to ascertain if the mechanisms of change proposed are plausible.
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	The section on risks identifies some adaptations that could be undertaken to respond to changing conditions. A ToC (see above) with external and internal factors identified would better enable to anticipate adaptations needed to respond to changing conditions.
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?	Not applicable.
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	The narrative appears to suggest that this will be the case. See earlier suggestions of STAP in regards to mapping activities to outputs (missing Appendix D?). STAP suggests conducting an exercise to understand the vulnerability, resilience and adaptive capacity of the socio-ecological system that is the target of this project. Approaches like the RAPTA (see above) or similar could be useful to that end. This exercise could serve to better identify and profile the 'vulnerable communities' the project refers and whether the right conditions exist for the adoption of the intended innovative technologies that the project will fund through component 2.
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?	Partly. The narrative suggests the project will generate global environmental benefits, though STAP suggests better indicators are identified to verify that this is the case.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes, there is a good formulation of the problem, though it lacks data and information to back up the arguments.

	Are the adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	yes, they are very aspirational and well described. STAP recommends that in the project development phase criteria is develop to 'test' if all the outputs mentioned will deliver the said adaptation benefits.
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Partly. The PPG phase needs to better identify methodologies and indicators to measure and monitor that aspirational adaptation benefits are attained.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Components 1, 2, 3 of the project describe outputs and vaguely activities that are to increase resilience to climate change.
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?	Yes, the project is innovative in aspects of methods of innovation and business model, and the method for training and learning.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	There is a good articulated narrative for scaling up and out the project outcomes. The project identifies key partners in the different components and it describe how this partners will help scaling up across geographies and institutions.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		the project provides a map with an indicative area of where the interventions will tke place.
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?	Key stakeholders have been identified, this section is well developed.
	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 of stakeholders are identified
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?	STAP suggests the team consults the publication of UN Women on gender responsive implementation of the UNCCD https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2018/2/towards-a-gender-responsive-implementation-of-the-un-convention-to-combat-desertification as it has several case studies of successful, tailored activities focused on sustainable land management that inter-alia contribute to climate change adaptation.
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	
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?	risks are identified.

	Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?	social risks are identified, the STAP suggests environmental risks be investigated in the phase of project development.
	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?	the project considers climate projections at 2050, and these projections are the argument for the development of this project.
	· Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?	Partly. STAP suggest the team uses RAPTA or similar approach to assess resilience and adaptive capacity.
	· Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?	see above.
	· What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?	this is specified in the project document and will be produced by other projects that form the baseline.
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, partly. STAP recommends the team investigates further lessons from other projects of similar objectives.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Partly. See earlier comments
	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. The mechanism appears adequate.
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 approach is described but knowledge management indicators and metric need to be incorporated in the project development phase.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	the plans are adequate and described in page 65. The mechanisms need to be more explicit in the project development phase.
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.	
	<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>	
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.	