

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10499
Project Title	Livelihood Landscapes in LAO PDR
Date of Screening	May 26, 2020
STAP member screener	Saleem H.Ali
STAP secretariat screener	Guadalupe Duron
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Minor issues to be considered during project design</p> <p>STAP acknowledges the World Bank’s project “Lao PDR Landscapes and Livelihoods Project”. STAP appreciates the project’s ambition to interface, agroforestry, biodiversity protection and tourism.</p> <p>STAP recommends developing a Theory of Change, especially with reference to linkages between ecosystem conservation and livelihood stability and incentive mechanisms. The project appears to build on this World Bank publication “Partnerships and Opportunities for a New Green Forest Economy in Lao PDR: Sustaining Forest Landscapes and Livelihoods. Perhaps a theory of change can be derived from this narrative.</p> <p>A recent evaluative study of forest plantation in Lao on livelihoods using an economic model is also worth reviewing that has just been published: Somvang Phimmavong, Rodney J. Keenan, Forest plantation development, poverty, and inequality in Laos: A dynamic CGE microsimulation analysis, Forest Policy and Economics, Volume 111, 2020, 102055</p>

	<p>STAP would like for the global environmental benefits to be more clearly articulated, and for the methodology to be defined that will be used to monitor the indicators. This information will complement Annex D.</p> <p>Climate risk reduction is a clear part of the project implementation strategy, especially Component 3. However, a climate risk screening is also not directly provided. STAP recommends providing a screening of the climate risks.</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 - there 4 key objectives defined clearly in the PID
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Provided with detail and building on earlier work by the Bank
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	Yes – these are listed in the PIF
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes – these are particularly so in the case of carbon sequestration.
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 provided
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	This is missing and should be added

<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>Yes</p>
	<p>Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?</p>	<p>Indirectly noted</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-defined, and can it only be supported by integrating two, or more focal areas objectives or programs?</p>	<p>Yes – this is provided in detail</p>
<p>2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects</p>	<p>Is the baseline identified clearly?</p>	<p>Yes – various references to existing material in PID</p>
	<p>Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?</p>	<p>Quantification is linked to the Aichi targets set forth by Lao</p>
	<p>Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
	<p>For multiple focal area projects:</p>	
	<p>are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators;</p>	<p>Yes</p>
	<p>are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and</p>	
	<p>how did these lessons inform the design of this project?</p>	<p>Historical forest policy measures are noted but direct project lessons from earlier projects are not provided.</p>

3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	This is missing and should be added
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	
	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?	
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	
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?	
	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?	Annex D has Aichi target details provided but those are at local level. The total estimated direct emissions avoided is 11,865,000 tCo2 and the total indirect avoided emissions is 33,900,000 tCo2 over 20 years. How this was calculated is not detailed.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	

	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's 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?	No clear innovations are mentioned but the linkages to conservation tourism targets could be further developed in terms of technology and survey tracking tools etc to get data on effectiveness of strategies in generating livelihoods.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	No
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Possibly
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Yes
2. Stakeholders. Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities;	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Yes - noted

<p>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>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>As a centrally planned economy, stakeholder participation is managed by the government.</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</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>There is a detailed section on gender empowerment but it is largely a qualitative discussion of Lao customs and could be linked to more specific targets.</p>

<p>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>Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?</p>	<p>Possibly could</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>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? 	<p>These are not directly mentioned as the project claims to mitigate risks and so perhaps the proponents assume that the climate risk is a non issue. However, there could be unforeseen risks of drought or other factors which could impact implementation and the STAP risk screening document should be considering in this regard. Please refer to: https://stapgef.org/stap-guidance-climate-risk-screening</p>

<p>6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives</p>	<p>Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?</p>	<p>The following projects are noted Scaling-Up Participatory Sustainable Forest Management (SUPSFM and AF) and would build on the ongoing Green Growth Development Policy Operation (GGDPO) series, Green Growth Programmatic Advisory Services and Analytics (GGPASA), IDA/GEF-supported Second Lao PDR Environment and Social Project (LENS2), Nam Theun 2 Social and Environmental Project (NT2), FCPF REDD+ Readiness Preparation Technical Assistance and emerging Emissions Reduction (ER) Program.</p>
	<p>Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?</p>	<p>However, the lessons learned are not presented</p>
	<p>Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?</p>	<p>Only names of projects given</p>
	<p>How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?</p>	<p>No</p>
	<p>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?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?</p>	<p>Not explicitly stated</p>
	<p>What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?</p>	<p>No explicitly stated</p>

Notes

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
<p>1. Concur</p>	<p>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.</p>
	<p>* 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></p>
<p>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>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:</p>
	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;</p>
	<p>(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.</p>
	<p>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>

<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>