

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10500
Project Title	Livelihoods Carbon Fund
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 Conservation International’s “Livelihoods Carbon Fund” project. STAP appreciates the scale and scope of the Livelihoods Carbon Fund that is providing a mechanism for harmonizing multiple focal areas around climate financing while considering social development concerns.</p> <p>Overall this proposal is comprehensive and covers many of the suggested guidelines. We would suggest some linkage to the climate justice discourse. See the following article from Nature Climate Change:</p> <p>Robinson, M., & Shine, T. (2018). Achieving a climate justice pathway to 1.5 °C. Nature Climate Change, 8(7), 564–569. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0189-7</p> <p>STAP also recommends adding a theory of change, especially with reference to linkages between the earlier work of the Bank in this arena from 2012 and how matters have changed since then in terms of lessons learned:</p>

	http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/287981468340804935/Carbon-livelihoods-social-opportunities-and-risks-of-carbon-finance	
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 – the objectives of linking the carbon fund to a range of specific outcomes are noted.
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 3 clear outcomes re defined
	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 next to each of the 3 outcomes in a table with clear metrics of tree plantation, livelihoods etc.
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
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?	Indirectly noted
	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 – this is provided in detail
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Yes, there is a detailed inventory of projects funded by LCF 1 and 2 provided in a table as the baseline.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Partially but this could be further elaborated in terms of methodologies used.
	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	
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	Figure 3 provides a decent lesson-drawing stats but this could be further linked to project design in current proposal that is presented in Figure 5.
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?	Not directly mentioned but there is a very large Appendix (Annex A which covers a lot of elements that could be considered in a GEB analysis but this should be made more explicit).
	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?	Brings together investors, corporations and government to invest in Nature Based Solutions.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Yes, scaling up is a key rationale of this proposal. And the innovation noted is "monetized return through a carbon offset offtaking mechanism secured by the long-term commitments from corporate investors."
	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.		Provided but not georeferenced.
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,	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Yes - noted

<p>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>Good stakeholder analysis provided in a detailed table which also includes indigenous peoples.</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>There is a detailed section on gender empowerment but it is somewhat generic and could benefit from more clear targets.</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?	Possibly could
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?</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? 	These are not directly mentioned as the project claims to mitigate risks as its primary aim 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.
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?	Much of the coordination section deals with LCF projects and "Livelihood Venture." There should be some mention of coordination with activities related to this project at the Green Climate Fund
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Partially

	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Partially
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	No
	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?	No
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?	Largely linked to the Livelihoods.eu portal.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	Also linked to above Livelihoods.eu portal.

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>