

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response	
GEF ID	10549	
Project Title	SVG: Coastal and Marine Ecosystems Management Strengthening Project	
Date of Screening	22 May 2020	
STAP member screener	Rosie Cooney	
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski	
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Minor</p> <p>STAP welcomes this project to establish a sound institutional, planning and knowledge basis to restore, manage and conserve biodiversity in coastal areas of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (SVG). The project is clear, logical, well-articulated, and directly addresses the problems stated, in a way that makes achievement of substantial global environment benefits (GEBs) appear likely.</p> <p>The minor here is given primarily because much information which STAP looks for in its reviews has not been provided here. Both PIF and PID were reviewed, and relevant information could not be found in either. The project planning could also be considerably strengthened by development of a robust and participatory TOC and sound climate risk screening, both of which are lacking.</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?	The objective is “To strengthen the management of coastal and marine ecosystems of St. Vincent and the Grenadines.”
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project’s objectives?	The information provided (in the pif and pid) is quite high-level, with very little detail provided on each component. However, overall, and based on what is presented, the activities/outputs/outcomes appear well planned,

		targeted to the problem, and likely to support the overall objective.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	Yes – see above.
	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.
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project’s logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
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, this is clear and well justified.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Threats and barriers are well-described, though the analysis remains at the rather proximate level without exploring the root causes driving the immediate threats.
	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?	No – this section of the pif has not been completed.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project’s benefits?	As above.

	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	As above.
	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, no specific lessons are drawn from previous interventions, and articulating these in further project development would considerably strengthen the project.
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	As 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 theory of change, but a clear project logic can be determined from the narrative.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	These are clear.
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	These are clear
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Yes they are plausible, but underlying assumptions are not identified and addressed. A robust TOC that sets out interim steps to achieve the project objective would enable identification (and monitoring) of critical assumptions. The STAP Primer on TOC (https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer) provides very useful guidance on developing TOCs. While some assumptions are adequately dealt with under Risks, there are many assumptions that underpin the progression of events to achieve the project's aims (e.g. in component 2, assumptions might be that livelihood opportunities that mainstream BD can be identified, that local tourism entities are willing to participate in developing/implementing a

		tourism plan, that greater enforcement capacity succeeds in reducing illegal activity etc).
	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. Adaptive management is referred to at points, but there is no consideration of how the project may need to respond to changed 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?	Yes.
	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.
	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.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	None are specified, although part of the rationale for the project is to increase the focal areas' resilience to climate change. However, an assessment to understand how the benefits and outcomes of the project can be made more resilient and durable in the face of projected climate change is what is needed (see climate risk screening below).
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 interventions here are not particularly innovative at a global level, but represent innovations in the social-ecological system in SVG,

		which currently lacks a clear institutional/policy foundation for sustainable marine/coastal management.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	There are measures for scaling up over time and across geographies, primarily embedded in component 3 (knowledge management).
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	The project is aiming to transform the institutional/policy/capacity landscape for sustainable coastal/marine management, which if successful should achieve long term durable benefits.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Provided.
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?	<p>It is somewhat concerning that there has been little stakeholder consultation at this stage, due in part to Covid restrictions. It is particularly concerning that representatives from the tourism and fisherfolk section did not choose to participate in the consultation meeting that was held, as this suggests a possible lack of support for the project. Thorough consultation, including with an array of community bodies/civil society, should be a priority for the next phase, and the project adapted in the light of input, as indicated in the pif.</p> <p>Otherwise the roles of different stakeholders appears clear and well thought-through. The level of coordination across government Ministries/agencies and with other GEF projects is very welcome.</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?	See above.
<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.</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>	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	Yes this appears robust.
	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	Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?	This section of the pif has not been included/completed, so can't be assessed. Climate risk screening in particular would appear to be

<p>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 there social and environmental risks which could affect the project? 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>very high priority for this project, given the likely impacts of climate change over a time horizon out to 2050 on the coastal areas and resources of SVG. STAP recommends this is undertaken as a very high priority, with the project reviewed in the light of this to identify resilience practices and measures, including technical and institutional capacity, to ensure outcomes of this project are durable over time. STAP guidance on climate risk screening is at http://www.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>Close links with other GEF projects are indicated to be planned.</p>
	<p>Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?</p>	<p>No, this would strengthen the project considerably.</p>
	<p>Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?</p>	<p>See above</p>
	<p>How have these lessons informed the project’s formulation?</p>	<p>See above</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>See above re lessons from previous work, but mechanisms to learn and share lessons from this project appear strong.</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>This is strong – as set out in component 3.</p>

What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	
--	--

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.
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.