

## STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

| <b>Part I: Project Information</b>   | <b>Response</b>  |                 |
|--|--|-----------------|
| <b>GEF ID</b>  | 10550  |                 |
| <b>Project Title</b>   | Binational and integrated water resources management in the Merín Lagoon Basin and Coastal Lagoons   |                 |
| <b>Date of Screening</b>   | 17 May 2020  |                 |
| <b>STAP member screener</b>  | Blake Ratner   |                 |
| <b>STAP secretariat screener</b>   | Virginia Gorsevski   |                 |
| <b>STAP Overall Assessment and Rating</b>  | <p><b>Minor</b></p> <p>STAP welcomes the project from FAO entitled “Binational and integrated water resources management in the Merín Lagoon Basin and Coastal Lagoons.” The project design has appropriate focus on participatory governance and binational cooperation. Threats and barriers are addressed, though the description of barriers is very brief, apart from dimensions of transboundary governance identified.</p> <p>The diagram described as theory of change does not communicate the logic of how the intervention will address the barriers to change identified, nor how the outcomes flow causally from areas of intervention. Identified risks include political support for transboundary cooperation (classified as low risk); this merits additional attention as it is fundamental to the ambition for transboundary governance.</p> <p>Good specification is provided of dimensions of gender analysis and anticipated actions to address gender gaps. These include gender-balanced participation in governance mechanisms.</p> |                 |
| <b>Part I: Project Information<br/>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?   | Yes.  |
| Project components   | A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?  | Yes.  |
| Outcomes   | A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.<br>Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?     | Yes, clearly designed, following typical TDA-SAP process.   |
|  | Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?  | Plausible based on design and existing binational framework.  |
| Outputs  | A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project.<br>Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes? | Plausible based on design.  |
| <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><br><b>Briefly describe:</b><br>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, with appropriate focus on participatory governance and binational cooperation.   |
|  | Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?   | Threats and barriers are addressed, though description of barriers is very brief, apart from dimensions of transboundary governance identified.<br><br>Inclusion of “no transboundary diagnostic analysis” as a barrier is questionable; instead, address describe something about the underlying lack of understanding of resource trends and socio-economic implications? |
|  | 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?   | Adequate: good description of institutional background but less treatment of baseline indicators for monitoring change.   |
|  | Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?  | Yes, in relation to general IW targets; however, data is not provided to quantify in relation to ecosystem status or other objectives.  |
|  | 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   |   |
|  | how did these lessons inform the design of 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?   | Reflected in description of project strategy. Diagram described as theory of change (oddly placed in section 1a4) is simply a visual summary of the components in relation to barriers and general objectives and impacts anticipated. It does not communicate the logic of how the intervention will address the barriers to change identified, nor how the outcomes flow causally from areas of intervention. |
|  | 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?   | Adequate narrative description.  |
|   | 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, but basis for measurement is not well developed in the PIF.<br>Useful linkages to SDG goals provided.   |
|   | 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, but additional indicators would be valuable.  |
|   | Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation? | Yes, for targets provided.   |
|   | What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?   | Provisions for assessing local climate scenarios are included.   |
| 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?                           | Identifies potential innovations in technologies for environmental monitoring and warning.<br>Experimentation with multi-sectoral collaboration incorporating virtual convenings could be innovative depending on how it is implemented. |
|   | Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?                            | Appropriate focus areas for lesson learning and exchange are identified.   |

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
|   | Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?  | Technology adoption could introduce incremental improvements but ambition for participatory governance implies transformational change.   |
| <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><br>Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities.<br><br>If none of the above, please explain why.<br><br>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?  | PIF identifies key agencies and indigenous groups, and preliminary indication of user groups. Additional detailing of stakeholders is merited, including private sector actors beyond the producer associations identified. |
|   | 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? | Initial narrative description provided; would benefit from table detailing anticipated roles in relation to project objectives and outputs.   |
| <b>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.</b><br>Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and   | Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?                                 | Good specification provided of dimensions of gender analysis and anticipated actions to address gender gaps. These include gender-balanced participation in governance mechanisms.  |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <p>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>Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?</p>   | <p>Yes, well described for this stage of project design.</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 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? 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> <li>• Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?</li> </ul> | <p>Identified risks include political support for transboundary cooperation (classified as low risk); this merits additional attention as it is fundamental to the ambition for transboundary governance.</p> <p>Good data on climate risk included among description of mitigation measures.</p> |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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?   | Initial list of related projects is provided, but areas for potential learning and exchange merit elaboration.   |
|  | 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?   |  |
| <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?  | The PIF indicates reasonable principles / objectives of KM but describes little in terms of approaches / mechanisms to achieve these.<br>Integration of “research-action processes” indicates appreciation of adaptive management. |
|  | 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 " <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. 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. |