

**STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects**

Part I: Project Information	Response
<b>GEF ID</b>	10553
<b>Project Title</b>	Sava and Drina Rivers Corridors Integrated Development Program
<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 this World Bank project to improve flood protection and enhance transboundary water cooperation in the Sava and Drina Rivers Corridors.</p> <p>Proposed GEF financing is described as supporting one component of a larger program. This assumes complementarity between investments in flood protection and infrastructure; flood management planning; and regional studies and knowledge exchange.</p> <p>The PIF is incomplete, missing most required sections. This screen has also relied upon separate Project Information Document provided.</p> <p>Nested character of investments, with regional interventions complementing prior and ongoing country-level investments, could yield important lessons for IWRM. There are also potentially important lessons relating to environmental security and cooperation after a legacy of conflict in the region, but these are not explicitly addressed.</p> <p>Description of stakeholder groupings does not adequately detail these groups and their anticipated roles. The indication in the PIF that there will be no private sector engagement is striking and comes without justification, though there is a suggestion elsewhere in the design that this is not the case (including</p>

	reference to SMEs). The PID indicates lessons from past GEF engagements have been integrated but does not specify these.	
<b>Part I: Project Information</b> <b>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?	GEF financing is proposed only for Component IV: Regional dialogues and studies.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	Description of outcomes is very skeletal. Does include climate adaptation elements. "This project is parallel co-financing of a larger program supporting flood risk management (including nature-based solutions) and integrated water resources management program for the Sava and Drina river basins."
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Insufficient information in PIF to assess. PID provides a better foundation, establishing sound basis for the project and institutional framework which the anticipated regional activities are meant to support.
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?	Component IV details outputs as preparatory studies, technical studies, Sava RBM plan, plus additional studies and plans, forecasting and "advocacy and communication" activities.
<b>Part II: Project justification</b>	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	<b>Insufficient information in PIF to assess: Section II, 1a omitted.</b> Responses based upon review of PID.
<b>1. Project description.</b> <b>Briefly describe:</b> 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 good description of institutional context and history of efforts at cross-border cooperation.

	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	PID integrates description of barriers and threats as part of regional and country context, with suitable references.
	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?	PID includes preliminary data and description of prior and complementary investments.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Additional specification needed to quantify anticipated benefits.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Adequate.
	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?	Annex contains a basic theory of change, including two assumptions related to political priorities and cross-border collaboration. Assumes complementarity between investments in flood protection and infrastructure; flood management planning; and regional studies and knowledge exchange.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Logic anticipates cumulative regional benefits of national-level action.
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	Not all linkages among project components are clear in the design.

	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Assumptions are initial indications, not linked explicitly to causal connections.
	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?	Difficult to assess. Incremental cost reasoning is implicit in the alignment of certain sub-components with GEF IW focus areas (PID, table 1).
	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 specific measures of progress should be proposed.
	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?	Yes, in terms of IW focal areas.
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Methodologies are not indicated.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Emphasis on climate links to flood risks.
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?	Not explicitly addressed. Description of outputs (component IV) is too preliminary to comment upon potential innovations.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Nested character of investments, with regional interventions complementing prior and ongoing country-level investments, could yield important lessons for IWRM. There are also potentially important lessons relating to environmental security and cooperation after a legacy of conflict

		in the region, but these are not explicitly addressed. For multiple dimensions to articulate these issues, please see STAP paper on Environmental Security.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	
<b>1b.</b> Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		
<b>2. Stakeholders.</b> 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?	Reference is made to prior consultations: “The proposed GEF project will be an Additional Financing to the World Bank Sava and Drina Rivers Corridors Integrated Development Program, Phase I. Full level of consultations were conducted via components 1-3 of the Program. The program has developed three robust Stakeholder Engagement Plans for Serbia, BiH, and Montenegro to identify key Stakeholders and lay out how the project will engage with these groups and institutions. Additional consultations will be held during the preparation stage of the GEF additional financing project, involving representatives of the CSOs in the riparian countries.”  “The process of engaging citizens, rural development networks and NGO representatives . . . will be detailed after the Social Assessment Screening is completed during the first year of project implementation.”
	What are the stakeholders’ roles, and how will their combined roles contribute to robust project design, to achieving global	Description of stakeholder groupings is provided in a table describing management / consultation

	<p>environmental outcomes, and to lessons learned and knowledge?</p>	<p>activities. Does not adequately detail these groups and their roles.</p> <p>Indication in PIF that there will be no private sector engagement is striking and comes without justification.</p>
<p><b>3. Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment.</b> 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</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Adequate description provided, including identification of specific barriers to women’s involvement in economic activities such as SME leadership. (Inconsistent with statement on no private sector engagement.)</p>

	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	As above.
<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>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"> <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> <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>	<p>Omitted from PIF.</p> <p>PID notes summary of screening on environmental and social risks, noting importance of "coordinated stakeholder consultations and decision making" and safeguards.</p> <p>Specific climate risks noted, including data on projected flood and drought frequency and intensity.</p>
<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?	<p>Omitted from PIF.</p> <p>Good linkages noted in PID.</p>
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	These are noted but not developed.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	PID indicates lessons from past GEF engagements have been integrated but does not specify these.
	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	What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?	<p>Omitted from PIF.</p> <p>PID notes component IV will address knowledge sharing along with capacity building as part of country and regional dialogue. Will be important</p>

<p>to the project's overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.</p>		<p>to indicate the approaches anticipated and the metrics for measuring progress.</p>
	<p>What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?</p>	<p>These are an element of Component IV.</p>

## Notes

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
1. <b>Concur</b>	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. <b>Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	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.

<p><b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b></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>