

**STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects**

<b>Part I: Project Information</b>	<b>Response</b>	
<b>GEF ID</b>	10566	
<b>Project Title</b>	Lake Kivu and Rusizi River Basin Water Quality Management Project	
<b>Date of Screening</b>	16 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>Concur</b></p> <p>STAP welcomes the project from AfDB entitled “Lake Kivu and Rusizi River Basin Water Quality Management Project.” This project occurs within a very challenging socio-political context, including ongoing conflict risk, means benefits are far from assured but objectives are very worthwhile. This project offers potentially valuable lessons in the application of an environmental security framework, linking social and ecological outcomes.</p> <p>The project design illustrates a direct linkage between the components and specific barriers. Good linkages are noted to chemicals &amp; waste, climate change, land degradation and biodiversity focal areas. The project’s approach to engaging the private sector in establishing data sharing and monitoring schemes could prove innovative. The approach to stakeholder engagement in participatory monitoring to increase transparency appears promising.</p>	
<b>Part I: Project Information</b>	<b>What STAP looks for</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>B. Indicative Project Description Summary</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, very briefly described.

Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	Yes.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Very challenging socio-political context, including ongoing conflict risk, means benefits are far from assured but objectives are very worthwhile.
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?	
<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> <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.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes, well substantiated.
	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?	n/a
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Good citation of published sources in describing baseline status of resources and trends (section 1a). Description of related projects is thorough.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Additional specification needed to measure anticipated benefits.

	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Yes, in relation to other investments.
	For multiple focal area projects:	n/a but good linkages noted to chemicals & waste, climate change, land degradation and biodiversity focal areas
	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?	Theory of change is not explicitly provided, and this is recommended for CEO endorsement stage. See STAP Theory of Change Primer.
	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?	Very good, direct linking of components to specific barriers that each addresses.
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Components are designed in relation to established priorities of national and regional institutions, which should help build commitment to implement.
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	Participatory M&E plans indicate readiness to adapt during implementation.
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?	Rationale for investment in relation to baseline scenario is well supported, including with useful table of baseline and gaps vs alternative scenario (section 1.5). Extent of area (ha) targeted is modest given the scale of investment.

	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, well described, in a region of very high global biodiversity importance.
	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?	Indicators to measure expected benefits need to be specified.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Good references made to climate projections for the lake region, though some are dated.
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?	Approach to engaging private sector in establishing data sharing and monitoring schemes could prove innovative. Approach to stakeholder engagement in participatory monitoring to increase transparency appears promising. Potentially valuable lessons in application of environmental security framework, linking social and ecological outcomes. Suggest making this explicit at CEO endorsement stage. See STAP paper on Environmental Security.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Given pace and severity of threats, achieving project objectives entails transformational change.
<b>1b.</b> Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information		

<p>and map where the project interventions will take place.</p>		
<p><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.</p>	<p>Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?</p>	<p>Good specification of expected roles for major actors in design and implementation.</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>Notable inclusion of specific corporate actors with investment roles identified.</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</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Specific gender-based disparities are well integrated into the description of the overall project challenge (1a).</p>

<p>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>Good, preliminary indication of specific gender-based challenges that may be addressed, including access to information, economic roles and institutional capacity building.</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> <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>Important recognition of "medium-intensity conflict" status of Burundi and DRC in project description (section 1). This needs to be reflected in the specification of risks and mitigation measures, including scenarios and decision criteria to respond in case conflict risk becomes elevated.</p>

<p><b>6. Coordination.</b> 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>There is detailed discussion of related projects and initiatives, but, by CEO stage there should be a more specific identification of the lessons derived from each to date, and how additional harvesting and exchange of lessons will be undertaken.</p>
	<p>Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?</p>	
	<p>Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?</p>	
	<p>How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?</p>	<p>Given the process of consultation described, it is likely that lessons have been incorporated, but these should be made more explicit.</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><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.</p>	<p>What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?</p>	<p>Description of KM plans remains preliminary, but these are clearly integrated into the project design.</p>
	<p>What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?</p>	<p>Would benefit from additional description of institutional linkages and mechanisms for lesson exchange and engaging other actors beyond project implementation partners, to help scale outcomes in the region and beyond.</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.

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