

Part I: Project Information

GEF ID	10077
Project Title	Strengthening Resilience of Central Asian Countries...
Date of Screening	1-Dec-18
Screener	B Ratner
Panel Member	B Ratner
STAP Overall Assessment	Concur

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
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	yes, very clearly
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits?	yes
	Are the global environmental benefits likely to be generated?	yes, well articulated in terms of potential impacts
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, assuming commitment and engagement of countries
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	yes, well articulated
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?	yes; data is very limited but the project addresses this gap
	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? Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	adequate
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	quantification will remain a challenge but monitoring systems envisaged will address this
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	yes, considering characterization of socio-political risks related to environmental trends
	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;	n/a very limited information available but well articulated situation analysis
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	good reliance upon international state-of-the-art techniques, enhancing cross-regional exchange
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	technology for resource monitoring

3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	Strengthened monitoring and management practices will enhance transboundary cooperation to address risks and vulnerabilities stemming from climate change impacts upon high altitude glaciers and associated water flows. This will also help reduce risks to regional stability resulting from anticipated dramatic changes in the future water regime.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	well described
	· What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	well described
	· Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	assumptions are not explicitly listed but can be inferred from discussion of political and institutional context
	· Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	Risks table addresses mitigating actions, including adaptive management; recognition of unsubstantiated past assumptions concerning implementation capacity and public participation suggests a readiness to examine these issues critically.
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, plausibly
	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, yes and are they measurable?	

	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	yes
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	yes
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	needs development
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	primary focus
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?	Design includes innovative focus on transboundary cooperation addressing climate change impacts on shared glaciers. Good recognition of governance risks and challenges in relation to regional stability and the links to water flows.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	adequate; would benefit from further development
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	transformational change needed; future scenarios potentially disastrous

1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.

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? adequate; notes very little information to support civil society engagement

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? described in a preliminary way; requires elaboration during project preparation

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. Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd

Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences? adequately identified

Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed? yes, issue is identified and preliminary priorities noted

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

Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Identified risks are all institutional. These are valid and worth prioritizing; however, it would also be useful to identify risks related, for example, to the rate of ecological change and the consequent pace and scale of adaptation required.
 Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?

Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project? yes, see above

For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:

· 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? yes, primary focus

· Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed? yes

· Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with? yes, primary focus

· What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures? addressed as primary focus

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? yes, links well identified in particular to non-GEF projects

Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them? yes

Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited? yes

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.

How have these lessons informed the project’s formulation?

features of institutional cooperation; new technology options; citizen science for monitoring; global monitoring

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?

yes

What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?

would benefit from discussion of metrics to be developed / applied

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

well articulated links to other regional and global monitoring and adaptation initiatives

STAP Notes