

**Part I: Project Information**

<b>GEF ID</b>	10116
<b>Project Title</b>	L Victoria EMP 3
<b>Date of Screening</b>	3-Dec-18
<b>Screener</b>	B Ratner
<b>Panel Member</b>	B Ratner
<b>STAP Overall Assessment</b>	Concur

**Part I: Project Information****B. Indicative Project Description Summary**

	<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, clearly structured
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.	yes, with core indicators including quantitative targets
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits?	yes
	Are the global environmental benefits likely to be generated?	reasonable likelihood, given past phases of project
Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project.	brief but adequate
	Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?	
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	Absent from PIF. Provided in separate WB "Project Concept Document" dated 5 Nov 2018. Includes Theory of Change diagram, which shows general project logic even if it does not specify causal connections anticipated. Causal connections are explained in the narrative of the project concept document.

**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, including data on environmental trends from prior project phases
	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?	yes, well described
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	yes
	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	n/a
	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?

The combination of efforts to strengthen cooperative management of transboundary resources in the Lake Victoria Basin, reduce soil erosion in selected hotspots, and improve pollution monitoring and enforcement will strengthen climate resilience, reduce livelihood vulnerability, and enhance economic development prospects of the states that share the basin.

What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?

well explained, integrating detailed lessons from prior phases

· 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?

yes

· Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?

thorough treatment of prior lessons include need for adaptive management, building confidence of policy stakeholders, and strengthening enforcement capacity

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?

GEF additionality clearly identified, including data monitoring, institutional strengthening, private sector engagement and lesson sharing.

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, and are they measurable?

Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?

Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?

Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?

What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?

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?

thorough treatment of past lessons learned suggests potential to generate new, valuable lessons; demonstrates potential for innovation in mechanisms for transboundary cooperation amidst variable and often weak enforcement capacity

Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?

recognizes need to move beyond policy design and agreements to ensuring enforcement capacity and incentives to generate longer-term shifts in resource use and pollution

Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?

Negative trends despite two decades of investment in transboundary cooperation suggest the need for transformational change; not clearly articulated as such. Full project development should specify.

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?

Engagement with stakeholders at multiple levels is evidenced.

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?

Project description suggests some thoughtful treatment of shifts required in stakeholder roles, including private sector engagement.

**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?

Addressed in a preliminary way but adequate, including gender-disaggregated monitoring of benefits.

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 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?  
Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?

yes, recognizes complexity of multi-country, multi-sectoral scope

Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?

yes, clearly identified

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

· 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, addressed in actions to address changes in lake ecology and land use

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

addressed in a preliminary way

**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?

list of relevant projects identified appears thorough

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

yes, commendable

Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?

yes, thoroughly described

	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	yes
	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
<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?	integrated within IW:Learn
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	includes cross-country exchange and private sector links

**STAP Notes**

Information included in the PIF is very minimal and does not address required elements of project justification. To complete this screen, the STAP has referred to the separate World Bank "Project Concept Document" dated 5 Nov 2018.

The project concept builds directly upon the prior two phases of the Lake Victoria Environmental Management Project. The STAP welcomes the inclusion of an explicit narrative theory of change, complemented by diagrams. This describes how the combination of efforts to strengthen cooperative management of transboundary resources in the Lake Victoria Basin, reduce soil erosion in selected hotspots, and improve pollution monitoring and enforcement will strengthen climate resilience, reduce livelihood vulnerability, and enhance economic development prospects of the states that share the basin.

The project concept also provides a thorough treatment of prior lessons, including the need for adaptive management, building confidence of policy stakeholders, and strengthening enforcement capacity. This treatment of past lessons learnt suggests potential to generate new, valuable lessons. There is particular promise regarding the potential for innovation in mechanisms for transboundary cooperation amidst variable and often weak enforcement capacity.

Continued negative trends despite two decades of investment in transboundary cooperation around the lake suggest the need for transformational change. While there is recognition of the need for substantially more investment than the project will include, the project would benefit from a clear articulation of how the planned interventions can help to leverage additional investment and action addressing drivers of environmental degradation at sufficient scale to reverse the trends. Commendably, the plans for knowledge management note mechanisms for cross-country exchange and private sector links; these should be further developed prior to CEO endorsement.