

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response	
GEF ID	10524	
Project Title	Capacity strengthening for management of invasive alien species in South Africa to enhance sustainable biodiversity conservation and livelihoods improvement	
Date of Screening	19 May 2020	
STAP member screener	Rosie Cooney	
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski	
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Concur</p> <p>STAP welcomes this proposal to address the increasing challenge of combating the entry and spread of invasive alien species in South Africa. Overall, it is a very well-planned proposal and a clear and well-written PIF.</p> <p>The main areas STAP highlights for strengthening are the development of an explicit Theory of Change with identification of underlying assumptions (see STAP Primer on Theory of Change); clear assessment of and learning from lessons from related projects i.e. previous attempts to address IAS problems; and formal climate risk screening using a time horizon of 2020 to 2050 (see STAP Guidance on Climate Risk Screening).</p>	
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?	The objective is very clear, and tightly linked to the problem diagnosis.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes, these are clear and well-organized.
Outcomes	<p>A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.</p> <p>Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?</p>	These are clear.

	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes.
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.
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	There is no explicit TOC, and project design and development would benefit from this. The TOC of this project is quite simple and is implicit in the project description, but an explicit TOC would be a valuable tool for participatory project planning and help articulate key assumptions underlying project implementation and success.
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 these are clear.
	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?	Yes.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	The project's benefits are necessarily rather non-specific, since it is partly geared toward avoiding future threats from invasive species that could

		have unpredictable far-reaching effects. Given this the benefits are adequately quantified.
	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	No, no specific lessons are described, and further project development would be enhanced by careful examination of lessons learned from similar/related projects.
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	See above
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	There is no explicit TOC, but as indicated above, the internal logic of this project is quite straightforward and is clearly explained in the narrative project description.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	This is clear.
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	This is clear.
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	The mechanisms of change are plausible, but underlying assumptions are not articulated. A good TOC would assist in doing this.
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	No, not explicitly, although some responses are identified at section 5 in consideration of risks. More thinking on this front would strengthen the project.
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, this is likely.

	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, and at least some are measurable.
	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?	Yes (to some extent – some can not be but are nevertheless important).
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	None are explicitly considered. However, it is hard to see that climate change would directly affect the project and its outcomes. Climate change may make the threat addressed by this project worse (a risk addressed at 5.), but is unlikely to affect the measures established by the project.
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?	The innovations introduced by the project are significant in terms of shifting the functioning of the local system in relation to IAS, if not in terms of global innovation.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Yes, this is clearly laid out.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	This project could be described as modestly transformative – it is not trying to transform a whole system, but is trying to transform (rather than adapt) the way IAS are managed in order to shift from reactive battling against invaders toward averting future introductions or addressing them more effectively at early stages. The chance for sustainability (durability) of project outcomes

		appears high – the project is largely piloting new ways of doing things for established institutions, in order to ramp up their ability to counter IAS, to put them at project's end in a much better to pursue these goals more effectively.
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?	Stakeholders have been clearly identified and full details have been provided on who has been involved to what extent in preparation of this pif. IPLCs have not been involved to date, but involvement of these groups in this project is minor.
	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?	Very clear and well thought-out.
3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	Exceptionally well thought through – a wide range of potential response measures to address gender

<p>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.</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>differentiated risks and opportunities have been identified.</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>See above.</p>
<p>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</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"> • How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 	<p>This appears to be a robust set of risks and response measures are particularly well thought-through and detailed. On climate risk, climate risk screening has not been undertaken in any clear way, although some general consideration of climate risk is included here.</p>

address these risks to be further developed during the project design	<p>2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed? • Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with? • What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures? 	
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?	There is little evidence of this presented.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	See above.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	See above.
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	See above.
	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?	This is not clear and should be strengthened.
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.	What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?	This is very clear and well thought-through.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	As above.

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 <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>
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	<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>