

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

| Part I: Project Information | Response | |
|--|--|---|
| GEF ID | 10531 | |
| Project Title | Integrated watershed management of the Putumayo-Içá river basin | |
| Date of Screening | 16 May 2020 | |
| STAP member screener | Blake Ratner | |
| STAP secretariat screener | Virginia Gorsevski | |
| STAP Overall Assessment and Rating | <p>Minor</p> <p>STAP welcomes this World Bank project to support integrated watershed management of the Putumayo- Içá river basin. The regional context is challenging, and political-economic barriers to progress are high, but the project design is well conceived to address these issues.</p> <p>The structure of components is clear, and there is indication of appropriate preparatory consultation processes undertaken. However, the PIF is incomplete, missing most required sections. This screen has relied upon separate Project Information Document provided.</p> <p>The PID provides summary of screening of environmental and social risks, including institutional complexity, presence of armed groups, and risks associated with potential remediation of heavy metal contamination. Importance of the region's ecosystem services in relation to climate change and associated vulnerabilities are noted, but there is inadequate assessment of climate risk. See STAP document 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? | Yes. |
| Project components | A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives? | Yes. Structure of components is clear and supports the objective. |
| Outcomes | A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits? | Yes, with good indication of preliminary means of verification for anticipated results. |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | |
| | Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated? | Sites are specifically targeted, with rationale for calculation of anticipated mercury pollution averted. |
| 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? | Regional context is challenging, and political-economic barriers to progress are high, but design is well conceived to address these. |
| Part II: Project justification | A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change. | Part II, 1a omitted from PIF. Screen based upon separate Project Information Document provided. |
| 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, with good institutional analysis. |
| | Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references? | Yes, with good reference to published research, including biodiversity features. |
| | 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? | Yes, with good integration of international waters, chemicals and waste, and biodiversity priorities. |
| 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? | Yes. |
| | 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; | Yes, well supported. |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | 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 diagram provided in PID, Annex 2, organized by component, linking outputs and intermediate outcomes. Would benefit from identification of causal linkages across components and underlying assumptions. |
| | 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? | |
| | Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions? | |
| | Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes? | Yes, design indicates appropriate measures for learning and adaptive management. |
| 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, 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, with initial indicators provided. |
| | 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? | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation 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? | PID describes potential innovations in "bottom-up governance" addressing shared water and natural resources. Citizen Science initiative for participatory monitoring of water quality could yield important lessons. |
| | Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors? | As noted in PID, "excellent opportunity to demonstrate IRBM for a major Andes-Amazon sub-basin." |
| | Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability? | Clear transformational intent. |
| 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 | Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers? | Yes. Description is provided of a workshop during project preparation, and expectations for WCS to undertake "coordinating the communication and efforts among different stakeholders in each country and between the countries." Reference is made to mechanisms for stakeholder engagement without indicating what these are: "Consultations with key stakeholders, beneficiaries, and local communities will be systematically carried out during project preparation using existing consultation and participation mechanisms." |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement. | | PID provides additional detail on government agencies, international NGOs and university institutes engaged. |
| | 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? | Description of project governance structure indicates appropriate coordination planned with other related initiatives. |
| 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? | Adequate description of plans, with examples of key barriers provided, including women's land tenure. |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed? | As above. |
| 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 | <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"> • 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? • 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? | <p>Omitted from PIF.</p> <p>PID provides summary of screening of environmental and social risks, including institutional complexity, presence of armed groups, and risks associated with potential remediation of heavy metal contamination.</p> <p>Importance of the region's ecosystem services in relation to climate change and associated vulnerabilities are noted, but there is inadequate assessment of climate risk.</p> |
| 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? | <p>Omitted from PIF.</p> <p>Some evidence in PID but needs explicit identification of lessons.</p> |
| | Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them? | |
| | Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited? | |
| | 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? | |
| 8. Knowledge management. Outline the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, and how it will contribute to the project's overall | What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used? | <p>Omitted from PIF.</p> <p>PID details plans for a culturally-appropriate knowledge management system.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|----------------------------|
| impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations. | | |
| | What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience? | Good indication of intent. |

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. |
| | <i>* 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 "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> |