Part I: Project Information	Response	
GEF ID		
Project Title	Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in the tourism sector of the protected areas and strategic ecosystems of San Andres, Old Providence and Santa Catalina islands	
Date of Screening	21 May 2020	
STAP member screener	Rosie Cooney	
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski	
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	Concur STAP welcomes this project entitled "Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in the tourism sector of the protected areas and strategic ecosystems of San Andres, Old Providence and Santa Catalina islands" from the World Wildlife Fund – US. Overall STAP finds that this is a well-planned and well-articulated project aimed at decreasing the negative impacts of tourism in these islands of Colombia through mainstreaming biodiversity in the tourism sector. There is a very clear and well-thought out theory of change, which is graphically illustrated. This is very welcome, and it clarifies the project logic greatly. The project is set up to generate substantial GEBs. Key innovations in this project relate to policy and economics. Specifically, by shifting the institutional environment toward one that supports sustainable tourism; and by altering the incentives of small businesses toward greener models. The main concern over this project is the durability of benefits in the face of both an unclear prognosis for global tourism and expected devastating impacts of climate change on reef ecosystems over coming decades. These risks deserve more focused attention, and detailed climate risk screening in particular should be undertaken (see STAP guidance document on climate risk screening).	
Part I: Project Information	What STAP looks for	Response

B. Indicative Project Description Summary		
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	The objective here is just biodiversity mainstreaming, but BDM is not an end in itself, but an avenue to achieve a biodiversity conservation outcome. The objective should be re-written to specify what the overall conservation outcome is that is to be achieved using BDM. Here it would be something like "Negative impacts of tourism are reduced, and positive impacts increased, through BDM…"
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes, and the planning is based on clear and participatory assessment and ranking of threats to the area's key ecosystems, which is great to see.
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?	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.	
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. Clear and with fully adequate information.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes, very well described. Fig 2 provides a very clear graphic illustration of the structure of the problem, indicating how

		deeper drivers structure and cause proximate threats to ecosystems.
	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, this is adequate.
	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;	
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	Previous projects are mentioned, but the project doesn't specify lessons learned from previous projects and how these inform the design of this project.
	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 a very clear and well-thought out TOC, graphically illustrated. This is very welcome, and it clarifies the project logic greatly.
	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?	Yes, the mechanisms of change appear sound.

	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	In the Risks section there is some recognition that there may need to be adaptation, particularly in the light of Covid-related impacts on tourism. However, no articulation of specific adaptations that may need to be made is made.
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
	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.
	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, this is particularly clear.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	None are explicitly considered. Overall the project should increase resilience to climate change, but climate change poses major threats to tourism in the region, so explicitly considering measures to increase resilience is necessary.
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?	Key innovations here are in policy – shifting the institutional environment toward one that supports sustainable tourism; and economic – shifting the incentives of small businesses toward greener models.

	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	This is quite high-level but reasonably clear.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Durability of project outcomes should be promoted by several project characteristics, particular the involvement of a wide range of stakeholders, and shifting the incentives facing them through changing the regulatory/policy/institutional environment for tourism.
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?	Yes, this is well thought through. The array of stakeholders to be involved is large, and managing the coordination/communication will be a major task.

	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?	See above – this is well done.
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?	Yes, particularly thoroughly.
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	See above.
5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that	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?	The risks of not gaining political or industry support are categorised as low, which seems very optimistic. The response measures emphasise communicating the business case

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	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? • 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?	for biodiversity conservation, but under the right institutional conditions short term exploitation is clearly favoured. The project is attempting to shift incentives in a way that fosters longer-term thinking, and it is hard to see how these risks can be effectively countered, yet this ranking does appear low. Likewise for several other risks the response measures are quite weak – emphasising adaptive management but with no indication of what adaptations could be made. Climate risk screening is a major priority for this project. Over a 2020-2050 time horizon the specific predictions for climate impacts in the region should be considered and their impacts assessed. Will coral reefs even be able to persist in this area by 2050? What about projected weather impacts? What resilience measures could be taken to address these impacts? The STAP guidance on climate risk assessment would be useful to guide such climate screening.
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 – there is (unlike the vast majority of GEF pifs) an effort to articulate lessons learnt from previous projects and indicate how they have influenced the design of this project.
	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?	Clearly articulated
	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
8. Knowledge management. Outline the	What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?	This is rather weak at this point – to be developed during the PPG phase.

"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 plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	No specific plans are set out here.

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 *"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."*
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**	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.