| Part I: Project Information | | Response |
|---|---|---|
| **GEF ID** | | 10186 |
| **Project Title** | | Climate Change Adaptation in Forest and Agricultural Mosaic Landscapes |
| **Date of Screening** | | 29-May-19 |
| **STAP member Screener** | | Toth, F. |
| **STAP secretariat screener** | | Zommers, Z. |
| **STAP Overall Assessment** | | Minor |
| | | This project seeks to increase the resilience of rural communities through innovations and technology transfer for adaptation. The focus is forest communities. Community structures for forest management will be strengthened, support will be provided for sustainable charcoal production and for strengthening of non-timber forest product value chains, as well as for agribusinesses.<br><br>This project is clearly presented. The integrated focus on livelihood diversification and technology transfer is welcome. The results will provide benefits related to mitigation, sustainable land management and forests. The project is thus relevant to a variety of GEF-7 focal areas. However, given the LDCF funding source, during project development, STAP recommends that the adaptation or resilience-related components of the project are strengthened. The project team may want to review the RAPTA guidelines (http://www.stapgef.org/rapta-guidelines) for suggestions on ways to enhance resilience, adaptation and transformation in the project. The creation of a fully articulated Theory of Change would help highlight how activities contribute clearly to the overall objective to building resilience.<br><br>Further consideration of risk is also advised. Climate change may not only increase risks of extreme events, but also forest die-offs due to droughts or disease outbreaks, fires. The PIF itself mentions that bushfires post a serious threat to land use and forestry (pg 15) but then does not mention this in the risk section. How will value chains or livelihood activities promoted by this project be affected? Could they be undermined by increasing fires?<br><br>Other comments and suggestions are provided below. |
| **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? | Yes |
| Project components | A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives? | Yes |
| Outcomes | A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. | Clearly described. |
| | Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits? | Yes |
| | Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated? | Yes, reasonable likelihood |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Outputs | A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project.<br>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. | No proper theory of change 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 |
| | Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references? | Yes |
| | 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 |
| 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. Good presentation of differences in outcomes with / without this project. |
| | 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 |
| | are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and | Yes |
| | how did these lessons inform the design of this project? | Properly |
| 3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project | What is the theory of change? | No proper theory of change is presented. |
| | What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes? | The planned outputs can be expected to lead to the intended outcomes and thus achieve the objectives specified for the individual components. Taken together, these components constitute a plausible logical framework, although not as valuable as a full-blown theory of change would be. |
| | · 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? | No such concerns are presented. They should be considered and proper fallbacks developed. Tying the specified sequence of actions and events together in a theory of change would also enable this kind of contingency planning. |
| 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? | Yes |
| 6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) | Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable? | Yes |
| | Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment? | Yes, 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? | Yes |
| | What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change? | The main focus of the project is to support adaptation to current and projected future climatic conditions. |
| 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? | Yes, various innovations are planned for implementation: technological, business model and institutional. |
| | Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors? | There is some indication of scaling up, but more specific plans would be required for an effective and successful scaling up. |
| | Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability? | Customary management schemes do not work under the changing circumstances, therefore they will need to be fundamentally changed to stop overexploitation of resources before protective measures can produce results. |
| 1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place. | | Provided |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **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 |
| | 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? | Roles properly designed. |
| **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? | Improving gender equality is repeatedly mentioned as an objective of the project. Gender risks and opportunities are identified, possible response measures mentioned, but not much information is provided about them. |
| | Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed? | A radical change of traditional gender roles in the ownership and management of assets would involve the redistribution of assets and decision authorities, and would create winners and losers, and the opposition of the latter to the whole plan. Proper social transition pathways will need to be designed to avoid these kinds of pitfalls. |
| **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? | The identified risks are valid but their scope is somewhat limited (5 in all); most are outside the project's control. |
| | Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project? | Yes |
| | 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? | Climate risks are severe, but the central objective is to reduce vulnerability to them. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | · Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed? | Yes, a sensible initial impact assessment is presented, but more would be desirable in the next project development step. |
| | · Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with? | Yes, they serve as starting point. |
| | · What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures? | A promising plan is presented to address these issues |
| **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 |
| | Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them? | Yes |
| | Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited? | Yes |
| | How have these lessons informed the project's formulation? | Properly |
| | 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 "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? | A regrettable deficiency of this PIF is the virtually missing KM plan. The sporadic ideas presented under Point 8 are useful but they are rather poor and need substantial improvement to allow all results and benefits of the project to spread and scale up. |
| | What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience? | |
| **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. | |