

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <b>Part I: Project Information</b>               |  | <b>Response</b>   |
| <b>GEF ID</b>                                    |  | 10188   |
| <b>Project Title</b>                             |  | BIOREACH: Biodiversity Conservation and Agroecological Land Restoration in Productive Landscapes of Trinidad and Tobago   |
| <b>Date of Screening</b>                         |  | 21-May-19   |
| <b>STAP member Screener</b>                      |  | Rosie Cooney  |
| <b>STAP secretariat screener</b>                 |  | Virginia Gorsevski  |
| <b>STAP Overall Assessment</b>                   |  | Concur  |
|  |  | STAP welcomes the multi-focal area project proposal from FAO entitled "Biodiversity Conservation and Agroecological Land Restoration in Productive Landscapes of Trinidad and Tobago." Overall this is a well-written, well thought through, and comprehensive project, which needs only minor clarification of some key points and activities (see below). It is a relatively short project (48 months) and is requesting a modest GEF investment (\$3.75m). The project has 4 main Components and it follows a logical set of actions that encompass numerous interventions. This will work if the project is well-organized and adequately staffed to cover the numerous and wide-ranging interventions (land use planning, biodiversity data collection, invasive alien species, fire management, agro-ecology, farmer schools, value chain, etc.). While STAP welcomes Component 1 focus on biodiversity-friendly land use planning, it is important to note that the plans are not, in and of themselves, an outcome but rather a means to achieve a stated environmental goal. |
| <b>Part I: Project Information</b>               | <b>What STAP looks for</b>   | <b>Response</b>   |
| <b>B. Indicative Project Description Summary</b> |  |   |
| Project Objective                                | Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?   | The objective of this project is to "promote biodiversity conservation, to restore degraded lands and improve livelihoods of rural communities in targeted productive landscapes." This is a general objective but encapsulates the planned activities.   |
| Project components                               | A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?  | There are 4 main components with several (perhaps too many) planned activities. These are 1) BD-sensitive land use planning, 2) landscape restoration in designated agriculture and forest landscapes, 3) enabling environment for BD-friendly value chain development, and 4) KM and monitoring. Yes these support the project's objectives.   |
| Outcomes   | A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.   | Numerous outputs under each Component can be considered the short-term building blocks necessary to achieve the main objective which is landscape restoration and green value chains. The first Component - land use planning - is a good first step but perhaps not an outcome as much as an essential first step in the process.  |
|  | Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/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.<br>Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes? | There are many outputs associated with each Component (17 in total!) that encompass a wide variety of activities (e.g. wildfires, plans, BD data, partnerships, strategies, IAS, farmer field schools, etc.) While all of these outputs are interesting and useful and add value to the larger effort it will be critical that these activities are ordered and managed carefully so as not to overwhelm the project objective through a lack of clear focus.   |
| Part II: Project justification                   | A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.  |   |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <b>1. Project description. Briefly describe:</b>   |  |   |
| 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?   | The threats are well stated and as are the underlying root causes (land tenure, poverty, etc.)  |
|  | Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?   | The barriers are listed as 1) agricultural; 2) encroachment; and lack of LU guidance, planning and enforcement. However, it is not clear what these are barriers to. There is nothing between the threats and barriers section to explain what the barriers are standing in the way of and therefore why they are highlighted as opposed to others. Further, at least some of these barriers are not really barriers to change so much as drivers of environmental degradation (e.g. "encroachment"). |
|  | 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 - land degradation and biodiversity loss are intertwined and the proposed solutions address both in an integrated fashion.  |
| 2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects   | Is the baseline identified clearly?  | Several projects are listed under the Baseline section and throughout the PIF the project discusses how this proposed GEF project will build on 'lessons learned' from other related activities.  |
|  | Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?   | Project benefits are described in terms of GEF indicators (hectares, carbon) so yes although little information is provide in the map or elsewhere about the project areas themselves.  |
|  | Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?  | unclear   |
|  | 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;   | somewhat. Needs more data and analysis for LDN, for example. Recommend using Trends.Earth for land degradation  |
|  | are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and  | Yes - this is done well throughout the project proposal   |
|  | how did these lessons inform the design of this project?   | Will learn from GEF project in Haiti on cacao value chain, for example  |
| 3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project                 | What is the theory of change?  | The TOC is presented in a separate document. Shows root causes of BD loss and degradation and how project interventions will address two of these (inadequate knowledge and unsustainable land use practices) - not poverty and poor governance, per se, though assumptions are made that improved livelihoods and clarity on land tenure can address these as well.  |
|  | What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?  | Land use planning, followed by implementation of restoration activities, combined with KM and CB.   |
|  | · What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?   | See above   |
|  | · Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?   | Yes - though there may be gaps. The project recognizes this and commits to adaptive management to address potential shortcomings.   |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   | · 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 - see above  |
| 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? | N/A  |
| 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 - though many outputs may need to be scaled back or prioritized  |
|   | 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?             | throughout the document there is mention of indicators and data to be generated (e.g. biodiversity). This project should make an effort to use publically available BD and other data (e.g. high resolution land cover data from remote sensing) that is open source AND should similarly make available any BD or other data acquired from this project to open source platforms such as GBIF.  |
|   | What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?   | forest restoration   |
| 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?                   | Not really apart from the acknowledgement and engagement of squatters who are normally treated as external to the project.   |
|   | Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?                    | Innovation is based on the use of community-based land use planning mechanisms. These have been around for awhile; however seem to be new to GEF projects so perhaps innovative. Same for fire management. The project should make use of FIRMS (Fire Information for Resource Management System) which uses MODIS active fire data to provide near real-time fire locations to resource managers. This would be innovative for a GEF project. |
|   | Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?   | This proposed project includes many different types of activities. Therefore incremental adaptation is more realistic.   |
| 1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.     |   | Map is provided but not clear and no geo-referencing. More information is needed on proposed project sites.  |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <p><b>2. Stakeholders.</b> 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.</p>  | <p>Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?</p>  | <p>Yes. However, one concern is the repeated statement that after "...land use plans are developed they should be shared widely with community leaders and actors to ensure that people are aware of what kind of activities should take place in which zones." (p. 44). Waiting to engage community leaders after the plans are developed rather than include them in the process is a recipe for disaster.</p> |
|  | <p>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?</p> |  |
| <p><b>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.</b> 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</p> | <p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>                                 | <p>Yes</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><b>5. Risks.</b> 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>  | <p>Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?</p>   | <p>Most of the risks listed are internal to the project with the exception of political changes which the project will mitigate by working at the local level. However, the main executing partner is the Environmental Management Authority. It will be important to get buy in from communities and the private sector.</p>  |
|  | <p>Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?</p>   | <p>It is unclear what the relationship is between the 'squatters' and others. Seems like there may be potential for conflict which is not addressed in this project.</p>   |
|  | <p>For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p>   |  |
|  | <p>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?</p>                      |  |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  | · Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?  | no  |
|  | · 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?  |   |
| <b>6. Coordination.</b> 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?  | see above   |
|  | 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?  | none mentioned  |
| <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?   | there is a KM component as part of this project which stresses monitoring and adaptive management |
|  | What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?  |   |
| <b>STAP advisory response</b>  | <b>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</b>   |   |
| <b>1. Concur</b>   | 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 <b><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></b> |   |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b> | 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.  |  |
| <b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b> | 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. |  |