Part I: Project Information		Response
GEF ID		10192
Project Title		Ecosystem conservation and community livelihood enhancement in North Western Zambia
Date of Screening		23-May-19
STAP member Screener		Rosie Cooney
STAP secretariat screener		Virginia Gorsevski
STAP Overall Assessment		Concur
		STAP welcomes this proposal from UN Environment entitled "Ecosystem conservation and community livelihood enhancement in North Western Zambia." The project is clear, well thought-out, well-written, and appears to have a high likelihood of success. STAP appreciates that this project has a limited number of well thought out Components with targeted outcomes and outputs that should result in concrete deliverables and action on the ground. The use of livelihood surveys and participatory land use mapping is a sensible way to begin a project to accurately assess baseline socio-economic conditions and to ensure buy-in from stakeholders. STAP recommends that the results from the livelihoods survey be made spatially explicit and integrated with the land use planning process, if possible. STAP further recommends that the project make use of readily available, open access remote sensing and other data to monitor land cover and land use changes over time, including after the project ends to determine sustainability of outcomes. For land degradation and Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN), the tool Trends.Earth would be very useful in this respect. Finally, STAP's paper on "Local Commons for Global Benefits" recommends that projects to strengthen or establish community-based management should adopt a number of fundamental design characteristics related to land tenure, value, governance, etc (all of which appear to be strongly embedded in this project) (see Child, B. and Cooney, R., 2019. Local Commons for Global Benefits: Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel to the Global Environment Facility. Washington, DC.)
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. The project objective is to strengthen community-based sustainable management of forest landscapes, and provide improved livelihood opportunities for targeted forest-dependent rural communities in Zambia's North West Province.
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.	There are 2 Components, with several outcomes, sub-outcomes and outputs. All are clear and well-thought out in terms of covering the multitude of interventions which combined would provide resources and incentives for community-based natural resource management.
	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. 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.	The PIF does a good job explicitly linking each Component with barriers identified in the previous section. Most PIFs do not do this and it indicates that clear thought has gone into developing the project's logic. However, a graphic and explicit TOC would be advisable, and helpful in implementation and ongoing adaptive management of the project. A modified version of the TOC set out in this paper may be of use Biggs, D., Cooney, R., Roe, D., Dublin, H. T., Allan, J. R., Challender, D. W. S. and Skinner, D. (2016) "Developing a theory of change for a community-based response to illegal wildlife trade." Conservation Biology 31(1): 5-12.
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?	There doesn't appear to be a clear 'problem statement' however, the threats are described in some detail (deforestation due to agriculture, infastructure development, energy, etc.) as well as the underlying root causes (poverty, population growth migration).
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Barriers are well articulated.
	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?	In terms of past and ongoing programs, yes.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	The scientific baseline could be derived from statistics provided in earlier sections (e.g. households clear on average 0.53 ha of forest per annum) and other information could be provided during the household surveys that could be used to set a baseline and evaluate improvements resulting from implementation of the project (including socio-economic indicators).
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	See above.
	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;	Indicators are based on GEF requirements (e.g. areas of HCVF avoided).
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	Project proponents clearly have a good understanding of past and ongoing efforts in Zambia, but clarifying key lessons from these, that the project is either taking forward or avoiding, would be welcome.
	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?	No explicit TOC is provided however the underlying notion is that providing communities with capacity, skills and financial and other incentives to practice sustainable management that deforestation rates will be decreased.

	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Spatial planning, baseline assessment, followed by a sl
	· 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 explicit mention is made of adaptive management in the PIF. However, elements of the Risks Section acknowledge that some flexibility will be necessary in working with communities depending on what transpires after the project begins and there is clearly a willingness to change course where necessary.
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, and also local. They are measurable. The project should make use of tools such as Trends.Earth for assessing land degradation and remote sensing datasets from Global Forest Watch and elsewhere to monitor forest cover over time - including after the project ends.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	GEF investment is about $5.3 m which is reasonable for the proposed activities and overall level of effort - particularly if the project collaborates with other related, ongoing activities.
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	Yes, using GEF indicators
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	See above comment with regards to Trends.Earth and GFW. Other open source data platforms are available.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	The project lists increased droughts and floods as a low-medium risk. Mitigation measures include diversified livelihood alternatives, reduced over dependence on natural resources, etc. These are embedded within the project design.
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?	While this (CBNRM) is not a new approach, it will substantially shift institutional structures and incentives at local level, so has considerable potential for transforming patterns of damaging activity.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Not especially.

	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Map is provided but no georeferencing.
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, although the Zambia CBNRM Forum would presumably be another useful group to engage with, both to ensure lessons and insights from past/other experience are fully integrated into the project, and to disseminate knowledge and learnings from the project.
	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?	Table is provided
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
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	No
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?	Yes - mainly they are internal to the project and will be covered by the proposed interventions.
	Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?	No mention of political change, conflict, etc. so unclear.

	For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:	See above
	· 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?	Not detailed in the project
	· 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?	Yes - internal to the project
	· 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?	Yes
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Not really - past experience is referred to (s 7), but specific lessons have not been articulated.
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	Unclear
	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?	Unclear
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?	KM approach is standard. Includes the establishment of a national community forestry platform. The project should make use of existing open source data and integrate it with outputs from this project.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	This project intends to be a test case for the efficacy of the proposed interventions. If they are successful the plan is to achieve large scale change in community-based forest management.
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.	