

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10517
Project Title	Integrated Agro-ecosystem Approach for enhancing Livelihoods and Climate Resilience in Tuvalu
Date of Screening	May 13, 2020
STAP member screener	Graciela Metternicht
STAP secretariat screener	Guadalupe Duron
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Minor issues to be considered during project design</p> <p>STAP acknowledges FAO’s project “Integrated Agro-ecosystem Approach for enhancing Livelihoods and Climate Resilience in Tuvalu”. The project aims to tackle land degradation, enhance local livelihoods, and increase climate resilience through integrated agro-ecosystem management in Tuvalu. The project also aims to support Tuvalu develop its land degradation neutrality (LDN) strategy, and strengthen the enabling environment for implementation of LDN-related activities.</p> <p>To support Tuvalu’s LDN efforts, STAP recommends for the project developers to assess the land potential in the target sites. This assessment will determine the capacity of the land to sustain the productivity this project desires (e.g. tree nurseries), as well as explore the capacity for the land to deliver ecosystem services (e.g. erosion control). A land potential assessment is essential to designing land degradation interventions. The LDN technical guidelines target GEF projects, and offer advice on how to design LDN interventions relying on land potential assessments. (The guidelines can be found on STAP’s website: https://www.stapgef.org/guidelines-land-degradation-neutrality).</p> <p>As FAO described in the PIF, Tuvalu is at high risk of being impacted by climate disasters (e.g. seasonal storm surges and flooding due to cyclones). STAP is pleased the project developers will conduct a thorough analysis of</p>

	<p>climate hazards, and embed this analysis throughout the project interventions. In addition to this analysis, STAP recommends planning for multiple scenarios, or impact pathways, to plan for uncertainty and undesired changes. Developing different impact pathways in the theory of change, will allow the opportunity to assess different options to maintain, adapt, or transform the system – and keep the project on a track to meet its objective. STAP highly recommends, therefore, for a systems-based theory of change to be a critical component of this project. Relying on a systems analysis-theory of change to design and implement the project, will provide valuable support to Tuvalu in managing the complexity of land degradation.</p> <p>Bilateral cooperation has provided expert knowledge to Tuvalu over the years in support of improved livelihoods and sustainable agriculture (e.g. through ACIAR). STAP recommends the project team to familiarize with the knowledge and learning from these projects, and to build proposed activities that are complementary to work already done.</p> <p>Below, STAP offers recommendations on how to improve the project design.</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, the objective is defined clearly, and consistently linked to the problem statement.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project’s objectives?	Yes, the activities support the project objective.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits?	Yes, the outcomes focus on global environmental outcomes.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	The benefits are likely to be generated with careful monitoring, and with good cross-sectoral coordination as well as inclusiveness of other

		ongoing projects with similar focus (e.g. funded by the Australian Government).
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, outputs are likely to contribute to outcomes.
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?	<p>Yes, the problem is well-defined, which includes a description of the root causes. In the final project document, STAP suggests describing in greater detail the socioeconomic context of the target sites. It also would be valuable to use climate information to describe Tuvalu's vulnerability to climate change. The following resources characterize Tuvalu's context in relation to climate change:</p> <p>https://climateknowledgeportal.worldbank.org/country/tuvalu</p> <p>https://www.climatewatchdata.org/countries/TUV#climate-vulnerability</p> <p>STAP also suggests the team familiarise with the substantial body of applied research and projects funded by the Australian Government (e.g. Foodcube) to assist Tuvalu in developing sustainable agriculture and good security. furthermore, STAP recommends the team to review the recent report of UNCCD and FAO. 2020. Land Degradation Neutrality in Small Island Developing States. Technical report. Bonn, Germany</p>
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes, the barriers are described. STAP recommends re-assessing the barriers during the development of a theory of change that identifies the assumptions required to achieve each outcome. The barrier analysis is part of the process of defining the assumptions.

	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?	Does not apply.
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Yes, the PIF includes a narrative baseline identifies efforts by the ministry of home affairs and agriculture, and by several on-going, or past, projects. The baseline will primarily build on the ministry's activities.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Core indicators will be used to quantify the project benefits. STAP recommends using the core indicators of LDN to complement the indicators mentioned in the PIF.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Yes, the baseline is sufficiently robust at this stage.
	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;	Does not apply.
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	Yes, several lessons are identified in the baseline projects, which will inform the design of this project. This includes lessons on natural resource management, and climate adaptation.
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	Unclear. Recommend specifying in the final project document how the lessons informed 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?	A preliminary theory of change for the project is: "Tuvalu's UNCCD NAP highlights and documents the problem of land degradation, drivers of degradation and the directions to address the drivers in the country. The project analysis above is closely aligned with the NAP. The root causes of land degradation are the inappropriate and unsustainable agricultural practices and the impacts created is further exacerbated by extreme weather events. There are a variety of barriers that needs to be addressed to effectively address the causes of

		land degradation. This project will systematically address these barriers. NAP also mentions the need for integration at all levels and intersectoral coordination to address land degradation in Tuvalu, the project will adopt an integrated agro-ecosystem approach to promote integration at both national and local levels, and lay the groundwork to achieve LDN.”
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	STAP recommends developing a theory of change that describes the causal links between outputs and outcomes; and that identifies relevant stakeholders for engagement in different activities designed for achieving the expected outcomes.
	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?	STAP recommends for the final project document to include a theory of change narrative and figure, explaining the causal link between the outputs and outcomes. STAP also recommends defining the assumptions, which includes a barrier analysis (and identifying enablers of change), and also identify external factors that may affect the ability to deliver the expected outcomes.. STAP’s theory of change primer: https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	Partly. The climate risk screening recognizes that Tuvalu is at high risk of climate hazards. During the project design, the interventions will be reassessed through a climate risk screening lens. However, the project does not appear to plan for undesired changes, or uncertainty. STAP recommends developing a systems-based theory of change with adaptation pathways. Developing different scenarios will allow the opportunity to assess different options to maintain, adapt, or transform the system – and keep the project on a track to meet its objective.
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected	GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?	Yes, with careful monitoring and a good theory of change.

contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing		
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	Does not apply.
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?	<p>Yes, the global environmental benefits are articulated clearly.</p> <p>When designing the project, assessing for suitable land management and restoration practices, and managing trade-offs between benefits, STAP recommends applying its LDN technical guidelines released in April 2020, which are more detailed than earlier versions of the guidelines. The technical guidelines can be found at: https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/LDN%20Technical%20Report_web%20version.pdf</p> <p>Before restoring degraded lands by pursuing agroforestry and agroecosystem practices (component 2), STAP recommends assessing the land's potential to recover from land degradation. This process will involve looking at the biophysical characteristics of the land, including the vegetation and landscape features, as well as the soil properties. Climate projections for Tuvalu should also form part of this assessment. Appendix 2 in the technical guidelines provides guidance on pursuing a land assessment.</p> <p>For component 3, STAP encourages the project team to use the theory of change to monitor short-term outcomes, which are linked to the long-term outcomes the project will achieve. Furthermore, the theory of change can be used to undertake the iterative learning component 3 aims to achieve.</p>
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Unclear. Suggest identifying the barriers and enablers to scaling in the theory of change.

		Because of the strong focus on capacity building, STAP suggests attention be paid to cultural aspects and values (related to scaling deep) to effect sustainable change.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Yes, global environmental benefits are defined.
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	STAP suggests describing the methodologies that will be used to monitor and evaluate the core indicators. In addition to listing the GEF core indicators, STAP suggests identifying indicators to monitor and track progress of the causal links in the theory of change. These indicators will test the validity of the causal pathway, which requires the theory of change to be explicit about assumptions, and the project barriers.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	The climate risk analysis identified several options to increase the project's resilience to climate change. This included doing a deeper climate risk analysis during the project design, focused disaster and hazard readiness.
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?	<p>The project is innovative in applying LDN practices as Tuvalu has not yet defined its LDN targets. STAP encourages the project developers to apply the technical guidelines on LDN when designing the project.</p> <p>As mentioned above, the assumption is that applying LDN, and agro-ecosystem management, will generate the knowledge and institutional conditions to scale deep (i.e. influence social systems) across temporal and spatial scales. STAP would like to see these assumptions identified and tested in a theory of change, and for the necessary adaptive management to take place based on this learning. STAP recommends its paper on durability and theory of change - where it lists principles that need attention to achieve scaling: https://www.stagef.org/achieving-enduring-outcomes-gef-investment; https://www.stagef.org/theory-change-primer</p>

		STAP further recommends this paper: Butler, J.R., Rochester, W., Skewes, T.D., Wise, R.M., Bohensky, E.L., Katzfey, J., Kirono, D.G., Peterson, N., Suadnya, W., Yanuartati, Y. and Handayani, T., 2020. How Feasible Is the Scaling-Out of Livelihood and Food System Adaptation in Asia-Pacific Islands?. <i>Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems</i> , 4, p.43.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	The project states it will focus on scaling out, scaling up, and scaling deep. To facilitate these actions, STAP recommends its theory of change primer, and RAPTA: https://research.csiro.au/eap/rapta/
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	It is possible that both adaptation and transformational change will be required due to Tuvalu's high risk of climate hazards. STAP encourages the project team to consider uncertainty to cope with the level of change (desired and undesired) that may take place. This requires considering systematically time scales and spatial scales when planning the interventions. A systems-based theory of change can do this as it targets how a social-ecological systems functions across scales. Refer to STAP's theory of change primer, which is a good resource for developing a theory of change based on systems analysis: https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		A map of the target sites is provided, depicting land uses. However, the project coordinates appear missing. When designing the project, STAP recommends its guidance on earth observation systems, which provides advice on how to provide high-quality georeferenced information (see page 64): https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/GEF%20EO%20Mainstreaming%20March2020%20Final%2020200331-v3.0.pdf

<p>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.</p>	<p>Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?</p>	<p>Yes, the PIF lists a variety of stakeholders which are essential to addressing the barriers and solving the problem. The role of stakeholders in the project is specified.</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>Preparing the PIF involved consultations with key stakeholders. STAP encourages the project team to develop a stakeholder engagement plan, and identify who will be affected by the interventions; and who needs to be involved in the design and implementation of the project. Who is involved may change depending on the learning and adaptation, or transformations, that take place during project implementation.</p> <p>Additionally, project developers are encouraged to pay attention to stakeholders' values, governance arrangements (formal and informal), agents of change (individuals who can catalyze change), and other issues that enable social innovation and drive action towards the project objective.</p>
<p>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>The PIF describes the different roles between men and women in natural resource management, and agroforestry. These differences (and opportunities) will be assessed during the project design. The results will be used to develop the components.</p>

<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no/tbd</p>		<p>Additionally, STAP recommends considering whether the full participation of an important stakeholder group is hindered as a result of the gender analysis, and describing how will the project address these obstacles.</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>Unsure as the gender analysis will be done during the project design. STAP recommended (above) to give due consideration of how a gender analysis may hinder the full participation of an important stakeholder group.</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>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?</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? 	<p>The PIF summarizes the risks the project may face, including climate risks, lack of stakeholder engagement, lack of project governance, among other factors. STAP recommends detailing the assumptions that underlie the casual links, which needs to include these risks and the project barriers.</p> <p>In addition to the climate risks identified in the PIF, STAP recommends addressing the climate</p>

further developed during the project design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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>resilience measures described to the left. STAP also encourages the project developers to continually test causal links, assumptions, and risks in the theory of change. This process will enable the project team to assess for the resilience of the system – identify how, and where, the system is weak, or strong, in its capacity to deal with disturbances.</p> <p>Additionally, the project team may find it useful to look at the following resources: STAP’s screening guidelines: http://www.stapgef.org/sites/default/files/document/s/GEF%20AGENCY%20RETREAT%20Mar-Apr%202020.pdf World Bank Climate Change Knowledge Portal: https://climateknowledgeportal.worldbank.org/ U.S. Agency for International Development Climate Risk Screening and Management Tools: https://www.climatelinks.org/resources/climate-risk-screening-management-tool</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?	Yes, the project will build on the knowledge of other projects based on the baseline projects listed in the PIF, and described in the coordination section.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	See above.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Yes, lessons from other projects will be used to develop this proposal.
	How have these lessons informed the project’s formulation?	See above.
	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, the project includes a component on monitoring (component 3). STAP recommends linking the theory of change (i.e. monitoring of short-term outcomes) to the monitoring component (i.e. monitoring of long-term outcomes).
8. Knowledge management. Outline the “Knowledge Management Approach” for the project,	What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?	The project will create an inventory of the native tree species and fruit tree species. This knowledge base will be used to develop soil conservation and agroforestry interventions. The project will also

<p>and how it will contribute to the project's overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.</p>		<p>disseminate best practices and lessons learned across other atoll nations. The knowledge strategy will be developed further during the project design.</p> <p>STAP recommends building this iterative learning into the theory of change, and linking this process to component 3 on monitoring. STAP recommends considering knowledge management metrics, and specifying further how the knowledge generated will influence scaling of results beyond replication. In particular, it would be valuable for the project to build-in interventions that support social innovation (scaling deep). In regards to output 3.1.3 STAP recommends the use of regional platforms for sharing and storing best practices and lessons learned, so that they can be shared with other Pacific Islands (e.g. Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP))</p>
	<p>What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?</p>	<p>See above.</p>

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 <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>
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.

<p>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</p>	<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>