

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10541
Project Title	Sustainable management and restoration of the Dry Forest of the Northern Coast of Peru
Date of Screening	May 27 2020
STAP member screener	Graciela Metternicht
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Concur</p> <p>STAP welcomes this project from FAO/IUCN to sustainably manage and restore portions of the dry forest along the northern coast of Peru. This is a comprehensive and ambitious project that applies a landscape approach to support improved management and restoration of an important ecosystem.</p> <p>The threats are well described, as are the barriers to conservation and improvement. The project components, and the outcomes and outputs contained therein are sensible and should result in local and global environmental benefits, provided incentives for engaging in non-destructive income generating activities are successful. This will be done through technical assistance and improved access to markets.</p> <p>The project includes a Theory of Change; however, it needs to include underlying assumptions or alternative pathways. STAP recommends that project proponents revisit the ToC during PPG phase and make use of the STAP primer on Theory of Change.</p> <p>STAP is pleased to note that this project evaluates climate risk in a thoughtful and detailed manner (as an Annex) and that further work will be done during PPG phase to identify and incorporate appropriate climate smart interventions on the ground.</p>

	<p>STAP welcomes the project is to apply the LDN Conceptual Framework and the LDN Guidelines purposely written for GEF projects. In this regard, STAP suggests that planned LDN interventions consider ‘land potential’ and that complementary national and subnational indicators be selected appropriate for locally-relevant ecosystem services that are not covered by the three global LDN indicators —SOC, Net Primary Productivity and land cover/land use change.</p> <p>Below, STAP describes its guidance.</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?	<p>The objective of this IUCN/FAO project is “to restore and sustainably manage the dry forests of the Northern Coast of Peru, facilitating the conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services, increasing the resilience of communities and their livelihoods, and supporting the achievement of the Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) target.” This is a clearly defined objective and closely related to the problems identified by the project.</p> <p>STAP recommends that in undertaking assessments for determining LDN interventions, consideration be given the ‘land potential’, as explained in the LDN guidelines and the LDN Scientific Conceptual Framework.</p>
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project’s objectives?	Yes
Outcomes	<p>A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.</p> <p>Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?</p>	Planned outcomes are feasible; the restoration approach will aim to protect remaining native vegetation areas along with increasing sustainable agricultural and forestry production which should not only prevent further decline in biodiversity and stem land degradation but also contribution to mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change.
	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 – the dry forests of Peru are clearly important in terms of their high levels of biodiversity (including genetic) and endemism. They are also home to 5 million poverty-stricken people who rely heavily on the forests to survive. This project seeks to find the balance between conservation of a critical landscape while ensuring that the needs of local inhabitants are met in the immediate and long term.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Threats are comprehensive – unsustainable agricultural practices (intensive overgrazing, poor agricultural practices, agrochemicals), unsustainable forestry practices (selective and illegal logging for charcoal and wood), hunting and illegal wildlife trade, wildfires, land trafficking. Dry forests also vulnerable to climate change effects. Barriers are clear and well categorized and described with specific examples.
	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 – both in terms of degraded area of each region (ha) (a baseline will be established to assess degradation of ecosystem services (p. 33)), as well as comprehensive information on baseline international cooperation projects (GEF and non GEF).

	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	The project provides specific indicators for the various outcomes that can be compared with the baseline (i.e. 10% increase in METT score over the baseline and specific baseline and targets for PAs provided on p. 31). Others are less clear such as number and type of start-ups with access to the market (presumably the baseline is 0)
	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	No. Like many GEF projects this one will publish lessons learned from this project and will coordinate with other GEF and non GEF projects, but does not show any indication that this particular project was designed to take into account lessons learned from prior efforts.
	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?	A ToC is presented in Graph 1 (p. 35) which is a good start but is somewhat simplistic and mainly mirrors the narrative in earlier sections (more akin to a log frame). During PPG phase it would be beneficial to provide detail regarding the underlying assumptions and processes which include the various stakeholders and their roles. See STAP primer on Theory of Change for more information.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	First the project will strengthen the planning and management capacities of national, regional and local stakeholders for the sustainable management of dry forests, contributing to their better conservation and restoration, and the adoption and scaling-up of biodiversity-friendly practices and sustainable land management.

		Then the project will work at the local level to work with stakeholders to provide technical assistance (e.g. through Farmer Field Schools) and offer access to markets for sustainable products of dry forests with the goal of increasing income and improving livelihoods.
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	Improved harmonization and coordination of policies at the national, regional and local level followed by planning and technical and financial assistance at project sites. Numerous outputs for each including master plans, trainings, monitoring systems, financial instruments, etc.
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	The mechanisms of change are plausible; however, more information needs to be provided regarding the underlying assumptions and alternative courses of action should these assumptions prove untrue.
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	Not really
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/adaptation benefits, and are they measurable?	Yes. Since this project intends to support Peru in achieving its LDN targets, STAP recommends the use of latest version of the STAP's technical guidelines on LDN to apply the LDN response hierarchy of avoid, reduce, and reverse land degradation to achieve global environmental outcomes on biodiversity and sustainable land management.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes. This is a \$7.6 million project over a 5-year period. It seeks to improve PA management of 2,500 km ² , restore 23 km ² of land, and support

		improved practices on 1,173 km ² of land surrounding PAs.
	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
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	The project itself, through improved management and restoration will increase the resilience of the dry forest area to the effects of climate change. A detailed climate risk screening is provided which states the following: "the project integrates multiple measures that aim to reduce GHG emissions, diminish soil erosion and improve soil fertility in areas at high risk of desertification. The previous are achieved with a package of sustainable management and restoration practices. A more in-depth climate-analysis is recommended at the PPG stage, which can include a climate rationale that can further support the activities and objectives of the project."
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 – innovation is found mainly in the use of Earth Observation information such as Open Foris Tools /Collect Earth to allow for greater data precision and transparency as well as the capability to monitor change over time. These tools were highlighted in a recent STAP publication Earth Observation and the GEF and STAP is pleased to see their continued use and looks forward to seeing the results.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Not really. As with many GEF projects, this one assumes that success will be documented and shared and this will encourage uptake in other areas in Peru as well as nationally. Also states that alliances with the private sector will allow replicating experiences with sustainable value chains but does not explain how specifically.

	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Transformational change will be needed to successfully transition people from heavy and unsustainable dependence on natural resources to new SLM practices and income generating activities based on sustainable use of resources.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Detailed maps are provided in Annex A for prioritized landscapes, the map of restoration areas, and watersheds. A good description is given for how areas were selected (p. 41). Specific geo-referenced information for the sites is not provided; this can be done easily for the PAs in the form of a WDPA shapefile using bounding coordinates. It is less apparent for areas outside PAs and areas targeted for restoration; however, this information can be obtained during PPG phase using GPS or via Collect Earth or other software. See Earth Observation and the GEF Annex A1.0.
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?	Key stakeholders and their roles are articulated and appear to include all relevant groups. Additional effort could be applied during PPG phase to go beyond detailing roles and responsibilities but also to articulate how the project will promote engagement between stakeholders and build ownership, thereby increasing likelihood of durable outcomes once the project is completed.
	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.

<p>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</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Yes – the role of women is described as well as major challenges including limited access to credit and low levels of education.</p> <p>This project will develop a gender action plan as well as specific actions to ensure equal access of men and women to the project and its benefits, including (importantly) measures that will contribute to the improvement of income received by women.</p> <p>STAP provides a list of recent resources that focus on mainstreaming gender in LDN interventions (see list at the end of this document).</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>See above.</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? 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>Risks are fairly standard (e.g. lack of coordination, economic pressure) and addressed in the project design. A detailed environmental and social risk identification screening checklist is provided which offers additional detail.</p> <p>STAP is pleased to see a detailed climate risk screening included in the Risks table as well as in a separate annex. Further detailed information will</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? 	be provided during PPG phase to specifically identify climate-smart activities. An environmental and climate risk specialist will be hired and the project will include sharing of climate data among project stakeholders.
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?	The project lists other ongoing relevant GEF projects in Peru with which it will coordinate.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Adequate recognition of current GEF and non GEF projects but not lessons learned from prior projects.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	No
	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?	Component 4 on Knowledge Management will feed lessons learned from this project to future efforts but no mention is made of how lessons learned from earlier projects will be incorporated or how they have or will influence design and implementation.
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?	<p>In addition to activities described above (sharing lessons learned), this project will raise awareness about the importance of dry forest conservation.</p> <p>STAP recommends that communications and information strategy addressed to stakeholders (regional and local governments, producers, communities, and the education sector) profit from recent ICT development and successful experiences in the use of these technologies for capacity building and extension services in rural areas; these can accommodate for different cultural and social contexts. It is important that communication plans go beyond the usual 'I inform you' using traditional tools (printed materials). STAP provides a list of recent scientific literature that evidences the potential of innovative modes of</p>

		communicating and delivering knowledge of stakeholders of rural areas, with attention to different levels of education..
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	Several web platforms of FAO, IUCN and the Peruvian government will be used to disseminate information, as well as at fairs and other events.

List of bibliography STAP recommends to be considered in the design of the PPG:

Gender and LDN:

UN WOMEN, GLOBAL MECHANISM OF THE UNCCD AND IUCN (2019). A Manual for Gender-Responsive Land Degradation Neutrality Transformative Projects and Programmes http://catalogue.unccd.int/1223_Gender_Manual.pdf

Global Mechanism of the UNCCD. 2019. Land Degradation Neutrality Interventions to Foster Gender Equality. Bonn, Germany http://catalogue.unccd.int/1222_UNCCD_gender_briefing_note.pdf

LDN Guidelines, LDN scientific conceptual framework and recent lessons on LDN:

Cowie (2019) Guidelines for Land Degradation Neutrality A report prepared for the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel of the Global Environment Facility. https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/LDN%20Technical%20Report_web%20version.pdf

UNCCD-SPI. Scientific Conceptual Framework for Land Degradation Neutrality. A report of the Science-Policy Interface. <https://www.unccd.int/publications/scientific-conceptual-framework-land-degradation-neutrality-report-science-policy>

Cowie, A.L., Orr, B.J., Sanchez, V.M.C., Chasek, P., Crossman, N.D., Erlewein, A., Louwagie, G., Maron, M., Metternicht, G.I., Minelli, S. and Tengberg, A.E., 2018. Land in balance: The scientific conceptual framework for Land Degradation Neutrality. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 79, pp.25-35.

Global Mechanism of the UNCCD. 2019. Land Degradation Neutrality Target Setting:

Initial findings and lessons learned. Bonn, Germany. http://catalogue.unccd.int/1217_newLDN_TSP_Initial_Findings_191108.pdf

P.H. Verburg, G. Metternicht, C. Allen, N. Debonne, M. Akhtar-Schuster, M. Inácio da Cunha, Z. Karim, A. Pilon, O. Raja, M. Sánchez Santivañez, and A. Şenyaz. 2019. *Creating an Enabling Environment for Land Degradation Neutrality and its Potential Contribution to Enhancing Well-being, Livelihoods and the Environment*. A Report of the Science-Policy Interface. United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), Bonn, Germany. http://catalogue.unccd.int/1210_UNCCD_SPI_2019_Report_1.2.pdf

A. Reichhuber, N. Gerber, A. Mirzabaev, M. Svoboda, A. López Santos, V. Graw, R. Stefanski, J. Davies, A. Vuković, M.A. Fernández García, C. Fiati and X. Jia. 2019. The Land-Drought Nexus: Enhancing the Role of Land-Based Interventions in Drought Mitigation and

Risk Management. A Report of the Science-Policy Interface. United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), Bonn, Germany. http://catalogue.unccd.int/1211_03EP_UNCCD_SPI_2019_Report_2.pdf

Theory of Change and scaling for sustainability

STAP's theory of change primer: <https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer>
Scaling: <https://www.stapgef.org/achieving-enduring-outcomes-gef-investment>;

Design of activities and processes that are participatory and inclusive for low education stakeholders:

David, Soniia, and Christopher Asamoah. "Video as a tool for agricultural extension in Africa: a case study from Ghana." *International Journal of Education and Development using ICT* 7, no. 1 (2011): 26-41.

Gumucio, Tatiana, James Hansen, Sophia Huyer, Tiff van Huysen, and Saroja Schwager. "Identifying pathways for more gender-sensitive communication channels in climate services." (2018).

King, Elizabeth G., Ryan R. Unks, and Laura German. "Constraints and capacities for novel livelihood adaptation: lessons from agricultural adoption in an African dryland pastoralist system." *Regional Environmental Change* 18, no. 5 (2018): 1403-1410.

Maredia, M. K., Reyes, B., Ba, M. N., Dabire, C. L., Pittendrigh, B., & Bello-Bravo, J. (2018). Can mobile phone-based animated videos induce learning and technology adoption among low-literate farmers? A field experiment in Burkina Faso. *Information Technology for Development*, 24(3), 429-460.

Ninsiima, D. (2015, May). " Buuzza Omulimisa"(ask the extension officer) text messaging for low literate farming communities in rural Uganda. In *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Information and Communication Technologies and Development* (pp. 1-4).

Shalander, Kumar, A. M. Whitbread, and K. P. C. Rao. "Innovation platforms as vehicle to strengthen stakeholders capacity to innovate for improved livelihoods in drylands in Asia and Sub Saharan Africa." (2017).

Stakeholder participation: IAP2 public participation spectrum. <https://i2s.anu.edu.au/resources/stakeholder-participation-iap2-public-participation-spectrum/>

Tesfamariam, Yordanos, and Margot Hurlbert. "Gendered adaptation of Eritrean dryland farmers." *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management* (2017).

Notes

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
<p>1. Concur</p>	<p>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.</p>
	<p>* 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></p>
<p>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>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:</p>
	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;</p>
	<p>(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.</p>
	<p>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>

<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>