STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response	
GEF ID	10688	
Project Title	Restoring and Enhancing the Value of Degraded Lands and Forest Ecosystems for Enhanced Climate Resilience in Benin (PIRVaTEFoD-Benin)	
Date of Screening	December 1, 2020	
STAP member screener	Graciela Metternicht/Ed Carr	
STAP secretariat screener	Guadalupe Duron	
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	**Minor issues to be considered during project design** STAP acknowledges UNDP's project "Restoring and Enhancing the Value of Degraded Lands and Forest Ecosystems for Enhanced Climate Resilience in Benin (PIRVaTEFoD-Benin". The project seeks to support Benin's efforts on Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) targets, and to strengthen the climate resilience of vulnerable populations in the Niger Valley, Alibori Sud-Borgou Nord-2KP and Zou-Couffo Agricultural Development Areas. The project proposes actions that acknowledge the intrinsic links between reversing land degradation, supporting climate change adaptation for vulnerable communities, and reducing further pressures on existing natural ecosystems. STAP recommends strengthening the problem analysis. Currently, the climate change component of the project statement is retrospective – there is no forward-looking statement of challenges in the PIF. As a result, it is not clear what climate-related challenges the project is meant to address going forward. Further, STAP recommends disaggregating the projected climate impacts across the three zones of implementation. The southern zone is the site of different agricultural practices and crops relative to the two northern sites and is subject to different climate trends and impacts.	

	STAP acknowledges that the Project Team mentions the LDN Guidelines for project implementation and, in this regard, it encourages a full use of these guidelines and the LDN Conceptual framework for embedding LDN interventions into existing planning processes, rather than being an additional process. Additionally, STAP recommends paying attention to two assessments when designing and implementing the project: land potential assessment, and a resilience assessment. STAP also encourages the team to consider a variety of target trajectories for land restoration or rehabilitation, given that in some of the proposed project sites land rehabilitation may be more feasible and effective than land restoration. The LDN Conceptual Framework provides guidance on the latter. The project also does a good job at describing the enabling environment needed for LDN implementation at different scales. To support the enabling environment, STAP recommends including representatives of universities, research institutions and national associations in the Project Steering Committee. Lastly, with almost 65% of Benin's population under the age of 25, STAP strongly encourages the team to develop the PPG (and implement the project) proactively engaging with youth for co-design and implementation of activities that —while fulfilling the project objectives— open opportunities of sustainable livelihoods for this sector of the society, to reduce their unemployment and forced migration. STAP has recent advice on multi-stakeholder dialogues, and insights on behavioral change; the latter needs to be embedded in selected interventions to achieve the vision set in the PIF Theory of Change. Hereafter STAP offers recommendations on how to improve the project design.	
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.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes, the activities support the project objective. Because they present unique challenges for implementation and project outcomes, STAP recommends the project identify interventions that require changes of current behavior by the beneficiaries of this project and assess any challenges that might emerge from such behavior change, such as social stress, to ensure sustainability of the project outcomes. It also recommends multi-stake dialogue processes, not only to consult, but to co-design interventions with beneficiaries, and agents that can enable changes (e.g. private sector) STAP forthcoming guidelines on behavioral change are recommended to guide this process.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	Yes, the outcomes focus on global environmental outcomes, and adaptation benefits. STAP recommends indicators and targets related to outcome 1.1 be revised; the current indicators are unlikely to be sufficient to monitor whether the claimed GEBs and adaptation benefits can be achieved
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes, potentially. The benefits are likely to be generated with a good theory of change which the Team highlights will be enhanced during the preparation of the PPG, and careful monitoring of the interventions.
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, the outputs are likely to contribute to the outcomes. However, it will be important to define the assumptions that underlie the outcomes, and the barriers/enablers of change in the causal pathway. The risks identified in pg 32 need to be incorporated in the ToC, as external factors that may affect the delivery of outputs.
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	Yes, a draft Theory of Change is presented, which will be further refined during the PPG. See comments above in regard elements that need to be

		included in the revised ToC: mention of external factors, discussion of assumptions and alternative scenarios that can be pursued to achieve the desired vision, anticipating external and internal factors that may affect project implementation. STAP recommends that the project carefully consider the answers to the following key questions: who should be involved in project design and implementation, and at what stage? (beneficiaries of the project and 'change agents'), why will a given intervention produce expected outcomes (assumptions)?; what other factors (COVID, political instability, migration and in-migration) will affect the project? Aiming for project efficiency, the ToC needs also to identify —out of the climate resilient range of interventions mentioned— what is going to be invested, by whom and through what set of activities.
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?	The problem statement is well-defined for some aspects of the project. The PIF describes increasing threats to land management as a result of climate change; poor land management due to a variety of reasons, and lack of policies supporting appropriate land use planning. However, the climate change component of the project statement is completely retrospective – there is no forward-looking statement of challenges in the PIF. As a result, it is not clear what climate-related challenges the project is meant to address going forward. In the project document, STAP recommends specifying the timeframe for the change in climate which is described under "climate change impacts and adaptation challenges". Further, STAP recommends disaggregating the projected climate impacts across the three zones of implementation. The southern zone is the site of different agricultural practices and crops relative to the two northern sites and is subject to different climate trends and impacts. Overall, to ensure the design and implementation of effective interventions, the

		project should carefully link projected climate impacts with agricultural and livelihoods impacts, as this connection is currently somewhat vague and notional. The barriers section of the PIF cites the multiplicity of projects and funding that exist in Benin for addressing climate change and land degradation, and the urgency for enhanced coordination across institutions to improve coherence in implementation and to address knowledge and action gaps at the national level. STAP recommends the project team to reach out to the leaders of the GEF project "Participatory assessment of land degradation and sustainable land management in grasslands and pastoral systems" (FAO-IUCN). This project has generated important learning for multi-sectoral, multi-scale coordination of different national government agencies, national associations of producers, etc that this PIF project claims as 'innovative'. Furthermore, the STAP takes note of the challenges and barriers associated with transhumance, migration, and concurs with the view that an overarching long-term solution will be to improve the climate resilience of rural livelihoods (emphasis on women and youth) that are dependent on agricultural production by diversifying agricultural livelihood options. STAP notes that such diversification is not straightforward, as existing activities and crops are often closely linked to identities, roles and responsibilities at the community and household level, and therefore diversification initiatives should not rest on the assumption that increased productivity or incomes will be sufficient to incentivize changes. This highlights the importance of using knowledge from prior projects of Benin, as well as from other

		geographies with similar socio-ecological and cultural contexts.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes, the barriers and threats are described, which focus on: gaps in policies and in efforts to adapt to climate change (i.e gaps in NDC implementation); limited capacity for restoring degraded land amidst climate change impacts; competing uses of land (herders and farmers); pests; and coping capacity challenges. STAP notes that these threats and barriers are not always evenly distributed across the three proposed implementation sites, and suggests that at the PPG stage the project carefully identify and link specific threats and barriers to each site to ensure that interventions address appropriate root causes. In the theory of change, STAP recommends identifying the assumptions behind the identified challenges, proposed solutions, and expected outcomes, which includes an analysis of the barriers, and the enablers of change. Doing so, will ensure the interventions are feasible and appropriate. STAP cautions to pay attention to the following root causes mentioned, which can negatively impact on the proposed activities: a) lack of enforcement of LUPS and b) insufficient rural extension.
	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, the PIF includes a narrative baseline describing several on-going projects on forest restoration and climate change, early warning systems and climate resilience, value chains and sustainable land management, among other efforts.

		It also describes current trends in land degradation and current climate change commitments, particularly those related to land degradation. However, the PIF does not extrapolate these current trends into the future to provide a baseline against which to compare project outcomes. Without trends in environmental conditions clearly demarcated in the baseline it is difficult to quantify project benefits. STAP appreciates the table that has been provided to list the various projects. It would be valuable to add a column to the table on the (emerging) lessons from each project, and how they are relevant to this LDCF project.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	No. While the PIF provides information on current conditions and activities, it does not extend its reporting on conditions into the future. As a result, it is difficult to quantify the environmental benefits of this project against the baseline of business as usual. STAP suggests that current environmental conditions and trends be extended into the future to create a robust baseline in the PPG phase. To achieve this, STAP suggests identifying environmental and social indicators beyond the GEF core indicators and LDCF results framework indicators to monitor sustainable land management, and climate resilient livelihoods. For the environmental indicators suggest focusing on the three UNCCD LDN indicators: land cover (physical land cover class), land productivity (net primary productivity, NPP) and carbon stocks (soil organic carbon (SOC) stocks). STAP also recommends the PPG identifies locally relevant indicators of LDN that can be used complementary to the global LDN, as suggested in the STAP LDN guidelines.

	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	No, because the baseline does not allow for the measurement of environmental benefits from the project. STAP recommends extending baseline trends in land degradation and climate impacts into the future (ideally 2050) and identifying environmental and social indicators that complement the GEF's and LDCF's indicators, and which track progress towards achieving the project objective. Additionally, STAP recommends identifying what needs to be monitored in the theory of change, which includes identifying indicators for each outcome.
	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;	No. The GEF and LDCF indicators will be selected during the project design.
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	Partly. Ongoing initiatives are listed in the baseline and coordination sections, and some lessons are described. STAP suggests elaborating for each project the (emerging) lessons – including lessons on scaling, and how they will contribute to this LDCF project. This information could be added in a new column to Table 1.
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	See above. STAP recommends the project team reach out to other GEF projects that have been implemented in similar socio-economic, political, and ecological contexts to identify relevant lessons.
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	STAP notes with appreciation the inclusion of a preliminary theory of change in the PIF. This ToC can be described as follows: To achieve land degradation neutrality and increased climate resilience in rural Benin, the project will support "climate risk informed sustainable land and forest management practices, and strengthen the climate resilience of vulnerable populations, in the Niger Valley, Alibori Sud-Borgou Nord-2KP, and Zou-Couffo Agricultural Development Areas."

	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	The ToC suggests that increased climate resilience and the sustainability of forest and land use will result from i) the promotion of sustainable, resilient and climate smart production systems in degraded lands and deforestation hotspots in Benin, ii) the implementation of green infrastructure, selected through integration of climate scenarios and resilience potential under current climatic stressors, to strengthen the Green belt as a nature based solution against desert advancement and support communities' in climate change adaptation in the north of the country, iii) strengthening the protection and preservation of forest ecosystems located in large agricultural production basins, iv) identifying and promoting climate resilient value chains and increase productivity and competitiveness of the horticultural sectors, and v) facilitating the mobilization of innovative financing and the involvement of private sector for the scaling up and sustainability of climate smart agriculture, climate risk informed sustainable land and forest management. See earlier comments on deficiencies of the ToC and how to address them during the preparation of the PPG.
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	The 4 components form a coherent package of planned interventions. STAP is pleased that a draft theory of change is provided in the PIF. During project design, STAP recommends describing the assumptions, barriers, and risks for each outcome in the theory of change narrative and diagram. Enablers of change also can be identified. Refer to STAP's theory of change primer for guidance: https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	The project team will elaborate further the theory of change during the project design. STAP recommends identifying the assumptions for each

		outcome in the theory of change. Doing so, will ensure the project interventions are feasible and sufficient to meet the project objective.
	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. STAP recommends for the project team to think about the drivers of change, including long-term drivers (e.g. market changes, effects of climate change), and what response measures may be needed. This process entails having stakeholders think through one, or two simple scenarios for possible futures that focus on different change trajectories based on key shocks, stresses, and risks to the project. Droughts and floods are already becoming more severe in Benin; What alternative pathways may be required for the outcomes to endure impacts from long-lasting change, such as climate? Other external drivers may also be important, such as market and population changes. Refer to STAP's theory of change primer (table 2) and RAPTA for guidance on developing pathways, and more than one scenario: https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer https://www.stapgef.org/rapta-guidelines
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, with a good theory of change, and careful monitoring, evaluation, and learning. STAP recommends component #3 could include locally-appropriate Payment for Ecosystem Services initiatives as an alternative livelihood that could be developed through PPPs.
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	Same as above.
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, the benefits are listed, and they are measurable. As noted above, STAP recommends complementing as needed these indicators with other environmental and social indicators. In addition, recommend identifying success indicators for each outcome in the theory of change.

		Additionally, STAP recommends addressing the following issues related to the different components: For component 1, to develop and support an enabling environment, it will be important to establish governance structures that are conducive to collaboration and trust between stakeholders. Therefore, suggest relying on stakeholder engagement strategies and developing a plan that maps out different social characteristics (e.g. power, political and cultural dimensions, gender) required to implement an effective and equitable governance. In component 2, STAP recommends applying an assessment of land potential and other preparatory assessments to inform land use planning, and reverse land degradation. A land assessment will account in a holistic manner the properties that will influence the capacity to resist and recover from land degradation. These properties include the biophysical characteristics of the land, such as vegetation, soil properties, and climate. Pursuing a land assessment will inform the potential of the land to be restored, or whether rehabilitation measures, are needed to reversing land degradation. STAP recommends for the project team to apply the guidance from its LDN guidelines, and from UNCCD's Scientific Conceptual Framework on LDN, which covers land potential assessment as well as other assessments (e.g. resilience of current, and proposed land uses, and socio-economic context of land users) that inform land use planning interventions : https://www.stapgef.org/guidelines-land-degradation-neutrality https://www.unccd.int/sites/default/files/documents/2019-06/LDN_CF_report_web-english.pdf.

		STAP also recommends to appraise whether land rehabilitation may be a viable alternative to land restoration in some of the project areas. For component 3, STAP recommends developing a "mini" theory of change to assess the various assumptions, barriers, and risks affiliated with reaching the outcome of improved climate resilient livelihoods resulting from diversified value chains. Developing a separate theory of change will help analyze the causal pathways more carefully and, monitor changes and learning resulting from this component (e.g. what changes are value chains contributing, or hindering). These should be tailored to the different socio-ecological contexts of the three implementation areas in the project, as each will present different opportunities and challenges. Refer to the following resources for developing the theory of change: https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09614524.2019.1641182
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Possibly. To make the assessment of benefits clearer, STAP recommends extending the baseline into the future to facilitate the quantification of social and environmental benefits. STAP also recommends elaborating further the theory of change, and consider developing various causal pathways to encourage adaptability to change, including to address long-term drivers, such as in-migration and out-migration into the project areas. Additionally, parts of the project areas will experience more frequent and intense droughts, putting greater stress on water resources and on agricultural productivity. Considering one, or two, alternative trajectories will assist the project team plan for adaptation, and possibly for transformational change. Refer to the World Bank's Climate Change Knowledge Portal for

		climate change trends in Benin, and at STAP's theory of change primer for the development of alternative pathways: https://climateknowledgeportal.worldbank.org/country/lesotho/vulnerability https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Yes, the global environmental and adaptation benefits are defined in section 5.
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Yes, indicators are provided to measure progress. Suggest also describing the methodologies that will be used to measure and monitor the indicators.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	The PIF does not outline any such activities. The project will focus on LDN interventions that encompass climate resilient measures (See component 2). As part of the land use planning activities, STAP recommends applying a resilience assessment of the targeted socio-ecological systems. STAP's LDN guidelines along with RAPTA are two resources that can assist the project team with a resilience assessment: https://stapgef.org/guidelines-land-degradation-neutrality https://www.stapgef.org/rapta-guidelines
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?	The project demonstrates some degree of innovation, through proposed multi-sectoral governmental participation, and the focus on integrated land use planning, via LDN. The project also aims to bring together stakeholders across spatial scales (policymakers to land users) and sectors to achieve climate resilient LDN and livelihoods. Careful attention should be paid to identifying stakeholders that are essential for achieving long-term impacts and scaling. In terms of scaling, it is suggested lessons from the paper of Buttler et al 2020 (how feasible is the scaling out of livelihoods

		and food system adaptation in Asia Pacific Islands). STAP suggest spatial land use planning and spatial prioritization be included in the planning of interventions. Examples from GEF projects such as Costa Rica and Uganda are leading the way, along with additional pilots in Colombia, Kazakhstan, and Peru, to use spatial data to map essential life support areas (ELSAs) and other good practices mentioned in the STAP paper https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/GEF%20EO%20Mainstreaming%20March2020%20Final%2020200331-v3.0.pdf
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Partially. The project needs to address the assumption that LDN, other integrated approaches, and value chains will induce innovation for climate resilient landscape management. STAP recommends identifying the assumptions in the theory of change (including behavioral change assumptions) required to achieve component 1 and 2. See earlier comments. Additionally, STAP recommends relying on the theory of change, and its monitoring, to identify opportunities for scaling and transformative change. The theory of change also should be used to address barriers, and enablers, of scaling. Refer to STAP's primer on theory of change: https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	It is likely that incremental adaptation, and, or, transformational change may be needed due to climate stressors (e.g. increased frequency and intensity of drought in parts of the project areas), other long term changes (e.g. out and in-migration as a result of food insecurity and conflict in neighboring countries), and from shocks, such as COVID-19. As previously mentioned, we suggest developing several pathways to reach the project

		goal, testing the assumptions, and asking which pathway will be necessary and sufficient to address long-term changes resulting from climate change, COVID-19 and other long-term changes. Refer to STAP's primer theory of change, and RAPTA: https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer https://www.stapgef.org/rapta-guidelines
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Geo-referenced information was provided, along with maps. STAP recommends following its guidance on maps in its Earth Observation document – see page A1: https://www.stapgef.org/earth-observation-and-gef
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?	The key stakeholders have been identified. Suggest reflecting whether there are other stakeholders that need to be involved during the project development, implementation, and monitoring. The stakeholders need to be mapped in the Theory of Change, to anticipate their role in the phases of project implementation, and to anticipate whether barriers could exist for their engagement (e.g. levels of literacy, cultural barriers). STAP reiterates the need to engage with youth beyond merely 'consulting' and awareness raising. (pg 31 "ensuring that gender and youth-focused NGOs and CBOs are invited to participate at meetings, seminars, workshops and discussion groups that address agricultural and sustainable land management issues at the macro-level). We trust the PPG will have clearly thought processes to involve gender and youth-focused NGOs and CBOs in project implementation and capacity development at national and local levels.
	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?	STAP is pleased that a stakeholder plan will be developed during the project design. STAP suggests elaborating further on stakeholders' roles, particularly at the outcome level. As suggested

		above, assessing whether all the key stakeholders have been identified during the PPG stage, and amend stakeholder plans as needed. Additionally, recommend using STAP's guidance on Multi-stakeholder engagement for transformational change", which is focused on establishing stakeholder engagement processes to achieve long-term drivers thru scaling and transformative change: https://www.stapgef.org/multi-stakeholder-dialogue
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?	The PIF describes the gender differences in Benin's society, referencing several documents and gender policies. STAP is pleased that a gender specialist will develop a gender plan to guide the project development and implementation.

	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	No. In the gender plan, STAP suggests assessing whether a gender consideration hinders the participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups). If so, describe how will these obstacles be addressed.
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? Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project? 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? • 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?	The PIF describes a series of risks to the project, including: weak implementation capacity on landscape management, low community participation, climate change risks, COVID-19 risks, and risks due to trade-offs between environmental and social benefits. STAP recommends for these risks to be defined in the theory of change so they are explicitly dealt with and managed. Not acknowledging the risks will undermine the causal logic of the interventions. For climate change, STAP recommends taking into account the questions to the left, and relying on its climate risk screening guidance: https://www.stapgef.org/stap-guidance-climate-risk-screening
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 GEF, LDCF and non-GEF projects. STAP recommends reaching out the GEF project PRAGA (FAO-IUCN) that has experience in multi-sectoral multi-stakeholder coordination, including national associations.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes, there is recognition of how learning from previous projects will feed into this initiative. Further elaboration on learning would be welcome by STAP.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	See above.
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	It is unclear how learning from previous projects was imbedded in ROLL-GEF. Suggest describing this learning process.

	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, component 3. Additionally, the theory of change should be linked to the monitoring system.
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?	The PIF identifies several knowledge management efforts and approaches the project will rely on. As the project stakeholders develop the knowledge management plan, consider indicators for knowledge management. Additionally, suggest linking the theory of change to component 3 as both will be needed to manage knowledge and learning.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	The PIF states that knowledge will be generated as a result of its monitoring, evaluation and knowledge component. Dissemination of results will be made through IFAD's partnerships on landscape management, and will include other efforts. Cross learning between Kenya and South Africa (countries involved in the ROLL project) will also take place.

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 ***"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.