

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10691
Project Title	Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) for resilient natural resources and agro-pastoral communities in the Ferlo Biosphere Reserve and Plateau of Thies
Date of Screening	November 27 2020
STAP member screener	Edward Carr
STAP secretariat screener	Guadalupe Duron
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Minor issues to be considered during project design.</p> <p>STAP welcomes UNDP and IUCN’s project “Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) for resilient natural resources and agro-pastoral communities in the Ferlo Biosphere Reserve and Plateau of Thies.” The project seeks to address the increasing vulnerability of the rural populations, particularly agropastoralists, in the Ferlo Biosphere Reserve and Plateau of Thies to climate variability and associated annual droughts and floods.</p> <p>STAP commends the use of multiple climate scenarios in the planning of this project, as this will result in interventions that are robust in a range of conditions. STAP recommends the project map these future scenarios explicitly to project activities and outcomes to assess the possible impacts of such change on the durability of project results. STAP also encourages the project to employ a similar level of rigor to the development of its assumptions and causal pathways through a clearly-articulated theory of change. The diagrammatic theory of change is useful, but does not spell out the assumptions and causality needed to carefully interrogate and improve project design.</p> <p>STAP also suggests the project carefully consider social challenges at the community and household level when designing this project, as gendered expectations of roles and responsibilities in livelihoods can, when challenged by</p>

	<p>project activities, produce conflict and exacerbate the vulnerability of women and other marginal groups.</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
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	Yes
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes
Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project. Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?	Yes
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
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 connects climate change impacts and what the PIF characterizes as maladaptive practices as drivers of widespread land degradation. The results of this are resulting in challenges for both herders and sedentary agriculturalists, and the PIF suggests there is anecdotal evidence of conflict between these groups as they extend their farms and grazing ranges to compensate for degradation. Senegal is also particularly hard-hit by the impacts of the pandemic because it is a heavily remittance-dominated economy and the global economic slowdown related to the pandemic will likely reduce these flows.

		<p>STAP notes with appreciation that the PIF contains multiple climate scenarios for the two project areas, reflecting the inherent uncertainty of the future climate. STAP suggests that the project carefully consider how these different scenarios might produce different challenges and opportunities for the proposed project in the two study areas to ensure project design delivers robust results.</p> <p>Finally, the PIF rightly notes that climate change impacts are interacting with human behaviors to produce observed degradation. The PIF characterizes these behaviors as maladaptive, but it is not clear what these behaviors are (with the exception of extensification) or how they are connected to the described changes in climate. STAP suggests that the targeted maladaptive behaviors be clearly described and connected to the described climate change impacts.</p>
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	The barriers are well-described, but there are no references or data provided to support them. In the case of the two barriers focusing on limited institutional capacity and process, such documentation may not be available. For the other two barriers, it seems the project should be able to identify some data sources with which to support their claims. STAP suggests that doing so might refine understandings of the specific nature of these barriers and how to address them.
	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?	
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Yes. STAP appreciates the clearly articulated and well-supported baseline.

	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Yes.
	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;	
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	The PIF does not have a formally-articulated theory of change, though there is a diagrammatic version of a ToC included with the PIF. Between the diagram and the narrative under the alternate scenario the PIF expects that by promoting long term planning for climate change impacts while facilitating budgeting and establishing innovative financing to support climate change governance at the commune level, the project will speed the adoption of ecosystem-based adaptation in the project areas. Specifically, this will allow for the development and anchoring of livelihoods in the maintenance of ecosystem services. The outcome is expected to be a sustainable, green economy constructed on an ecosystem-based adaptation approach which supports both ecosystem restoration and resilient livelihoods.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	The project will first develop regional and local governance capacities needed to support ecosystem-based adaptation. It will then turn to the design and implementation of restoration and conservation interventions in the project areas to build the climate resilience of both natural assets and ecosystem services. Finally, to support climate-resilient, natural resource based-livelihoods, the project will create and strengthen

		small and medium enterprises to establish climate-resilient value chains.
	<p>What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project’s objectives?</p>	<p>The project will conduct assessments of the governing bodies of the two project areas to assess barriers to the uptake of climate change adaptation generally, and ecosystem-based adaptation specifically (this assessment will be designed at the PPG stage). This assessment will inform the design of training sessions for land management bodies and key stakeholders aimed at building deep understandings of climate change adaptive capacity provided by the ecosystem services in the two project areas. These trainings will also highlight the value of resilient ecosystem-based livelihoods and the need to integrate socio-cultural values from communities to facilitate the productive implementation of infrastructure or livelihoods. This effort will produce strengthened stakeholder capacities in planning and implementing EbA, and a series of specific linked outputs aimed at institutional capacity-building.</p> <p>The project will leverage the work under the first component to set up work restoring forest and rangelands in the project areas, including reforestation, re-vegetation and assisted natural regeneration (ANR) of arid and semi-arid lands, restoration of soil and vegetation cover and sustainable land management measures engaging local communities. There will also be an anti-erosion scheme for the Plateau of Thies, and the restoration of a green belt in the area of Thies. This effort will produce agropastoralist livelihoods, ecosystems, and productive landscapes that are more resilient to climate change, with specific outputs being measures of regenerated, restored, or otherwise managed land.</p> <p>Finally, the project will target value chains in agriculture, forestry, and other activities identified</p>

		during feasibility studies in the PPG phase of the project, setting up a private sector platform to coordinate value chain activities that promote EbA. The project will also organize forums to identify and record private sector stakeholders' ideas and opportunities and will support an incubation scheme for local entrepreneurs and SMEs. Finally, the project will provide entrepreneurs and SMEs with infrastructure and materials to facilitate the adoption of EbA-based livelihoods activities. All of this community-level work and private sector work will be incentivized with financial services. The expected outcome will be private sector investment in value chains anchored in the sustainable use of local ecosystems.
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	The mechanisms of change are plausible, but the PIF does not clearly identify any assumptions about the motivations for the behaviors among stakeholders or the proper incentives to engage and change those behaviors. While the implicit theory of change seems reasonable, STAP suggests the project consider these assumptions carefully at the PPG phase to ensure they are well-targeted to the project context.
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	The PIF does not discuss this in its alternative scenario but does have a discussion of the impact of climate variability on the project. The PIF suggests that adequate thought has been given to potential needed adaptations to the project.
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?	
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	Yes
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits, and are they measurable?	These are clearly adaptation benefits and should be measurable. However, they are not yet measurable

and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)		with the data at hand in the PIF. STAP notes that the project has identified the weakness of existing data about the environment as a problem in the PIF, and that the project intends to try to fill this gap during the design phase and implementation.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	The adaptation benefits are explicitly defined.
	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 is, itself, targeted at building resilience to climate change. STAP notes that the PIF does not discuss how the project itself might be made more resilient to the impacts of climate change, such as variable rainfall during implementation. STAP suggests the project consider likely climate impacts during implementation and address how to make the project resilient to such impacts during the PPG stage.
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 PIF argues that EbA approaches have not been systematically promoted or adopted in Senegal. It also argues that the business incubation schemes are innovative means to meeting long-standing financing challenges for local innovation. However, STAP notes that several of the ongoing projects this PIF references in terms of coordination are either undertaking EbA-type activities, incubating supply chains, and working on local livelihoods. Some take on more than one of these activities.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	While the activities described in the PIF are scalable, the plan to do so is very weakly articulated. The PIF suggests the project will share business cases for nature-based SMEs with other projects in Senegal, as well as Great Green Wall projects across Sudeanean/Sahelian Africa. However, the PIF also notes that component 4 of

		the project, focused on KM and M&E, is intended to also develop a knowledge dissemination plan that will facilitate scale-up.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	The emphasis is on incremental adaptation.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		The maps are generally helpful, but the versions in the PIF were unreadable and therefore could not be used to identify specific places in the study area.
2. Stakeholders. Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities. If none of the above, please explain why. In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Yes
	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?	Government ministries and national organizations will technically support communities during implementation while receiving capacity building. Regional and local administrations are project target groups.

		<p>Communities are seen as direct beneficiaries, and community organizations will play a role in field activities.</p> <p>NGOs and international organizations were part of stakeholder consultations.</p> <p>Research institutions will identify and disseminate climate resilient agricultural practices and receive training. They will also support the development of climate information systems and promote the understanding of climate impacts in target communities.</p> <p>The private sector will be the investors in value chain infrastructure and the backbone of the green economy approach taken by the project overall.</p>
<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-</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Gender differentiated issues have been identified, though they are not clearly labelled as risks. The PIF does have responses to these issues in the PIF, such as addressing the patriarchal character of local governance, which can exclude women from decisions and benefits related to EbA, the project will strengthen or, where needed, establish local women’s committees. The project plans to develop a thorough gender analysis and action plan during project formulation. STAP notes that the patriarchal character of society trickles down to communities and households in Senegal, where men can be threatened by women’s economic autonomy. STAP recommends that in the course of its gender analysis the project consider social disruption at the household and community level as a potential risk of project activities that target or disproportionately benefit women, develop ways of identifying if that risk is realized in the course of the project, and consider ways of mitigating that risk.</p>

<p>making; and/or economic benefits or services. Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /td</p>		<p>The project is expected to contribute to more equal access to and control over resources, participation and decision-making, and economic benefits and services.</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>This is not addressed in the PIF. However, as noted above, STAP suggests the project examine this issue carefully at the household and community scale to ensure no unintended social consequences emerge from this project.</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 further developed during the project design</p>	<p>Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control? 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? • 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>The identified risks are valid and comprehensive. Most risks are outside project control, but STAP is concerned that the project rates the risk of tensions and power relations within the community disrupting project activities as low, and suggests that the project examine this closely, particularly through its gender analysis, as literature on livelihoods in this region suggests that such tensions could emerge quickly and in significant ways. The project would benefit from a consideration of these issues to calibrate its planned responses to such tensions. Climate variability is the principle environmental risk listed in the PIF.</p> <p>The project does not consider how its objectives or outputs might be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050. STAP suggests the project consider this possibility and how it might be addressed. The PIF does discuss sensitivity to climate variability in the project. As the project is about developing EbA interventions, it is almost entirely about developing resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts.</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
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Yes
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	The projects listed in the PIF focus on improving agropastoral livelihoods and restoring ecosystems, thus funneling direct experience of proposed project activities into the project.
	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, though the sharing of lessons from this project remains somewhat vague. STAP recommends this be developed further in the PPG stage.
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 overall KM approach is to gather lessons and data from the operational phases of the project and use this to develop a scaling-up strategy. Indicators and metrics for KM are not defined in the PIF. STAP suggests such indicators and metrics be developed in the PPG phase.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	The project proposes to develop these plans over the course of project implementation. Some concrete plans listed include the development of an online repository for project results, training, tools, and initiatives. It also mentions written products for dissemination.

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>