

Part I: Project Information		Response
GEF ID	10412	
Project Title	Sustainable Luangwa: Securing Luangwa's water resources for shared socioeconomic and environmental benefits through integrated catchment management	
Date of Screening	5-Dec-19	
STAP member Screener	Blake Ratner	
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski	
STAP Overall Assessment		<p>Minor issues to be considered during project design: While the project components and proposed interventions are common (i.e., create and manage protected area, improve land management, etc.), the focus of this project in an upper catchment area with the intention of improving the larger watershed is innovative and, if successful, could serve as an important model for other GEF projects as a way to enhance important ecosystem services. Component 2 is less well developed and rests on the extent to which the project will succeed in creating "alternative livelihoods," which theoretically should reduce unsustainable and destructive farming practices. However, even if successful, very little is known about what impacts (if any) alternative livelihood projects have had on biodiversity conservation, as well as what determines the relative success or failure of these interventions [See Roe et al. (2015) "Are alternative livelihood projects effective at reducing local threats to specified elements of biodiversity and/or improving or maintaining the conservation status of those elements?" Environmental Evidence 4:22. DOI 10.1186/s13750-015-0048-1]. Finally, while the project has a clear logic based on a Theory of Change that includes various pathways, underlying assumptions, as well as strategies for adaptive management in the event that one or more of the assumptions prove untrue or due to other unforeseen issues that may arise.</p>
Part I: Project Information		
B. Indicative Project Description Summary		
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes. The problem statement is very clear and concise and the objective corresponds to the problem. This is essentially that chitemene farming practices and cattle grazing leads to soil erosion and siltation of waterways specifically, and to BD loss and LD generally. The overall vision of the project is to "reduce the key threats to the Luangwa upper sub-catchment, for the purpose of protection of the free-owing Luangwa river and the biodiversity, land and ecosystem services values of the upper sub-catchment."
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes. Activities fall under 3 components - 1) improved management of Mafinga Hills and water catchment area; 2) community management and 'alternative livelihoods'; 3) KM and M&E. If successful, these will reduce the threats to BD and land in the immediate area and in the watershed.
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?	Yes. See above.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	The barriers to protection of the Luangwa river source are clearly articulated (limited protection, lack of resources and management, lack of buy in, poor understanding of alternatives).
	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 the problem statement and analysis identifies the main proximate threats; however, it does not delve into underlying drivers (i.e. poverty, lack of land tenure, etc.) although these are implied. While the project brings together biodiversity and land degradation and each of these will be addressed, the overarching approach is to restore or improve ecosystem services in the entire watershed which will be beneficial for land, biodiversity and people.
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	The baseline scenario describes several ongoing related projects.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Not from a scientific perspective; however, gives a good sense of what types of activities are underway - particularly related to protected areas.
	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;	N/A
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	Other projects are described; however, an effort is not made to distill lessons learned and systematically apply them to the development of this project.
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	N/A
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	A hypothesis is provided that states "If the headwaters are protected through a participatory planning and protection process resulting in a WRPA; and if the threats of unsustainable wood and wildlife offtake can be reduced for Manga Hills National Forest Reserve, and if sustainable and efficient productive agriculture practices replace agricultural land expansion; then the headwaters of the Luangwa Upper Sub-Catchment will be better managed and protected, contributing to the conservation of biodiversity, water, land and the associated ecosystem services supporting community livelihoods, and securing the sustainable future of the free flowing Luangwa River." With additional effort, this could be transformed into a more robust TOC, including pathways, assumptions, etc.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	As above.
	· What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	As above and as outlined in the Components.
	· Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	The mechanisms of change are fairly standard in terms of participatory planning, capacity building, etc.

	· 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.
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing	GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?	Yes
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	N/A
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?	Yes though biodiversity benefits are also local. Also not clear how improvements in ecosystem services will be measured but they should at least be articulated.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	Yes
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Indicators are: 1) terrestrial PAs created or under improved management; 2) area of land restored; 3) area of landscape under improved practices; number of direct beneficiaries. Of these, only management is measured with the METT (though this is not specified in the project) - others are based on total area.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	The project states that the main objective of improving agricultural land in critical upper sub-catchment areas will lead to improved resilience, among other things.
7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up	Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?	While the project components and proposed interventions are common, the focus of this project in upper catchment area with the intention of improving the larger watershed is innovative and, if successful, could serve as an important model for other GEF projects.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	See above comment.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	incremental adaptation
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		This project provides a very good map and some (limited) geo-coordinates.
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, though there may be room for more local stakeholders (Community resource boards?)
	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?	Explained in table.

<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; this is a strength of the project description.</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>Yes but this is acknowledged and project will develop a gender plan and hire expert.</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?</p>	<p>Yes. The table indicates potential consequences of the identified risk and counter measures, as well as risk rating and probability and impact which is helpful. Some risks are internal to project implementation and among immediate stakeholders (i.e. limited uptake by stakeholders, disagreement, capacity, etc.). The mitigation measures for these are fairly standard (capacity building, participation), so the viability is difficult to assess. External factors such as economic developments and climate change are also considered with corresponding mitigation measures.</p>
	<p>Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?</p>	<p>Yes. See above.</p>
	<p>For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p>	
	<p>· 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>	<p>Not specified.</p>
	<p>· Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?</p>	<p>No.</p>
	<p>· Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?</p>	<p>Yes. See above.</p>
	<p>· What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?</p>	<p>Technical experts should be consulted to assess climate resilience of proposed interventions.</p>
<p>6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives</p>	<p>Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?</p>	<p>Yes - though mainly GEF. It is likely that other non-GEF projects are underway or have been completed in Zambia (i.e. USAID) which could related and provide important lessons learned.</p>
	<p>Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?</p>	<p>See above comment.</p>
	<p>Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?</p>	<p>See above comment.</p>

	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	N/A
	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?	Not clear.
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?	Component 3 is devoted to KM and includes fairly standard activities (information dissemination, etc.)
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	See above comment.
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.	
	<i>* 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."</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.	
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.	