

<b>Part I: Project Information</b>		<b>Response</b>
<b>GEF ID</b>		<b>10201</b>
<b>Project Title</b>		<b>Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration (FOLUR) Impact Program</b>
<b>Date of Screening</b>		13.05.2019
<b>STAP member Screener</b>		B. Ratner, F. Toth, M. Stafford Smith
<b>STAP secretariat screener</b>		Z. Zommers
<b>STAP Overall Assessment</b>		<b>Concur.</b>
		<p>The PFD provides an excellent narrative description of root causes, barriers, and baseline scenario. Activities presented in the alternative scenario are well justified in relation to the overall objective and the intended outcomes and tied together in a coherent theory of change. The rationale for country program selection is well-described and presents an opportunity for significant synergies and important levers of influence on priority value chains. More than 20 relevant global collaborations and initiatives with demonstrated links to the FOLUR objectives constitute a strong asset for the program to strategically influence key stakeholder groups.</p> <p>The STAP encourages additional quantification of key trends during the next phase of program preparation as a baseline from which to measure change, and further specification of the change mechanisms indicated in the theory of change, especially those essential to achieve scaling. The scale of outcomes is difficult to predict and highly dependent upon quality of stakeholder engagement processes at multiple levels. Given the geographic and commodity coverage of this IP, scaling up beyond country-level outcomes is integral to planned program-level outcomes, targeting fundamental transformation in food systems. In particular, the scaling potential relies significantly on shifting patterns of investment, with the intent that “policy and coordination platforms will crowd-in investment,” but it remains unclear how this will be achieved in practice. The STAP encourages in-depth review of the pitfalls and lessons of related prior efforts to ensure these inform the next stages of detailed program design, with regards to the global platform as well as the current (and future) round of country projects.</p> <p>More detail should be provided during full program development regarding systematic risk identification and assessment of risk management options and strategies. Gender equality aspects merit deeper analysis during full program preparation, particularly regarding barriers to gender-equitable resource access and tenure rights, and to inclusive decision-making in landscape-level planning and policy formulation. Climate mitigation and adaptation goals are well integrated in the high-level program description, and climate-smart agriculture (CSA) practices and technologies are integral to the planned landscape-level responses. Yet, assessment of program-level sensitivity to climate impacts is not presented; more detail is expected in development of country projects and in program-level monitoring and targeted capacity support functions. The PFD notes potential social and environmental risks posed by the country projects but does not specify these. While generic policy and governance risks are noted, there is inadequate explicit attention to political and economic interests that could (and are likely to) oppose desired changes.</p> <p>Further detail on opportunities for improvements are indicated in the table below, which integrates commentary focused on the six priority STAP screening criteria.</p>
<b>Part I: Project Information</b>	<b>What STAP looks for</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>B. Indicative Project Description Summary</b>		
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, well conceived
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.	Yes
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	Yes
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes, reasonable chance, but dependent upon critical assumptions regarding scaling – see below
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?	Preliminary but adequate for PFD stage.  Yes, likely to contribute – but scale of outcomes is difficult to predict and highly dependent upon quality of stakeholder engagement processes at multiple levels.
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	Presented under PII 1 3)
<b>1. Project description. Briefly describe:</b>		
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
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes, with clear description of need for system transformation. Good recognition of impact that shifts in consumption and market demand continue to have on production patterns.
	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?	N/A
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Yes
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	A reasonable basis for supporting the project but little quantification for measuring the project's benefits.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Programmatically sufficient for overall design, but quantitatively weak as a basis for subsequent monitoring of program impact.
	For multiple focal area projects:	N/A
	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?	

<p>3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project</p>	<p>What is the theory of change?</p>	<p>Theory of change is that action interventions at landscape level (integrated landscape management and restoration), combined with value chain interventions focused on sustainable food production, can generate sufficient lessons, tools and innovations to support effective global knowledge exchange and outreach to key actors influencing value chains, policies and financial incentives in ways that yield global environmental benefits at scale. The theory of change presents a coherent summary of the program logic, linking problem analysis, intervention structure, key assumptions and planned outputs.</p> <p>While outcomes, longer-term outcomes and GEBs are clearly specified, the causal links at these levels are less explicit. In other words, the mechanisms or pathways to achieve scaling merit closer attention and explicit treatment (and debate among partners) during the next stage of program design. (Visually, this includes expanding the arrows between 'Outcomes' and 'Longer-term Outcomes' layers in Fig.2, along with accompanying narrative explanation of the different change mechanisms.) The PFD makes evident that program proponents are thinking clearly about these scaling challenges and how to ensure that changed practises are durable, including well-articulated dimensions of the program pillars in section 6 (Coordination).</p> <p>Given the breadth of the program, it would be advisable to additionally develop, in consultation with key partners, a particular theory of change for each of the value chains, drawing upon a common language of the overall program theory of change. This would both clarify the change pathways that each constellation of value chain and country partners will pursue, and it would enable comparative analysis and exchange across these groupings.</p>
	<p>What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?</p>	<p>The program structure aims to catalyze learning, capacity and global knowledge sharing through strategically selected Country Projects (promoting integrated landscape management, sustainable food production practices and restoration of natural habitats), synthesizing lessons from landscape / national to regional / global levels.</p> <p>Good visual depiction of linked global and national outcomes (Figure 1).</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?</li> </ul>	<p>Activities, outputs and outcomes are logically integrated.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?</li> </ul>	<p>Plausible causality chain presented.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?</li> </ul>	<p>Possible adaptations not addressed as part of the theory of change but later as part of the risk assessment and risk management plan.</p>
<p>5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing</p>	<p>GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?</p>	<p>Yes, incremental reasoning is clear.</p>

	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?	The main emphasis is on local and regional benefits, and the resulting GEBs. Little attention is devoted to trade-offs and possibly negative side effects, though social and environmental risks are mentioned in the Risks section. There is little explicit attention to power dynamics, including potential winners and losers from the changes envisioned and how potential conflicts may be addressed. This will be essential to address explicitly during the course of full program development, with regards to each value chain and country project.
	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?	Yes
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Climate resilience not addressed in detail, though mentioned in the section on risks. The proposed response to climate change is quite general at this level; more detail expected in development of country projects and in program-level monitoring and targeted capacity support functions.
7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up	Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?	<p>The program is innovative in its concept, structure, and the combination of global and country-level engagements. Specific innovations are expected to emerge from CPs. Emphasis is on policy and institutional innovations. More thinking about possible technological, financing, and business model innovations would be desirable, from which each country and the IP as a whole could benefit.</p> <p>The theory of change relies strongly on the interactions between innovations at landscape / country level and in regional / global value chains. Therefore, attention is needed during full program development to explicitly identify innovations at each of these levels. Given the broad geographic and value chain coverage of the program, a hallmark contribution may be innovative approaches to rapidly scale tested solutions – working across countries and value chains.</p> <p>Moreover, a view on the different ways to scale (see notes on scaling out, up or deep in STAP priority criteria document) would also ask whether there are cultural norms or other cultural barriers which require innovative responses as well, for example, in areas such as consumer demand, rule enforcement, or indigenous peoples' rights. These may not be the most salient barriers, but it is useful to explicitly consider these</p>

	<p>Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?</p>	<p>Given the geographic and commodity coverage of this IP, scaling up beyond country-level outcomes is integral to planned program-level outcomes, targeting fundamental transformation in food systems. Achieving these outcomes at scale is likely to be more difficult than it seems to be depicted. In particular, the scaling potential relies significantly on shifting patterns of investment, with the intent that “policy and coordination platforms will crowd-in investment,” but it remains unclear how this will be achieved. Barriers to adoption of innovations at landscape level and in value chains are addressed well, if still at a general level, in the discussion of governance issues and in program risks. But explicit barriers to scaling and transformation are less well-covered.</p> <p>The program design brings the advantage of planned engagement with key industry platforms, partnerships and global initiatives that, collectively, bring a vast range of experience, including experience confronting barriers to scaling and system transformation. The PFD notes plans for in-depth consultation during full program development. This should offer an excellent opportunity to probe this experience, including participatory processes to surface emergent lessons that may not yet have been explicitly identified and documented.</p>
	<p>Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?</p>	<p>Transformational change is envisioned. See notes above.</p>
<p>1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.</p>		<p>Global map appears cut off in PDF. But the map in Annex A1 appears in full and is very useful.</p>
<p><b>2. Stakeholders.</b> Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities. If none of the above, please explain why. In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.</p>	<p>Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?</p>	<p>Yes, including strong identification of relevant multi-stakeholder platforms and initiatives. Multi-stakeholder interactions and collaboration are at the heart of the program design. Various types of interactions are discussed, but in the next stage of program development these should be presented more specifically to assess their feasibility and potential effectiveness. In particular, it will be essential to describe the value addition of the IP in relation to existing platforms and initiatives, and to validate (from the perspective of actors engaged in these) the demand for specific inputs, knowledge products, policy dialogue activities, or other services.</p> <p>Moreover, it will be essential to show plans for ensuring that all child projects are appropriately engaged with the appropriate global and regional platforms during the period of full project design. If this is done in particular with an eye to testing and validating for each country project the barriers, planned innovations and theory of change, this can help bring critical insights to project design that will aid subsequent scaling at the program level.</p>
	<p>What are the stakeholders’ roles, and how will their combined roles contribute to robust project design, to achieving global environmental outcomes, and to lessons learned and knowledge?</p>	<p>All key public and private sector actors assumed to join in following their respective mandates and commitments. Expected engagement of civil society actors is dependent upon existing networks and platforms.</p>

<p><b>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.</b> 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, including strong intention to develop action plans that address linked dimensions of access to productive assets, inclusive decision-making, and benefit sharing.</p> <p>Gender sensitive indicators are missing – but dimensions above indicate a suitable framework. Consider applying indicators and measurement protocols of Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI).</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>No hindrance indicated, but this merits deeper analysis during full program preparation, particularly regarding barriers to gender-equitable resource access and tenure rights, and to inclusive decision-making in landscape-level planning and policy formulation.</p>
<p><b>5. Risks.</b> 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, a broad range of valid risks identified. Not all are external, e.g. coordination failure. Risk management and mitigation plans remain general in several cases.</p>
	<p>Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?</p>	<p>Various kinds of policy, government and other stakeholder risks are mentioned (such as policy change, non-delivery of agreed contributions). While generic policy and governance risks are noted, there is inadequate explicit attention to political and economic interests that could (and are likely to) oppose desired changes.</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>Although various longer-term drivers are identified (as summarized in the 'contextual factors', theory of change Fig.2), their implications are poorly analysed. FOLUR cannot expect to change these, but it can ensure that all projects are thinking about the significance of these factors and whether they mean different approaches might be more robust to future change. This would consider, for example, if future climate may undermine productivity of (or even demand for) a current staple in a region, then either improved management of that staple is addressed as an explicitly interim strategy while other solutions are developed; or improved management might be aimed at a different crop that is robust to the expected change in climate. Either way, at least the project level activities should include discussion of these possibilities early in design.</p>
	<p>· Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?</p>	<p>No climate impact assessment is presented; only the possibility of climate change impacts on productivity and resilience is alluded to. Since impacts will be region and location-specific, climate impact assessments and response strategies will need to be developed in the country projects.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?</li> </ul>	Climate mitigation and adaptation goals are well integrated in the high-level program description, and climate-smart agriculture (CSA) practices and technologies are integral to the planned landscape-level responses. Yet, assessment of program-level sensitivity to climate impacts is not presented.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?</li> </ul>	<p>Only generic reference to national climate change action plans is made. Systematic climate impact and adaptation assessments will require atmospheric/climate scientists to produce a range of plausible scenarios of regional climate change for the next few decades, and ecological, technology / economic experts to assess the potential impacts on climate-sensitive ecosystems and sectors together with various types of vulnerability and adaptation options under those scenarios.</p> <p>In addition, the Risk table mentions possible but significant social and environmental risks posed by the country projects but does not indicate what risks; only the Global Coordination Project is mentioned to undertake risk assessment and mitigation advisory service. More detail should be provided during full program development regarding systematic risk identification and assessment of risk management options and strategies.</p>
<b>6. Coordination.</b> 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, including IAP on Food Security in Africa, and IAP on Commodities.
	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?	Yes
	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?	The opportunity to feed lessons into this project is demonstrated; the mechanisms and responsibilities should be more clearly specified to ensure this happens at the more detailed level required for specific value chains, partnerships, and geographies.

<p><b>8. Knowledge management.</b> 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.</p>	<p>What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?</p>	<p>KM is a central element of the program. One of the three pillars of the global platform is explicitly devoted to KM and communications. Yet no KM indicators and metrics are specified; these will be needed to prepare more specific KM plans and actions. As noted in the main STAP screen, KM is a central element of the program, and the explicit focus of one of the three global platform pillars. Yet no KM indicators and metrics are specified; doing so will be important to help prepare more specific KM plans and actions. development.</p> <p>Also, although learning is discussed, it is not yet clear how this learning will be applied to support adaptive management in program implementation, for example using a regular review of the nested theories of change at program and project levels as a structured approach to this. See, for example, Thornton et al (2017) for description of such an approach.</p> <p>Thornton, P.K., Schuetz, T., Forch, W., Cramer, L., Abreu, D., Vermeulen, S.&amp; Campbell, B.M. 2017 Responding to global change: A theory of change approach to making agricultural research for development outcome-based. <i>Agricultural Systems</i> 152, 145-153.</p>
	<p>What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?</p>	<p>Proposed plans for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results are presented at a general level. They include a global platform for transferring knowledge and information in multiple directions: from country programs up, from the global dissemination platform down, and through fostering South-South exchange. The planned focal activities (testing methods, learning, capturing, sharing lessons) are reasonably identified at this stage. The specified objectives are also sensible but a more detailed operational plan would be needed during full program development.</p>
<p><b>STAP advisory response</b></p>	<p><b>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</b></p>	
<p><b>1. Concur</b></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><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 “<b>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.</b>”</i></p>	
<p><b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b></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>	

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