

STAP Screen: 11545

GEF ID	11545
Project title	Strengthening climate resilience of communities in Angola through community-based adaptation action
Date of screen	2 June 2024
STAP Panel Member	Edward Carr
STAP Secretariat	Virginia Gorsevski

1. Summary of STAP's views of the project

STAP acknowledges the project “Strengthening climate resilience of communities in Angola through community-based adaptation action.” The objective of this project is “To enhance adaptive capacity and increase resilience of local communities' livelihoods, food security and nutrition to climate change.”

Detailed climate information is provided in the PIF; however, STAP finds that the project itself lacks a clear adaptation rationale. Specifically, proposed activities are not directly or clearly connected to climate impacts, nor does the project connect local livelihoods practices to climate impacts, making it unclear why the targeted communities need adaptation or how increased adaptive capacity will address expected climate impacts.

STAP has communicated its concerns to the GEF Secretariat and provides additional observations and recommendations below.

Note to STAP screeners: a summary of STAP's view of the project (not of the project itself), covering both strengths and weaknesses.

STAP's assessment*

- Concur - STAP acknowledges that the concept has scientific and technical merit
- Minor - STAP has identified some scientific and technical points to be addressed in project design

X Major - STAP has identified significant concerns to be addressed in project design

Please contact the STAP Secretariat if you would like to discuss.

2. Project rationale, and project description – are they sound?

See annex on STAP's screening guidelines.

- This project seeks to enhance the adaptive capacity and increase the resilience of Angolan local communities' livelihoods, food security, and nutrition. STAP appreciates the detailed climate data provided in the PIF, including the use of multiple climate scenarios to capture a range of plausible futures against which to evaluate the potential efficacy of proposed project activities. STAP also appreciates the very clearly laid out issues of exposure, vulnerability, and adaptive capacity in the climate risk screen. Ideally, however, these data would be mapped to the project area to be able to localize the information and clearly identify which data are most relevant to the targeted sites.
- The climate data provided is not integrated into wider data on potential demographic, economic, and political futures for the project area. Such future narratives of the project area better capture the range of sources of uncertainty that can shape project outcomes and provide a conceptual range of possible outcomes against which potential interventions can be assessed for likely efficacy and durability. See [Simple Future Narratives: helping to ensure the durability of GEF investments](#) for additional guidance. The climate risk screen captures some of these wider issues implicitly, but they are not accounted for in terms of the baseline going forward.

- STAP appreciates the clear theory of change (ToC) contained in the PIF, particularly the distinct causal pathways connecting outputs to outcomes with a sense of the barriers they address. Such clear pathways will allow the project to monitor its assumptions and activities to ensure they are contributing to intended project goals.
- As currently framed, however, the adaptation rationale needed to justify this project is lacking. Specifically, the project provides little connection between proposed activities and the potential climate stresses identified in the PIF and the climate risk screen. Instead, the project appears to be designed to build adaptive capacity, but without any specificity in terms of what will have to be adapted and what it will have to be adapted to. Effective resilience work answers the question “resilience of what, to what, for whom?” The project does not answer this set of interlinked questions in a coherent way. While building adaptive capacity is a clear contribution to adaptation, any effective development project will likely build adaptive capacity simply by improving incomes, technical capacity, etc. Some discussion of how project interventions might render the local population less sensitive to expected climate futures, or less exposed to stresses, would serve to connect this project clearly to specific climate trends and stresses, and thus clarify the ways in which this is an adaptation project. The climate risk screen makes recommendations for the project components that start to address this issue, but nowhere are the issues of climate change, specific impacts and vulnerabilities, and specific interventions aimed at addressing those impacts/vulnerabilities linked in a manner that demonstrates an adaptation rationale.
- STAP also notes that this project intends to engage with local agrarian livelihoods, but it is not clear from this PIF that any communities or individuals engaged in those livelihoods were consulted in the development of this project. It is also unclear from the PIF the extent to which the reworking of these livelihoods is an expected outcome of project activities. There is no discussion of local livelihoods practices or any connection between them and expected climate futures and no identification of problems with local practices, which could suggest that project component 2 may be a solution looking for a problem. What evidence is there that communities need CBNRM the project intends to provide? To what extent are existing natural resource management practices problematic, and why?
- The project does not appear to have engaged with the complexities of local livelihoods that will be critical to the success of its interventions. For example, it is likely that local communities already engage in the processing and marketing of agricultural and NTFP commodities. But there is no sense of who does this work (men or women) and how enhancing such activities might change social dynamics at household or community scales. Shifting roles, for example by privileging work done by women, can lead to resistance from other members of the community to the attendant social changes. A clear, evidence-based assessment of how existing practices work in the context of a changing climate and country is central to determining if there is a problem, what the problem is, and who is best positioned to address it.
- Finally, the project assumes a degree of behavioral change is needed among these populations, but has not clearly identified behaviors in need of change or means of changing them.

Note: provide a general appraisal, asking whether relevant screening guideline questions have been addressed adequately – not all the questions will be relevant to all proposals; no need to comment on every question, only those needing more attention, noting any done very well, but ensure that all are considered. Comments should be helpful, evaluative, and qualitative, rather than yes/no.

3. Specific points to be addressed, and suggestions

Based on the issues identified above, STAP recommends the following specific points to be addressed:

1. Make a clear case for this project as an adaptation project. As currently written, the project interventions do not speak directly to likely climate futures. STAP suggests the project consult the "[Decision Tree for Adaptation Rationale](#)" to guide a reconsideration of this project.
2. Provide clear linkages between proposed interventions, particularly under components 2 and 3, and specific climate impacts. Generalized adaptive capacity, while useful, is not a project outcome unique to adaptation projects. Clearly identify specific forms of adaptive capacity and link those to specific projected climate impacts or stresses. STAP also suggests the project designers consider delivering climate benefits beyond increased adaptive capacity. For example, clearly showing how proposed project interventions might reduce the sensitivity of agrarian livelihoods to drought, would demonstrate that the project is clearly delivering an adaptation benefit. A starting point might lie in the climate risk screen, which suggests potential interventions and activities for the different project components, but these will still have to be clearly linked to specific stressors and impacts and the expected outcomes clearly identified.
3. Develop two or more [plausible future narratives](#) incorporating potential demographic, economic, and political futures for the study area. For example, one narrative might consider a high-climate impact, high population growth, and low economic growth scenario one with a lower-impact climate future of moderate population growth and high economic growth. Assessing proposed interventions against these futures will allow project designers to address future uncertainty and have some sense of likely intervention effectiveness across that uncertainty.
 - Engage local communities targeted by the project in components 2 and 3. This engagement should seek to identify problems with natural resource management, either in the context of the present or a plausible future under climate, economic, and demographic change. This will establish whether local practices need to be reworked to build adaptive capacity.
 - Assuming there *is* utility in working on local livelihoods, engage with communities to develop a detailed understanding of whose activities would have to change and the potential social and economic implications (good and bad) of such changes.

Note: number key points clearly and provide useful information or suggestions, including key literature where relevant. Completed screens should be no more than two or three pages in length.

*categories under review, subject to future revision

ANNEX: STAP'S SCREENING GUIDELINES

1. How well does the proposal explain the problem and issues to be addressed in the context of the **system** within which the problem sits and its drivers (e.g. population growth, economic development, climate change, sociocultural and political factors, and technological changes), including how the various components of the system interact?
2. Does the project indicate how **uncertain futures** could unfold (e.g. using simple **narratives**), based on an understanding of the trends and interactions between the key elements of the system and its drivers?
3. Does the project describe the **baseline** problem and how it may evolve in the future in the absence of the project; and then identify the outcomes that the project seeks to achieve, how these outcomes will change the baseline, and what the key **barriers** and **enablers** are to achieving those outcomes?
4. Are the project's **objectives** well formulated and justified in relation to this system context? Is there a convincing explanation as to **why this particular project** has been selected in preference to other options, in the light of how the future may unfold?
5. How well does the **theory of change** provide an "explicit account of how and why the proposed interventions would achieve their intended outcomes and goal, based on outlining a set of key causal pathways arising from the activities and outputs of the interventions and the assumptions underlying these causal connections".
 - Does the project logic show how the project would ensure that expected outcomes are **enduring** and resilient to possible future changes identified in question 2 above, and to the effects of any conflicting policies (see question 9 below).
 - Is the theory of change grounded on a solid scientific foundation, and is it aligned with current scientific knowledge?
 - Does it explicitly consider how any necessary **institutional and behavioral** changes are to be achieved?
 - Does the theory of change diagram convincingly show the overall project logic, including causal pathways and outcomes?
6. Are the project **components** (interventions and activities) identified in the theory of change each described in sufficient detail to discern the main thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they address the problem, their justification as a robust solution, and the critical assumptions and risks to achieving them?
7. How likely is the project to generate global environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF project (**additionality**)?
8. Does the project convincingly identify the relevant **stakeholders**, and their anticipated roles and responsibilities? is there an adequate explanation of how stakeholders will contribute to the

development and implementation of the project, and how they will benefit from the project to ensure enduring global environmental benefits, e.g. through co-benefits?

9. Does the description adequately explain:

- how the project will build on prior investments and complement current investments, both GEF and non-GEF,
- how the project incorporates **lessons learned** from previous projects in the country and region, and more widely from projects addressing similar issues elsewhere; and
- how country policies that are contradictory to the intended outcomes of the project (identified in section C) will be addressed (**policy coherence**)?

10. How adequate is the project's approach to generating, managing and exchanging **knowledge**, and how will lessons learned be captured for adaptive management and for the benefit of future projects?

11. Innovation and transformation:

- If the project is intended to be **innovative**: to what degree is it innovative, how will this ambition be achieved, how will barriers and enablers be addressed, and how might scaling be achieved?
- If the project is intended to be **transformative**: how well do the project's objectives contribute to transformative change, and are they sufficient to contribute to enduring, transformational change at a sufficient scale to deliver a step improvement in one or more GEBs? Is the proposed logic to achieve the goal credible, addressing necessary changes in institutions, social or cultural norms? Are barriers and enablers to scaling be addressed? And how will enduring scaling be achieved?

12. Have **risks** to the project design and implementation been identified appropriately in the risk table in section B, and have suitable mitigation measures been incorporated? (NB: risks to the durability of project outcomes from future changes in drivers should have been reflected in the theory of change and in project design, not in this table.)