

STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE

GEF ID	11284
Project title	Sustainable management of water and rangeland resources for enhanced climate resilience of rural communities in Djibouti
Date of screen	June 10, 2023
STAP Panel Member	Edward Carr
STAP Secretariat	Virginia Gorsevski

1. Summary of STAP's views of the project

STAP acknowledges the project "Sustainable management of water and rangeland resources for enhanced climate resilience of rural communities in Djibouti." As the PIF demonstrates, agro-pastoralists in Djibouti are highly vulnerable to water scarcity due to drought, as well as flooding. The project seeks to undertake fairly standard interventions related to institutional capacity building at the national and regional level, the development of climate services including flood early warnings, establishment of water access points, EbA approaches, nature-based livelihoods, and KML platforms.

If the project can clarify its unique contributions to "Enhancing climate change resilience for rural communities to achieve food, water and livelihood security by improving water access through water resource management and infrastructure, improved institutional capacity and climate risk preparedness" relative to other projects with similar goals, and if the project learns from prior projects and undertakes substantial engagement with target communities around the design and implementation of interventions, it has the potential to deliver both adaptation benefits and benefits associated with limiting land degradation.

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
- X** **Minor - STAP has identified some scientific and technical points to be addressed in project design**
- 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.

STAP appreciates that the PIF describes elements of the system, including rates of population increase, rates of urbanization, gender relations, the overall composition of the economy, and the character of agriculture. However, where the climate information provided in the PIF includes both historical data and projections based on two RCPs, the wider system is only described in its current state. Changes to that system over the next few decades will shape vulnerability to climate change, and therefore the need for adaptation.

Also, while STAP appreciates that the PIF includes more than one climate future, we note that the projections are listed for 2100. It is not clear that the project goals are aimed at this long time horizon, or that such a long time horizon is appropriate in a context of potentially large change. Clear projections of possible conditions in 2040 or 2050 are more relevant, but also will show a much smaller divergence in conditions under the two

scenarios. In short, the PIF does not capture the uncertain futures that adaptation will have to address, as such uncertainty is principally driven by changes in the system, not different pathways of change in the climate.

The PIF appears to conflate early warning systems with climate services. While early warning systems seem appropriate for issues such as flash flooding, droughts are a slow-onset challenge that often can be predicted some time in advance through the careful analysis of climate, hydrologic, and ecological data. STAP suggests that what the PIF is describing is a suite of climate services, including a flood early warning system and seasonal forecasts that might inform agricultural practice and decisions.

The PIF claims that pastoralist communities in rural areas do not have risk management options in place to cope with risks related to drought and flooding events (Barrier 6, #41). This is extremely unlikely, as nearly all populations engaged in natural-resource dependent livelihoods have to manage various risks related to precipitation and water supply, and often have long histories of doing so. Failure to identify and understand existing adaptations among targeted communities risks designing interventions that undermine actions and practices that work, in the worst case replacing them with project activities that are less effective. It is possible that pastoralist communities do not have risk management options in place that can completely or effectively manage new and changing conditions, but even in such cases project designers should assess the extent to which new interventions build on existing adaptations, complement them, or replace them with something more effective.

STAP notes that the PIF reflects learning from prior projects about the importance of intervention design via in-depth consultation with local communities and encourages the project designers to build on these lessons in the PPG stage. This is particularly important for the gender-sensitive aspects of the project, as livelihoods activities are deeply intertwined with issues of identity and associated roles and responsibilities. Understanding gender roles and local pathways of change will greatly enhance the impact of the project. The Advisory Document "[A Decision Tree for Adaptation Rationale](#)" contains useful advice, digested to a short set of project design decisions, that can guide designers to the key questions they should answer to ensure they capture existing adaptation efforts and build on them where appropriate.

While it is clear that Djibouti faces many challenges and is highly vulnerable to climate change, it is not clear that the components in this project are incorporating information from past projects which have sought to accomplish similar objectives. Specifically, 'lessons learned' from prior projects are listed but not incorporated as actionable items. For example, one important lesson learned from past projects is the need for sustainable financing, yet this continues to be missing from the proposed project. Baseline information is provided on ongoing activities; however, notably missing is GEF ID 10180 "Planning and implementing EbA in Djibouti's Dikhil and Tadjourah regions" from UNEP which feels oddly similar to this proposed project (including the same regions). Further, the PIF is not clear about how this project relates to several others engaged in similar work or addressing similar issues. It is therefore difficult to interpret the extent to which this project duplicates work in other projects.

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

- 1) Moving forward, the project should develop integrated narratives of the future that capture different ways in which system dynamics and climate change play out. For example, one narrative might assume a lower rate of climate change, high urbanization, a growing service economy, and regional stability. Another might assume a higher rate of climate change, current rates of urbanization and a continuation of current economic structures, but a less stable region that results in in-migration from one or more surrounding countries. Neither of these is a required narrative, just examples of narratives that would create integrated understandings of the future that targeted communities will have to adapt to – and therefore become

useful references against which to assess the potential efficacy of different interventions and activities. The STAP Brief "[Using simple narratives to ensure durability of GEF investments](#)" has helpful advice to guide this thinking in the PPG stage.

- 2) In the PPG stage, the project should consider shifting its emphasis from early warning to climate services more broadly, with early warning for floods one of the services to be developed.
- 3) In the PPG stage, the project should undertake significant consultations with target communities regarding their livelihoods and their current adaptations to a changing climate and the larger socio-economic system in which they find themselves. Project designers can use the STAP Advisory Document "[A Decision Tree for Adaptation Rationale](#)" to identify the questions they need to answer to ensure effective project design. In such consultation, the project should consider the sources of other important drivers such as overgrazing and over exploitation? If these other drivers and their causes are not understood, it is unlikely the proposed benefits of this project be sufficient to counteract the harmful impacts of these practices. This also speaks to a questions in Component 3 regarding incentives for people to change their existing practices (and turn to apiculture and handicrafts, for example). Consultations should explore why target communities haven't they done so already.
- 4) In the PPG stage, the project should clarify its relationship to those described in the PIF. Specifically, the project should be clear about how it builds on or otherwise extends those projects and their impacts. For example, how is this project different from 10180 "Planning and implementing Ecosystem based Adaptation (EbA) in Djibouti's Dikhil and Tadjourah regions" (UNEP)? Where there are significant overlaps with other projects, those overlaps should be clearly justified in terms of benefits that would not be delivered without that overlap. For example, one of the lessons from baseline projects mentioned in the PIF is that "the lack of sustainable funding can limit the long-term impact of interventions and make it difficult to continue activities once the initial project funding has been exhausted, and the lack of an exit strategy if not properly put in place can jeopardize the sustainability and continuity of results achieved." How will this project address this very important lesson learned as there does not appear to be a component related to sustainable financing? Further, what have been the outcomes of GEF ID 10051 (UNDP) to promote energy access in Djibouti and how will this inform the proposed project – specifically Output 3.1 Establishment of sustainable groundwater access points using solar-powered pumps and associated infrastructure in 6 villages?
- 5) In Component 1: which specific institutional and technical barriers within the GoD will be addressed and how? Is the aim to improve policy coherence across Agencies? Remove harmful subsidies? Or are there other specific actions planned?
- 6) Some of the project assumptions should be tested in the PPG stage, before implementation. This includes assumption 3: grey infrastructure will be sufficient for meeting community water needs and Assumption 4: land management practices will improve the provision of ecosystem services, including increased water quality. Both should be tested prior to committing to a project.
- 7) Component 4 on knowledge management will disseminate best practices and lessons learned among communities. Given the overlap with GEF ID 10180, it would be good to coordinate activities related to policy briefs, planning, information on EbA approaches, etc.

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.)