STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response	
GEF ID	10416	
Project Title	Sustainable Management of Drylands in Northern Togo	
Date of Screening	23.05.2020	
STAP member screener	Graciela Metternicht	
STAP secretariat screener	Guadalupe Duron	
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	**Minor issues to be considered during project design** STAP acknowledges UNDP's project "Sustainable Management of Drylands in Northern Togo". The project aims to achieve land degradation neutrality, improve agro-pastoral livelihoods, and enhance globally significant biodiversity in the Savanes and Kara regions. This initiative proposes to build on a solid baseline of national commitments and strategies, drawing lessons and synergies with past and ongoing interventions on sustainable land management and biodiversity conservation. Below, STAP makes a number of recommendations, which STAP expects will be acted upon during the project design. STAP requests that UNDP shares the draft project to allow STAP an added opportunity to review the project, and ensure it is scientifically and technical sound. Despite a thorough problem analysis (i.e. clear identification of drivers of land degradation and biodiversity loss), the project fails to identify what activities and outputs will be different from efforts that have been implemented by the baseline projects (Table 1). Information describing what inputs come from baseline projects like PRAPT — and what will be novel and exclusive of this project— is unclear. As a result, STAP is concerned this project may duplicate activities from the GEF PRAPT project (page 29 of PIF).	

	Furthermore, the PIF appears to over-estimate the global benefits of biodiversity to be delivered by this project. Core indicator #1 claims the project will achieve 371,000 ha (expected at PIF) of terrestrial protected areas under improved management for conservation and sustainable use. That area corresponds to the Oti-Keran/Oti Mandouri National Park with 179,000 ha, and the Fazao- Malkafassa National Park with 192,000ha. The map of intervention areas (Savane and Kara) and ancillary information STAP gathered shows that only about a third of the Fazao-Malkafassa National Park is located within the Kara region (most of the Park area is within the Centrale region). Of further concern is the fact that the buffer zones and transition areas of the OK/O-M biosphere amount to approximately 105,000 ha. Thus, it is STAP's view that about half of the expected benefits for this indicator are to be achieved if the tasks and actions are successfully implemented.	
	Additionally, the project mentions that a large majority of the stakeholders are illiterate (female adult literacy is 52% in the country) and that only 3% of the farmers have access to extension services. Capacity building and training (e.g. outputs 2.1.2, 2.1.3) along with gender empowerment activities need to consider illiteracy (and other socio-economic factors) to achieve the desired outcomes (e.g. 5000 land users demonstrate increase knowledge after training; 128,000 individuals are direct beneficiaries from project supported knowledge/skill buildings).	
	STAP further recommends the adoption of principles of SMART indicators, and to consider LDN indicators at national level. National-level LDN indicators will assist in complementing the three LDN global indicators, and enable the monitoring of locally-relevant ecosystem services.	
	For these reasons described above, STAP concludes these issues need to be explicitly addressed during project design. Particular attention should be paid to: i) specifying	

	the techniques and approaches that will be applied to achieve the global environmental benefits; and, ii) consider training and participatory approaches that empower stakeholders. "Informing" stakeholders (pg 50) is the first step of any participatory process, and falls short of empowering. Below, STAP specifies its guidance. It also provides a list resources that can assist the project team in improving the theory of change, approaches (including assessments and activities), and indicators to plan, implement and monitor sustainable land management of drylands in northern Togo.	
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?	The objective is clear, as it is the narrative of the drivers and barriers
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	The project aims to build on the successes of the previous project while integrating lessons learned, for: i) ensuring adherence to FPIC processes; ii) extensive outreach and awareness raising; iii) facilitating dialogue between community members, local and national government representatives to enable conflict prevention; and iv) active engagement of local communities in sustainable forest/land/PA management activities while demonstrating livelihood benefits, in addition to addressing risks related to increased potential of human wildlife conflicts. Three components summarise the planned activities and these appear to be capable of deliver on the project objectives, provided the mechanisms selected to implement these activities are context-based and participatory processes are seek to 'engage' with stakeholders rather than 'inform' them (e.g. page 50).

		A theory of change connecting desired vision with inputs, activities (including tasks and processes), outputs and their connection with expected outcomes, measured by SMART indicators would benefit project design. STAP provides a list of relevant literature on LDN Conceptual Framework, on theory of change, on guidelines for implementation of LDN and scaling for durability at the end of this document. STAP recommends reading the recent paper "Assessment of Habitat Change Processes within the Oti-Keran-Mandouri Network of Protected Areas in Togo (West Africa) from 1987 to 2013 Using Decision Tree Analysis" (see reference at the end of this document).
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?	The planned outcomes appear able to deliver important global environmental benefits, although the current PIF seems to have over-estimated these benefits. The summary (above) discusses the issues related to the claimed benefit of reducing threats to wildlife. In addition, it is not clear the link between tasks/activities/processes proposed and their translation into appropriate format to enable replication and upscaling at the local, national, regional and global levels (pg 36).
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	The project needs to strengthen the link between expected outcomes of global benefit and planned tasks and activities. The project needs to develop further locally relevant indicators to monitor the delivery of the expected benefits.
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?	Partly. Sum of outputs of component #1 Enabling Framework s and Capacity for LDN Implementation and Biodiversity Conservation appears likely to contribute to the expected outcomes (1.1.1 to 1.1.4), although political will and strategic coordination of Ministries will be essential to that end. Components 2, 3, and 4 would benefit from a good theory of change, constructed in a participatory manner, and considering external factors (social-political

		upheaval are highlighted as high risk) that could impact on delivery of activities.
		The project needs to consider specific techniques that are reported in literature for effective capacity building, training and provision of advisory services to stakeholders of low-level literacy, and of different ethnic backgrounds. (see bibliography at the end).
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	The project lacks a theory of change, though elements for a ToC could be extracted from table 2. The vision is one of 'sustainable land management in the northern drylands of Togo' that is to be achieved through four components that will : address gaps in national-level capacities and policy frameworks, and strengthen the enabling environment for sustainable management of land and forest resources and biodiversity conservation. To this end the project will apply participatory processes for land and water planning in selected landscapes of the Kara and Savane regions, including planning for habitat conservation and corridors; it will reduce pressures conducive to land degradation, and improve biodiversity conservation through SFM/SLM, restoration and interventions aimed at facilitating sustainable alternative livelihood in PAs and buffer zones (Components 2 and 3). It will further promote good practices in sustainable land and forest restoration and management (Component 2) through strong linkages with environmentally sustainable livelihood options and improved value chains of agricultural/agroforestry commodities (Component 3). The final component of this desired vision is to communicate to share the knowledge generated with target audiences (Component 4) to further enable replication and upscaling.
1. **Project description. Briefly describe:**	Is the problem statement well-defined?	Yes.

1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)		
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes.
	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.
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?	The project provides a baseline of land degradation, it cross references the LDN TSP of Togo as one of the aspirational baselines that the project aim to advance. However, it lacks specificity on the approach and thinking that have led to the quantification of the benefits.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Table 2 provides a good argument for the incremental cost reasoning, although it is not clear how some of the claimed global environmental benefits have been calculated.
	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	What is the theory of change?	See above.

outcomes and components of the project		
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Components 1 to 4 list a series of events that will lead to the desired outcomes.
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	See above.
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Well informed identification of underlying assumptions is needed.
	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 section on risks identifies measures to adapt and anticipate risks related to social upheaval, climate change, human wildlife conflicts, among others.
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?	Provided tasks and activities account for the socio-economic, political and legal specificities of the Kara and Savane regions, the project can deliver the expected 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?	n/a
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits, and are they measurable?	The claimed benefits are global, but it is not clear from the PIF how, for instance the claimed benefit of "local socio-economic development benefits delivered while reducing environmental pressures through sustainable production and value adding of agricultural/agroforestry commodities" can be measured.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	See comments in the overall summary.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Yes they are in table 2.
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	This information is very vague.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Table 4 (pg 52) lists the local impacts of global climate change and it details how such impacts will be mitigated. STAP notes that the project needs

		further thinking on how proposed activities and tasks will enhance resilience to climate change of the socio-ecological system of the Kara and Savane regions. Of concern is the lack of evidence of whether, and how, resilience practices and measures to address projected climate change and its impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?
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 project envisages applying innovative locally adapted technologies, tools, and techniques that focus on local and indigenous knowledge, traditional practices, as well as current scientific insights on agroforestry/agricultural methods and species selection. The project developers may wish to consider how ICT could be used to facilitate extension services reaching more farmers and particularly those with low literacy level. It is not clear how by 'informing' stakeholders of the outcomes of assessments of ecosystem services will provide enhanced understanding of ecosystem services for informed decision making (with linkages to components 3 and 4). How can this assessment and training help a farmer, or women? This approach could be useful for sectors of the Government of Togo that can influence delivery of component 1 (the enabling environment of LDN), but is it less clear what type of benefits a farmer and land user extracts from this information and training.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	This articulation needs to be better elicited.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	The component 1 of this project calls for a fundamental transformational change, and it will need strong political will.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide		Yes provided.

geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		
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?	Table 3 lists diverse stakeholders and their role and responsibilities, and it notes that a minimum level of engagement with local communities have existed in the preparation of this PIF.(pg 44)
	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?	Table 3 provides an overall view of the expected roles and responsibilities of stakeholders. STAP welcomes the inclusion of the local academic institutions like the Univesrity of Lome for the preparation of training materials, and the UNCCD to provide training on LDN.
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	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	Yes they have, and the project will undertake gender analysis. STAP recommends that training and extension services be also tailored to women of the area, and proposes recent literature and reports with good practices that could be transferred adapted to this project.

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		
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	
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	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: • 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?	Table 4 presents the risks of the project and the PIF notes that the overall risk rating is High. With regards to climate change risks, the project identifies the "Local impacts of global climate change may prolong and extend the severity of droughts and dry spells in northern Togo, worsening land degradation and affecting agroecological productivity as well as biodiversity conservation". As a response it proposes that "impacts will be mitigated by integrating weather variability models into project practices and encouraging the adoption of climate smart- agricultural/agroforestry practices, including use of drought tolerant species." While the risk of increased climatic extremes and way to address it are valid, the responses will need to also consider the aspects of

		exposure, sensitivity and adaptive capacity to a changing climate. The project design will benefit from applying frameworks like RAPTA (The Resilience, Adaptation Pathways and Transformation Approach that STAP developed to help GEF projects to design, implement and evaluate interventions for achieving sustainability goals within highly uncertain and rapidly changing decision contexts).
		While the PIF draws attention on how the targeted project components (e.g. drylands) will be impacted by climate change and *the level of severity*; specific information on how projected climate change impacts, including climate variability, in the project location can affect the efficacy of proposed GEF interventions.
		Information *on how* the proposed interventions may contribute to reducing the vulnerability to climate risks is essential, as it is an evaluation of the possibility that the proposed interventions increase vulnerability to climate risks or lead to maladaptation, and measures for preventing this.
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?	Project execution will be under the responsibility of the Ministry of Environment, Sustainable Development and Nature Protection (Ministère de l'Environnement, du Développement Durable et de la Protection de Nature MEDDN). UNDP will perform the quality assurance role and supports the Project Steering Committee and Project Management Unit by carrying out objective and independent project oversight and monitoring functions (pg 53). Table 1 lists recent and ongoing baseline projects relevant to enabling sustainable land management practices and biodiversity conservation in Togo.
		The PIF however is very week on specifying what good practices for subsequent replication or

		upscaling by the proposed GEF-funded intervention and/or lessons are to be drawn from these projects. The project recognizes previous projects and learnings derived from them; more clarity is needed on how lessons of projects cited informed the project design, and in relation to projects like PRAPT specific information on what out PRAPT outputs/outcomes will be 'input' for this project and to assure that there is not duplication, and/or activities undertaken as part of some of the ongoing projects are not double counted as part of this project.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	See above
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	See above
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	See above
	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?	See above
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?	Knowledge management is one barrier cited in this PIF. The team plans to coordinate with the knowledge management component of the GEF-funded Good Growth Partnership initiative to ensure integration of good practices in improving environmental and social sustainability of global commodities and potential access to global markets.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	Pg 58 specifies the plan for knowledge management, which appears well rounded and ambitious. STAP is pleased that academic institutions of Togo will be helping in KM and dissemination. The team aspires to establish linkages with open data platforms for sharing and publishing georeferenced information (Component 1), and coordination with the knowledge management component of the Good Growth

| | | Partnership (Component 3) for enabling upscaling at the global level.

Specific knowledge management activities are incorporated under Component 4 and will be integrated in support of capacity enhancement and training actions throughout project implementation. Broader dissemination of knowledge generated by the project will be pursued by development and implementation of a targeted stakeholder engagement and communication strategy. The project will furthermore explore opportunities to benefit from South-South and triangular cooperation mechanisms, and build on existing national networks for agricultural research and regional initiatives such as WASCAL.

STAP recommends that the dissemination plan be prepared taking into account that some key stakeholders of this project are said to be women and farmers with low literacy levels. Mechanisms and actions need to address this factor to ensure the highly aspirational targets are met. |
|---|---|---|

Literature that STAP recommends be used to enhance the PIF and planned

Polo-Akpisso, Aniko, Kpérkouma Wala, Ouattara Soulemane, Fousseni Folega, Koffi Akpagana, and Yao Tano**. "Assessment of Habitat Change Processes within the Oti-Keran-Mandouri Network of Protected Areas in Togo (West Africa) from 1987 to 2013 Using Decision Tree Analysis**." *Sci* 2, no. 1 (2020): 1. https://www.mdpi.com/2413-4155/2/1/1

Gender and LDN:
UN WOMEN, GLOBAL MECHANISM OF THE UNCCD AND IUCN (2019). A Manual for Gender-Responsive Land Degradation Neutrality Transformative Projects and Programmes http://catalogue.unccd.int/1223_Gender_Manual.pdf
Global Mechanism of the UNCCD. 2019. Land Degradation Neutrality Interventions to Foster Gender Equality. Bonn, Germany http://catalogue.unccd.int/1222_UNCCD_gender_briefing_note.pdf

LDN Guidelines, LDN scientific conceptual framework and recent lessons on LDN:
Cowie (2019) Guidelines for Land Degradation Neutrality A report prepared for the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel of the Global Environment Facility. https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/LDN%20Technical%20Report_web%20version.pdf

UNCCD-SPI. Scientific Conceptual Framework for Land Degradation Neutrality. A report of the Science-Policy Interface. https://www.unccd.int/publications/scientific-conceptual-framework-land-degradation-neutrality-report-science-policy

Cowie, A.L., Orr, B.J., Sanchez, V.M.C., Chasek, P., Crossman, N.D., Erlewein, A., Louwagie, G., Maron, M., Metternicht, G.I., Minelli, S. and Tengberg, A.E., 2018. Land in balance: The scientific conceptual framework for Land Degradation Neutrality. Environmental Science & Policy, 79, pp.25-35.

Global Mechanism of the UNCCD. 2019. Land Degradation Neutrality Target Setting:
Initial findings and lessons learned. Bonn, Germany. http://catalogue.unccd.int/1217_newLDN_TSP_Initial_Findings_191108.pdf

P.H. Verburg, G. Metternicht, C. Allen, N. Debonne, M. Akhtar-Schuster, M. Inácio da Cunha, Z. Karim, A. Pilon, O. Raja, M. Sánchez Santivañez, and A. Şenyaz. 2019. *Creating an Enabling Environment for Land Degradation Neutrality and its Potential Contribution to Enhancing Well-being, Livelihoods and the Environment*. A Report
of the Science-Policy Interface. United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), Bonn, Germany. http://catalogue.unccd.int/1210_UNCCD_SPI_2019_Report_1.2.pdf

A. Reichhuber, N. Gerber, A. Mirzabaev, M. Svoboda, A. López Santos, V. Graw, R. Stefanski, J. Davies, A. Vuković, M.A. Fernández García, C. Fiati and X. Jia. 2019. The Land-Drought Nexus: Enhancing the Role of Land-Based Interventions in Drought Mitigation and Risk Management. A Report of the Science-Policy Interface. United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), Bonn, Germany. http://catalogue.unccd.int/1211_03EP_UNCCD_SPI_2019_Report_2.pdf

Theory of Change and scaling for sustainability

STAP's theory of change primer: https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer
Scaling: https://www.stapgef.org/achieving-enduring-outcomes-gef-investment;

Climate change risk screening:

STAP's screening guidelines: https://www.stapgef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF%20AGENCY%20RETREAT%20Mar-Apr%202020.pdf World Bank Climate Change Knowledge Portal: https://climateknowledgeportal.worldbank.org/
U.S. Agency for International Development Climate Risk Screening and Management Tools: https://www.climatelinks.org/resources/climate-risk-screening-management-tool

Design of activities and processes that are participatory and inclusive, accounting for low literacy levels:

Cuendet, S., Medhi, I., Bali, K., & Cutrell, E. (2013, April). VideoKheti: making video content accessible to low-literate and novice users. In Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (pp. 2833-2842).

David, Soniia, and Christopher Asamoah. "Video as a tool for agricultural extension in Africa: a case study from Ghana." *International Journal of Education and Development using ICT* 7, no. 1 (2011): 26-41.

Debesai, Menghistab Ghebreselassie, Tesfai Tsegai Kidane, Woldeselassie Ogbazghi, Woldeamlak Araia, Simon Measho, and Semere Amlesom. "Understanding Drought Coping Mechanisms in Smallholder Farm Households: Evidence from Dry Lands of Eritrea." Journal of Agricultural Economics 5, no. 1 (2019): 548-554.

Gumucio, Tatiana, James Hansen, Sophia Huyer, Tiff van Huysen, and Saroja Schwager. "Identifying pathways for more gender-sensitive communication channels in climate services." (2018).

King, Elizabeth G., Ryan R. Unks, and Laura German. "Constraints and capacities for novel livelihood adaptation: lessons from agricultural adoption in an African dryland pastoralist system." Regional Environmental Change 18, no. 5 (2018): 1403-1410.

Kpadonou, Rivaldo A. Baba, Tom Owiyo, Bruno Barbier, Fatima Denton, Franck Rutabingwa, and Andre Kiema. "Advancing climate-smart-agriculture in developing drylands: Joint analysis of the adoption of multiple on-farm soil and water conservation technologies in West African Sahel." Land Use Policy 61 (2017): 196-207.

Maredia, M. K., Reyes, B., Ba, M. N., Dabire, C. L., Pittendrigh, B., & Bello-Bravo, J. (2018). Can mobile phone-based animated videos induce learning and technology adoption among low-literate farmers? A field experiment in Burkina Faso. *Information Technology for Development*, *24*(3), 429-460.

McCormack, Caitlin, 2018. *Key factors in the use of Agricultural Extension Services by women farmers in Babati District, Tanzania : the role of societal gender norms.* Second cycle, A2E. Uppsala: SLU, Dept. of Urban and Rural Development I also find that current measures within AES to target women farmers do not comprehensively address gender norms and there is an apparent lack of gender capacity amongst institutions and staff involved in providing AES

Medhi-Thies, Indrani, Pedro Ferreira, Nakull Gupta, Jacki O'Neill, and Edward Cutrell. "KrishiPustak: a social networking system for low-literate farmers." In Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing, pp. 1670-1681. 2015.

Mutsvangwa-Sammie, Eness P., Emmanuel Manzungu, and Shephard Siziba. "Key attributes of agricultural innovations in semi-arid smallholder farming systems in south-west Zimbabwe." Physics and Chemistry of the Earth, Parts A/B/C 105 (2018): 125-135.

Ninsiima, D. (2015, May). " Buuza Omulimisa"(ask the extension officer) text messaging for low literate farming communities in rural Uganda. In *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Information and Communication Technologies and Development* (pp. 1-4).

Oguge, N. O. (2019). Building resilience to drought among small-scale farmers in Eastern African drylands through rainwater harvesting: technological options and governance from a food–energy–water nexus perspective. In Current Directions in Water Scarcity Research (Vol. 2, pp. 265-276). Elsevier.

Shalander, Kumar, A. M. Whitbread, and K. P. C. Rao. "Innovation platforms as vehicle to strengthen stakeholders capacity to innovate for improved livelihoods in drylands in Asia and Sub Saharan Africa." (2017).

Stakeholder participation: IAP2 public participation spectrum**.** https://i2s.anu.edu.au/resources/stakeholder-participation-iap2-public-participation-spectrum/

Tesfamariam, Yordanos, and Margot Hurlbert. "Gendered adaptation of Eritrean dryland farmers." International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management (2017).

Notes

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.
	* 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."*
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.