

## STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
<b>GEF ID</b>	10690
<b>Project Title</b>	Building the resilience of forest biodiversity to the threats of climate change in Tanzania's Nature Forest Reserve
<b>Date of Screening</b>	November 16, 2020
<b>STAP member screener</b>	Rosie Cooney
<b>STAP secretariat screener</b>	Virginia Gorsevski
<b>STAP Overall Assessment and Rating</b>	<p><b>Minor</b></p> <p>STAP welcomes this project from UNDP to build the resilience of forest biodiversity to the threats of climate change in Tanzania's Nature Forest Reserves. While it appears that past projects have been successful in helping to establish and manage the NFRs, two major threats persist that this project seeks to address. The first is pressure coming from activities taking place in the buffer areas surrounding the reserves, and the second is impacts of climate change.</p> <p>STAP is pleased to see a preliminary ToC included in the PIF and agrees with the narrative that more work is needed to flesh out the details, working backwards (with stakeholders) from the objective to develop possible causal pathways, including underlying assumptions, etc. See STAP <a href="#">Theory of Change Primer</a> for more information and guidance.</p> <p>Doing so can help arrange the most logical sequence of events, which would likely <i>begin</i> with in-depth analysis of climate impacts for each of the reserves to help guide the management plans, including one of the key pre-determined mitigation measures (i.e. to increase the extent of connected areas between the reserves and intact forests).</p> <p>In addition, STAP notes that this project is clearly very well informed on the barriers to low-impact income generation opportunities (p. 25) and recognizes that Component 2 (income generation) clearly follows recommendations from a terminal evaluation of a prior project.</p>

	<p>Finally, STAP cautions that the section on Private Sector Engagement (p. 44) is slightly worrisome in its dependence on the recreational and tourism industry, given vulnerabilities of this sector exposed by the COVID epidemic. Also working with large industry including to develop offsets should be done with extreme caution to ensure that global environmental (and social) benefits that accrue from this project are not negated elsewhere (zu Ermgassen et al., (2019). The ecological outcomes of biodiversity offsets under “no net loss” policies: A global review. Conservation Letters. 2019; <a href="https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12664">https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12664</a>)</p>	
<p><b>Part I: Project Information</b>  <b>B. Indicative Project Description Summary</b></p>	<p><b>What STAP looks for</b></p>	<p><b>Response</b></p>
<p>Project Objective</p>	<p>Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?</p>	<p>The objective of this project is: “the improved governance, operations and financial management of NFRs (nature forest reserves) enhances the resilience of their forest biodiversity to the threats of climate change.”</p> <p>This objective essentially summarizes the project, the implication being that overall strengthening of the reserves will make them more resilient to climate change.</p>
<p>Project components</p>	<p>A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project’s objectives?</p>	<p>Activities revolve around developing and implementing plans for managing these reserves in a way that responds to future climate impacts, including working with communities outside the reserves to undertake ‘environmentally-friendly activities,’ that involve income generation supported by capacity development in the form of training, etc. and M&amp;E/KM/gender mainstreaming.</p> <p>These activities do support the overall project objectives; however, there is the question of timing and sequence. Presumably, the activities in Component 3 should take place first or at least along side Component 1 in order to first understand</p>

		what the impacts of climate change are likely to be before developing and implementing plans.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	Yes, the entire project is designed around adapting to climate change impacts.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes
Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project. Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?	Yes
<b>Part II: Project justification</b>	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
<b>1. Project description.</b> <b>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. Good distinction between direct threats and underlying drivers of deforestation.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes. Two main barriers to responding to climate change impacts on biodiversity in low-capacity, high risk NRFs are management deficiencies and lack of funding – each supported with detailed explanations and sources.
	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?	The baseline scenario is well described in terms of existing projects and this proposed project clearly explains how it follows from a prior GEF 5 project working in NRFs.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Yes if current METT scores are known. Also need baseline data for household income and information on connectivity (of which this project plans to increase the extent).

	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Yes.
	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	N/A
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	N/A
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	A ToC is presented on page 29. While this is encouraging, the diagram seems to be a listing of the project elements rather than an articulation of the various causal pathways (likely with many interlinkages) through which the eventual impact will be realized. The PIF notes that this is an outline for a provisional ToC, which will be developed in full during PPG.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Management plans developed, collaboration with communities, capacity development, implementation of plan, income generating activities operationalized, climate knowledge and decision support tools developed.  The project seems to include the key elements; however, it seems that the information about climate impacts should be first on the list of activities if, as is written, they are to be used for decision making. This would presumably include decisions about the plans themselves (including connectivity) and what type of capacity is needed, what types of income-generating activities, etc.
	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?	Yes
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	No

5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing	GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?	Yes
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	N/A
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits, and are they measurable?	Yes
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	\$4.8 million in GEF grant / 219,209 ha improved PA management and 9,000 ha under improved management outside reserves (buffers)
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Yes (in ha)
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	METT
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	The entire project is built around this objective
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?	No
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Scaling activities are standard.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Both
<b>1b.</b> Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Map is provided as well as centroid coordinates for each of the target reserves.

<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, though more specific information on NGOs and CBOs and academic institutions and the private sector, including their roles, is needed.</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>See above.</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</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>contribute to gender equality: access to and control over resources; participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services.</p> <p>Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd</p>		
	<p>Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?</p>	<p>Yes. Gender mainstreaming plan and integrated into each of the various components.</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? Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project? For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?</li> <li>• Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?</li> <li>• What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?</li> </ul>	<p>An assessment of risks to successful delivery of the project's outcomes and outputs was conducted, with results summarized in Table 2 (p. 45).</p> <p>A major risk is conflict with local communities over increased restriction to the reserves. This is addressed through elements of the project itself (MOUs, income sharing, training, etc.).</p> <p>In addition to assessing general risks, a preliminary climate-risk screening (following the STAP Guidance on Climate Risk Screening and drawing on data in the World Bank Climate Knowledge Portal and other published sources), and assessment of COVID-19-mediated risks was undertaken.</p> <p>The entire project is based on responding to the risks of climate change; however, the actual CRS is not provided in the project documents so general effects of climate change are described but more information is needed on the data and models that have been used (or will be used) to better understand future climate conditions for each of the project areas and surrounds.</p>

		One of the predetermined mitigation measures includes increasing connectivity of NFRs to intact natural habitats. The project may want to consult with the GEF-funded SPARC program, which included East Africa/Tanzania. See <a href="http://www.sparc-website.org/">http://www.sparc-website.org/</a> .
<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. Pp 31-32 show how Component 2 follows recommendations from a prior UNDP-GEF project evaluation.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Recommendations from prior projects feed into the development of this project
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	See above – recommendations from prior project form the basis for Component 2.
	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?	Yes.
<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.	What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?	Standard (i.e. lessons learned will be recorded and shared). The climate information will be useful – more information would be helpful to show where the data and information will be housed and what will happen once the GEF project has ended.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	Standard activities.



Notes

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
<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>* 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><i>“STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal and encourages the proponent to develop it with same rigor. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design.”</i></b></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>
	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;</p>
	<p>(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.</p>
	<p>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.</p>

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