STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE

GEF ID	11531
Project title	Upscaling ecosystem-based adaptation to enhance ecosystem services and community adaptive capacity in Tanzania's Greater Serengeti Ecosystem.
Date of screen	20 November 2024
STAP Panel Member	Jon Barnett
STAP Secretariat	Alessandro Moscuzza

1. **Summary of STAP's views of the project**

This is a well-considered and explained proposal. The project rationale is clear, the baseline problem well explained, and the objectives are well formulated. The theory of change is satisfactory, and the overall logic of the components is clear. Related projects are identified, as are country policies, which the project aligns with well. The identification of risks and strategies for their management are well considered.

There are some aspects that could be strengthened in the project design. The concept of village land-use plans (VLUPs) was not explained clearly at the outset, which is a noticeable fault since this is central to the whole proposal and is used more than 80 times therein.

Narratives about plausible futures could be better developed: negative trends and feedbacks are well explained, but not how these might amplify further in the future to the detriment of environmental and social outcomes. This also compromises the strength of claims the project might make about additional global environmental benefits.

There could be better integration between activities for output 2.1 and other outputs, especially since 2.1 consumes nearly 75% of project funding. Lessons learned from previous activities to implement Ecosystem Based Adaptation (EbA) and other project activities such as livelihood diversification could be better identified and applied.

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?**

A strength of its proposal is its account of the negative feedbacks between population growth, climate change, poverty and uncertain property rights on environmental degradation.

The **project rationale** is clearly written, and the description of the baseline problem was fully adequate. However, both would benefit significantly and would be more convincing if they indicated the sources for key information and included some data that indicated social conditions (such as indicators of poverty, educational attainment, access to healthcare, and gender inequality). It would also greatly benefit from defining practices such as village land-use plans (VLUPs) and Ecosystem Based Adaptation (EbA) that are central to the proposal, clearly at the outset.

Furthermore, the proposal does not provide a clear narrative of how these social conditions and practices might change in different **future scenarios** – negatively or otherwise - other than with initial reference to the impacts of warming on crop production. A discussion of the way even this (climate) driver might in turn trigger negative feedbacks would be helpful, let alone how other drivers might themselves drive change. This would help establish a worst-case scenario against which this project's rationale would be much strengthened. Recognition of positive trends that the project may amplify would also be helpful, for example around improvements in educational attainment. That said, the rationale for the project remains solid.

The **outputs** are generally well-described, but **Output 2.1** does not seem well integrated into the project design and reads like a separate conservation project inside the larger project. Perhaps this is merely a matter of highlighting the linkages with other outputs. However, the rehabilitation and restoration activities are not described as EbA strategies, nor are they linked to alternative livelihoods, which included a rather long list of activities that could have possibly been narrowed to include only those that are more likely to succeed. Moreover, these are to be determined not with local resource users but by the Vice President's Office and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, which again suggests that this output is divorced from other project activities. It should be added that this type of higher-up decision making also weakens the case about gender sensitivity and community engagement.

The existing **baseline** is well described, and the proposal provides a very good description of the potential **barriers** to the successful implementation of the preferred solution. Table 9 provides a good outline of the proposed strategies for overcoming those barriers and table 11 provides a good overview of several ongoing projects to coordinate and cooperate with. However, this may also underplay the risk of duplication, especially with activities planned for the Simiyu Climate Resilience Project (and in particular its WASH elements), and TACATDP and its lending and de-risking facility. The opportunities for synergies between these ongoing initiatives and this project are good, but there is also a risk of inefficiencies and duplication, and it would be good to see a description of governance arrangements to maximize the benefits and minimize the opportunities.

The section on **stakeholder engagement** was quite limited in scope and should be improved in the next phase of project development. The current version does not include a description of the private sector and civil society landscape and no clear indication of how these will be engaged in the future. It is, however, noted that the proposal recognized that due to time and resource limitations and logistical challenges; the initial consultations have been limited to a narrow range of actors operating in the target regions. It also mentions that a more comprehensive stakeholder mapping and analysis is planned for the PPG stage.

The proposal mentioned **learning** in several places throughout, but this aspect was insufficiently developed and should be improved. For example, as outlined above, the project proposes to develop alternative livelihood strategies, and lists several. Presumably some of these, or similar alternatives have trialed elsewhere in Tanzania but there was no reference to leveraging learning from any other initiatives. Similarly, the proposal mentions a sustainable finance mechanism, and presumably there are other examples from which lessons can be learned.

3. Specific points to be addressed, and suggestions

1. In the project rationale **develop narratives about plausible futures** based on better evidence about social and environmental conditions and trends, to the detriment of environmental and social outcomes. This can then support a case that the project will deliver (additional) global environmental benefits.

2. **Improve the level of integration** between activities for output 2.1 and other outputs, especially with respect to the relationships between rehabilitation and restoration activities and EbA, livelihoods, stakeholder engagement, and gender.

3. Ensure that **lessons learned** from previous initiatives/projects to implement EbA and other activities such as livelihood diversification are systematically identified and applied consistently. It would be good to see some

recognition of lessons learned from similar efforts, including on overcoming barriers to success and ensuring sustainability.

4. The design team should **conduct additional consultations during the PPG stage**, seeking specifically to bring local and government actors together, with the aim of building transparency and bridging social capital.

5. The first sentence of the project objective (on page 4) is convoluted. **The fourth sentence is much more straightforward and could be repurposed to be the headline objective**: "*improved resource management and enabling sustainable community livelihoods, the project will strengthen the resilience of crop and livestock farmers in the GSE to climate change-induced droughts and floods*".

6. **Define VLUP and EbA the first time they are** used (on page 4 & 5).

7. Given the significant role of the Vice President's Office and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism in decision making, the proposal should consider how gender sensitivity and community engagement will be ensured under the current decision-making arrangement.

8. **The discussion of gender inequity would benefit from some data**, e.g. from the Tanzania Human Development report, and it could be noted too that this is likely a key driver of high fertility (strengthening the gender rationale for the project).

9. **Provide a rationale for selecting the 24 villages to develop VLUPs**. This could also help strengthen the rational and feed into activities for outcome 4.

10. **Provide a clear explanation of how the project could deliver transformational change**. On page 4 the proposal says that the project will be transformative, but a case for this is not made anywhere in the PIF.

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.)