

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	11003
Project Title	Sustainable Land Management to Strengthen Social Cohesion in the Drylands of Burkina Faso
Date of Screening	June 10, 2022
STAP member screener	Graciela Metternicht
STAP secretariat screener	Guadalupe Durón
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Concur</p> <p>STAP welcomes Burkina Faso’s project, “Sustainable Land Management to Strengthen Social Cohesion in the Drylands of Burkina Faso”. The project aims to strengthen efforts on LDN, while achieving improved land and rangeland management. A number of global environmental outcomes are expected to be achieved as a result of LDN interventions targeting land degradation and rangelands in the Centre-Nord region that currently experiences many internally displaced people.</p> <p>STAP is pleased with the robust LDN logic chain described in the PIF. The project aims to strengthen the enabling environment for LDN, and social processes (e.g. governance, institutional arrangements, gender-sensitive solutions) that are necessary to achieve durable global environmental benefits and a number of prerequisite co-benefits that contribute to the well-being of the population. On gender, STAP welcomes its comprehensive focus across the components. Understanding the roles of men and women, their attitudes, and behaviors, is necessary to develop context-appropriate responses to land degradation.</p> <p>Integrated land use planning is a central component of the project’s LDN logic chain. STAP welcomes this activity and encourages the project team to conduct a land potential assessment and stratification as part of integrated land use planning, particularly to design the neutrality mechanism. Counterbalancing losses and gains is a central</p>

	<p>feature of LDN. It also has significant potential to manage negative spillovers from policies or interventions (e.g. leakage from deforestation) – and, thus, contribute to durable global environmental outcomes. As the project is designed, the project team is then encouraged to rely on integrated land use planning to review the proposed interventions linked to the LDN response hierarchy in case adjustments need to be made, particularly in response to the moderate risks. Additionally, STAP suggests focusing the proposed socio-ecological analysis on drivers (in addition to pressures) of land degradation, so that interventions and outcomes are durable.</p> <p>STAP welcomes the plans for continuously monitoring the LDN metrics and core-indicators to generate learning. In a similar fashion, the project team is encouraged to test the assumptions identified in the PIF, and adjust the theory of change as necessary. Any new knowledge management and learning platform that is developed is encouraged to be inter-operable with the knowledge platforms already existing in the country and region. Additionally, STAP recommends applying its guidance on south-south knowledge exchange as the platform is established.</p> <p>Below STAP details further its guidance, and supports the project team in developing the project with the same rigor as it did the PIF.</p>	
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?	Yes, the object is well defined and relates to the problem analysis.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project’s objectives?	Yes.
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?	Yes, the outcomes encompass benefits related to land restoration and improved land management.

	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes, with good monitoring and learning.
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.
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
1. Project description. Briefly describe: 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, the problem is defined well. The analysis describes the main drivers of degradation as being drought (driven by climate change), conflict, market, and political shocks, coupled with economic inequality that exacerbates access, and control of, (land) resources. The PIF also described the lack of spatial planning, and maladaptive land management practices, as contributors to land degradation. The project context (e.g. demographics, literacy rate, health of population, economic data, political context) is also well described.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes, barriers and threats are described well, and were systemically identified using a systems analysis to develop the theory of change. STAP notes the logical framework of LDN (figure 1) needs to include the drivers of land degradation, rather than focusing on pressures only.
	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?	Non-applicable.
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Yes, the project includes a baseline narrative of relevant projects in the target area. A useful table listing the projects is included in the PIF, which describes how each project relates to this initiative.

		In addition, the project team is cognizant the project will contribute to a quantitative baseline of the LDN indicators.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Not yet.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Yes.
	For multiple focal area projects:	Non-applicable.
	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 outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	<p>STAP is pleased with the theory of change figure 4, which clearly represents the logic chain to achieve the project objective, and long-term impacts on LDN.</p> <p>The theory of change can be described as: The project seeks to enhance national frameworks for the application of LDN in the Centre-Nord region, while generating global environmental outcomes and reducing natural resource-induced conflict. Three outcomes will contribute to this objective: 1) policies, practices and capacities for LDN application are enhanced; 2) gender-sensitive responses to degradation are applied to achieve LDN; 3) key barriers for outcome #1 and #2 are addressed; and, 4) project impact is monitored and learning is scaled up. These outcomes will be supported by four components: 1) LDN land use planning and monitoring; 2) implementation of gender-sensitive LDN practices; 3) enhanced coordination and finance for LDN; and, 4) monitoring and evaluation and knowledge management for upscaling.</p>

		<p>When developing component 1, STAP suggests conducting a land potential assessment and stratification by land type. A land potential assessment is an important output needed for integrated land use planning, especially for the neutrality aspect – balancing losses with gains within the same land type and potential. Assessing the potential of the land is also essential considering the extent of degradation in the Centre-Nord (14% of land is degraded as mentioned in the PIF), which might limit the potential of LDN.</p> <p>The project team might wish to rely on two resources on integrated land use planning for LDN: 1) <u>UNCCD-SPI's paper on The Contribution of Integrated Land Use Planning and Integrated Landscape Management to Implementing Land Degradation Neutrality: Entry Points and Support Tools</u> ;and, 2) <u>LUP4LDN</u>, a tool that integrates LDN into land use planning.</p>
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	See above.
	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, the theory of change is well informed by a set of critical assumptions at the outcome level. STAP appreciates this analysis of assumptions and considers it critical to the logic chain.
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	<p>Yes, the PIF identifies assumptions which will need testing, or validation, that might trigger adaptation.</p> <p>Additionally, the project team mentions a number of drivers with the potential to continue exacerbating degradation – land-based conflict, increased population growth, in part due to internally displaced people, market and political shocks. Planning for seen and unforeseen, risks and shocks to the targeted socio-ecological systems will be necessary. A resilience assessment can be</p>

		conducted, and/or a simple scenario planning (please visit STAP's website for this forthcoming advice) that identifies one, or two, implementation pathway options.
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?	<p>STAP appreciates the comprehensive table describing the project's incremental reasoning for each component.</p> <p>There is good potential that incremental activities can deliver global environmental outcomes. In this regard, it will be important to pay close attention to the neutrality mechanism in integrated land use planning as counterbalancing losses with gains can help avoid, and manage indirect effects (e.g. leakage from deforestation or land use change) that put at risk the durability of global environmental outcomes.</p>
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	Non-applicable.
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, the global environmental benefits are focused on improving landscape management, generating benefits resulting from sustainable land management and rangelands (e.g. increased soil organic carbon), as well as improved water management, and reduced greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture, forestry and land use change.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	<p>The project team seems to have carefully thought through the project's feasibility in contributing to Burkina Faso's LDN targets. The project is expected to contribute to approximately 4.5% of the LDN targets, around 250,000 hectares under improved practices.</p> <p>Annex A provides helpful information in delineating the area of degraded land, type of degradation, and how much area of land restored the project is expected to achieve.</p>

		STAP appreciates that a more detailed assessment of the land degradation status will be done during the PPG. This step will be critical in informing the extent to which the land can recover, or resist further land degradation; hence, achieve LDN. The section on land potential assessment and stratification in <u>STAP's LDN guidelines</u> provides useful guidance.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Yes, the global environmental benefits are defined as so are co-benefits in climate, water, and biodiversity. In addition to these co-benefits, STAP suggests identifying those co-benefits which underpin the durability of global environmental benefits, and identifying metrics for tracking their progress. These co-benefits will likely be in the form of improved socio-economic well-being of herders and farmers, which might have an impact on reducing conflict in the area. Other co-benefits might include gender equality, improved governance, or institutional arrangements for rangelands. Refer to STAP's recent note on co-benefits soon to be posted on <u>STAP's website</u> .
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Yes, the core indicators will be used to monitor global environmental benefits, as well as the LDN indicators on land cover, land productivity, and soil organic carbon. The project will use GIS to assess land use type, the scale and type of land degradation, and analyze other parameters to carry out integrated land use planning to identify the appropriate LDN interventions – i.e. avoid, reduce, or reverse.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	The project's LDN approach will embed an analysis and design of interventions that focus on the resilience of agro-pastoralists.
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?	Yes, the project lists a number of soil and water conservation technologies that have been adapted to suit local land-users' needs. Suggest to the project team to monitor the application of these

		<p>technologies, and assess opportunities for supporting the scaling of these technologies. For example, is capacity building required to scale out further the technologies; what learning can be garnered in relation to how the technologies contribute to herders/farmers' resilience? to the project objective? durable outcomes?</p> <p>The project is also innovative in its application of LDN. The project has a clear vision of the LDN logic chain – i.e. the need to apply integrated land use planning (an innovation in itself) to identify the appropriate interventions based on the response hierarchy of avoid, reduce, reverse, to achieve durable global environmental outcomes. Suggest thorough monitoring of the LDN approach, testing and validating the critical assumptions underpinning the outcomes.</p>
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Partly. The PIF indicates plans to scale out (disseminate results to others, replicate), but not necessarily how the innovations might influence policies, regulations, or impact behavioral change (scale deep). <u>UNDP's scaling toolkit</u> might help the project team identify strategies on scaling.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	It is possible that both incremental and transformational change will be required due the degree of stressors and risks from climate change, increased pressure from population growth, and land-based conflict. STAP's future guidance on scenario planning (please visit <u>STAP's website</u> in the near future) may help the project team plan for future risks, known and unknown.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		A project map is included. Suggest refining map to depict project areas, land use type, and land degradation classification if possible.

<p>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.</p>	<p>Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?</p>	<p>Yes, stakeholders were consulted comprehensively. As the project is designed and implemented, the project team is encouraged to consider whether there are additional stakeholders it ought to involve – for example, are other stakeholders needed to scale a technology?</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>Table 7 provides comprehensive information on stakeholders and their roles.</p>
<p>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 gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? Yes/no/tbd. If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Yes. STAP is pleased how the project’s LDN approach is rooted on gender. Gender is embedded throughout the components, and it is clearly understood as a social construct influencing land users’ and herders’ needs, and decisions.</p> <p>A detailed gender analysis will be conducted during the PPG to help design the project, and strengthen the robustness of the logic chain.</p>

<p>project is expected to 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 /td</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>Please consider whether gender considerations hinder the full participation of an important stakeholder.</p>
<p>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</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?</p> <p>For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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? 	<p>Yes, the risks are valid and comprehensive in the safeguard annex. Suggest embedding the critical risks at outcome and output level in the theory of change so they are visible, and accessible to monitor and pursue the required adaptive management.</p>
<p>6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives</p>	<p>Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
	<p>Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Yes, especially in the baseline section of the PIF – e.g. tables 1 and 2.
	How have these lessons informed the project’s formulation?	Yes, see table 1 and 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?	Component 4 on monitoring, evaluation and knowledge management is to an extent a mechanism to capture lessons learned. In addition to component 4, the project team is encouraged to use the theory of change as a tool for managing knowledge, and learning.
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?	The knowledge management plan will focus on adaptive management through monitoring and evaluation, exchanging lessons and information in the project areas, and producing outreach outputs.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	The project intends to share results and lessons via platforms, knowledge exchange forums in the region, and through outputs.

Notes

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
<p>1. Concur</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 <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></p>
<p>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</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>

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.