

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10099
Project Title	Landscape restoration for increase resilience in urban and peri-urban areas of Bujumbura
Date of Screening	November 27, 2020
STAP member screener	Ed Carr
STAP secretariat screener	Guadalupe Duron
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Minor issues to be considered during project design.</p> <p>STAP welcomes UNDP’s project “Landscape restoration for increase resilience in urban and peri-urban areas of Bujumbura”. The project seeks to strengthen the climate resilience of communities in Bujumbura and in the Ntahangwa watershed to floods, and landslides. STAP welcomes the theory of change provided by UNDP. It demonstrates the expected causal relationships across the components, and defines the barriers and assumptions. STAP looks forward to the theory of change being a valuable tool to the project developers as they design and implement the project.</p> <p>STAP is also pleased with the project’s focus on climate and hydrological modelling training to assist with resilience planning in the target sites. As this intervention is developed, STAP urges the project team to embed social determinants, such as culture, gender, values, among other factors, into the design of the intervention. Consideration in project design of social structures is essential in determining the usability of climate data and information.</p> <p>Additionally, STAP recommends for the project developers to consider biochar production to reduce the negative consequences from charcoal. Biochar is known to contribute to sustainable soils, and use feedstocks other than wood for its production. Guidance from a GEF-UNEP project on biochar production is provided further below.</p>

	<p>Lastly, as the project objective states, Bujumbura and Ntahangwa watershed are prone to an increased frequency of floods, torrential storms, and landslides. STAP recommends building one, or two simple scenarios into the theory of change to plan for plausible futures. Developing more than one trajectory to meet the objective will assist the project plan for ensuring its impacts endure long-term changes.</p> <p>Below, STAP offers recommendations on how to improve the project design.</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 objective is defined clearly.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes, the activities support the project objective.
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 focus on climate adaptation.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes, potentially. The benefits are likely to be generated with a good theory of change, and careful monitoring of interventions.
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?	Potentially. As mentioned above, it will be important to define a good theory of change, along with the assumptions that underlie the outcomes. Robust monitoring evaluation and learning also will be needed.
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	Is the problem statement well-defined?	Yes, the problem and its context are well defined. Increased temperatures, floods, storms, and landslides are increasing in Burundi. The country's socio-political instability, poverty, and unstable population movements within the country further exacerbate the country's environmental and social

need to be addressed (systems description)		challenges. Bujumbura faces increased soil erosion risks, and flooding. COVID-19 also has affected Bujumbura's residents and their livelihoods.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes, the barriers are described. STAP is pleased to see the barriers have been mapped in the theory of change. If there are enablers of change, these also should be identified in the theory of change.
	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 PIF includes a narrative baseline describing projects in the project sites on poverty and climate resilience, landscape restoration, value chain development, Lake Tanganyika management, among other initiatives.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Yes, possibly. In addition to the LDCF results based indicators, suggest identifying environmental and social indicators to monitor sustainable land management, and climate resilient livelihoods.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Yes, the baseline is sufficiently robust at this stage. However, recommend identifying environmental and social indicators that complement the LDCF's indicators, and which track progress towards achieving climate resilient livelihoods in the Ntahangwa watershed.
	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;	Non-applicable.
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	Partly. Lessons are described for some projects, which will be used for the design of this initiative. Suggest describing lessons for all projects, including lessons on scaling.
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	See above.

<p>3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project</p>	<p>What is the theory of change?</p>	<p>A preliminary theory of change narrative is:</p> <p>“The project aims to increase resilience of watershed communities in and around Bujumbura through a resilient integrated watershed management for landscape restoration and flood management”. This will be achieved through three main components: i) develop technical capacities for climate-induced flood and erosion risks mapping and their use to inform climate-resilient integrated watershed management and other planning processes; ii) implement landscape restoration and flood management approaches to restore ecosystem services against flood and erosion in the Ntakangwa watershed in and around Bujumbura; and, iii) increase resilience of the urban, peri-urban and rural communities in the Ntakangwa watershed through value chains. Knowledge management will be promoted as cross-cutting activities in each of the components to ensure that lessons learned and best practices in resilient integrated watershed management, flood management, land restoration and erosion control, green entrepreneurship are collected and disseminated to inform the upscaling of these interventions in other watersheds in Burundi.”</p>
	<p>What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?</p>	<p>See above. STAP welcomes the theory of change diagram, which demonstrates the logic between the various activities, the assumptions, and barriers to change. In the project document, STAP suggests writing a theory of change narrative that describes the project context, the logic depicted in the diagram (description of problem and project objective, and a description of the causal connections between outcomes-outputs- activities), and the indicators to measure and monitor success. Refer to STAP’s theory of change primer for</p>

		guidance: https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer
	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?	Partly. The theory of change diagram lists assumptions influencing reaching the project objective. For strategic project planning, STAP recommends identifying and validating the assumptions for each outcome in the theory of change, adjusting the causal pathway as 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?	No. STAP recommends for the project team to think about the drivers of change, including long-term changes (e.g. demographic changes, market fluctuations, COVID-19), and what response measures may be needed. This process entails having stakeholders think through one, or two simple scenarios for possible futures that focus on different change trajectories based on key shocks, stresses, and risks to the project. Refer to STAP’s theory of change primer (table 2) and RAPTA for guidance on developing pathways, and more than one scenario: https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer https://www.stapgef.org/rapta-guidelines
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?	
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	Yes, with careful monitoring of the theory of change, and identification of several causal pathways that are necessary and sufficient to reach the project objective and address long-term changes, such as demographic changes and climate stressors

<p>6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)</p>	<p>Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits, and are they measurable?</p>	<p>Yes, the adaptation benefits are articulated clearly.</p> <p>During the project design, STAP recommends addressing the following issues:</p> <p>Component 1, as currently written, assumes that stakeholders will use the climate data and information for developing and implementing climate resilient plans. STAP suggests considering the factors that will enable stakeholders to use the climate modelling knowledge, which they will be trained on. These enabling conditions include supportive institutions, building agency while capacity is being built, and remaining cognizant of the various social structures (e.g. gender, culture, norms, values) that influence how individuals may process and use the climate information and data. The project team may find the following paper on the use of climate information useful: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crm.2020.100242</p> <p>For component 2, careful attention should be paid to indicators that can monitor and evaluate how ecosystem-based adaptation is contributing to the outcomes. The project also should consider what are the barriers, or enablers to implementing an ecosystem-based approach. For land restoration activities, the project team should consider a land potential assessment during the project planning. The assessment will gauge the capacity of the land to rehabilitate and generate ecosystem services. Refer to STAP's LDN guidelines and to UNCCD's Scientific Conceptual Framework on LDN: https://www.stagef.org/guidelines-land-degradation-neutrality https://www.unccd.int/sites/default/files/documents/2019-06/LDN_CF_report_web-english.pdf</p> <p>Additionally, suggest embedding the social structures recommended for component 1 in</p>
---	---	---

		<p>component 2. Uptake of flood risk management strategies will depend on factors that influence human behavior. For example, communities will perceive risk and remember a flooding event based on a series of social factors (e.g. age, culture, among others). Refer to the risk framework that includes behavior factors in this paper for further guidance: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0085-1</p> <p>In component 3, STAP recommends the use of charcoal for biochar production. Biochar is known to contribute to sustainable soils, and it can be produced using animal manure, among other feedstock sources. Therefore, biochar has the potential to generate multiple ecosystem services. For further guidance on biochar production, refer to the guides developed by a GEF-UNEP project: https://biochar.international/</p>
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Possibly. Recommend elaborating further the theory of change by identifying the assumptions, including for scaling, and other long-term changes that are likely to impact the project, such as demographic changes due to conflict.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Yes, the adaptation benefits are defined.
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Partly. The PIF suggests that ecosystem-based adaptation approaches will be used to plan for flood risk management. Recommend describing other methods that may be used (e.g. disaster risk reduction), as well as assigning indicators to ecosystem-based adaptation.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	The project will focus on flood risk management, land restoration and other land management activities to address soil erosion and generate ecosystem services.

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 PIF suggests that applying ecosystem-based approaches for climate resilience, and for establishing green value chains, are innovations.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	No, the PIF does not describe a vision of how the innovation will be scaled. There is an assumption that ecosystem-based adaptation will successfully address flood risks, and that land restoration, or rehabilitation, will help address soil erosion and other drivers of land degradation. Suggest identifying the assumptions (inclusive of barriers and risks) for each outcome in the theory of change. The barriers, and enablers of, scaling also should be identified. Additionally, recommend defining the important behavior assumptions required to achieve component 1 and component 2 outcomes. Refer to STAP’s primer on theory of change: https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	It is likely that incremental adaptation, and, or, transformational change may be needed due to climate stressors (e.g. increased frequency and intensity of flooding in the project area), other long term changes (e.g. internally displaced people as a result of torrential storms and flooding), and from shocks, such as COVID-19. Suggest developing several pathways to reach the project goal, testing their assumptions, and asking which pathway will be necessary and sufficient to address long-term changes resulting from the stressors, shocks, and risks identified by stakeholders. Refer to STAP’s primer theory of change, and RAPTA: https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer https://www.stapgef.org/rapta-guidelines
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project		STAP recommends strengthening the geo-referencing information in the project document, such as coordinates. Refer to STAP’s guidance on maps in its Earth Observation document – see page

<p>interventions will take place.</p>		<p>A1-1. STAP guidance can be found at: https://www.stapgef.org/earth-observation-and-gef</p>
<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>The key stakeholders have been identified. Suggest reflecting whether there are other stakeholders that need to be involved during the project development, and implementation.</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>Suggest elaborating further on stakeholders' roles, particularly at the outcome level. Additionally, suggest assessing whether all the key stakeholders have been identified during the PPG stage, and amend stakeholder plans as needed. Recommend using STAP's guidance on Multi-stakeholder engagement for transformational change", focused on establishing stakeholder engagement processes to achieve long-term drivers thru scaling and transformative change. Refer to: https://www.stapgef.org/multi-stakeholder-dialogue</p>
<p>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>No. A gender analysis and plan will be developed once the PIF is approved. Recommend mainstreaming gender across the three components.</p>

<p>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.</p> <p>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.</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>Unclear. Suggest considering whether gender considerations hinder the full participation of an important stakeholder group during the gender analysis.</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? 	<p>The PIF describes a series of risks to the project, including: low commitment from communities and government authorities; political instability; market disruptions; flood structures do not withstand climate change, and others. STAP recommends for these risks to be defined in the theory of change so they are explicitly dealt with and managed. Not acknowledging the risks will undermine the causal logic of the interventions, and their impact in the long-term.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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? 	For climate change, STAP recommends taking into account the questions to the left, and relying on its climate risk screening guidance: https://www.stapgef.org/stap-guidance-climate-risk-screening
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?	Yes, the project will build on the knowledge of other LDCF projects.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes, there is recognition of how learning from previous projects will feed into this initiative. Further elaboration on learning would be welcome by STAP.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	See above.
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	It is unclear how learning from previous projects was imbedded in this project. Suggest describing this learning process.
	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?	Unclear. The PIF does not describe a monitoring system. The theory of change could assist in monitoring and evaluating progress if indicators of success were identified.
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 PIF plans to manage knowledge and learning through the project implementation reviews, and mid-term review. Recommend describing a monitoring, evaluation, and learning system either as a separate component or as part of the knowledge management strategy. Additionally, recommend linking the theory of change to this monitoring system as both will be needed to manage knowledge and learning.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	The project plans to create a website to disseminate knowledge products. Community gatherings also will be used as a medium to disseminate lessons learned and best practices. Suggest linking to regional platforms on land restoration, and other

		climate resilience, or environmental platforms, in the area.
--	--	--

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 <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>
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.

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