**STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE**

| | |
|---|---|
| **GEF ID** | **11489** |
| **Project title** | **Sustainable Land Management and improved Community Resilience in Dryland areas and livestock migratory hotspots of Tanzania** |
| **Date of screen** | **June 10, 2024** |
| **STAP Panel Member** | **Graciela Metternicht** |
| **STAP Secretariat** | **Guadalupe Duron** |

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

STAP acknowledges Tanzania's LDCF project "Sustainable Land Management and Improved Community Resilience in Dryland Areas and Livestock Migratory Hotspots of Tanzania". STAP expresses uncertainty about the project's ability to effectively enhance the use and effectiveness of climate information for sustainable land management and diversification of economic activities.

The theory of change is based on key assumptions that lack definition or elaboration of how they will be validated. These assumptions include strengthening farmers' and herders' access to markets and loans to incentivize improved land management and deter migration. STAP also recommends that the socioecological systems are clearly defined and summarised (within the known target sites) so that the project can be designed based on the traditional values and norms of pastoralists and farmers.

Additionally, the project could consider embedding actions into ongoing government initiatives that focus on improved land security, and customary rights. These initiatives include Village Land Use Planning (VLUP) processes, or Tanzania's Land Act and Village Land Act that recognize customary rights. Without supporting customary arrangements, the project could potentially undermine traditional climate adaptation strategies and knowledge, failing to consider the voices of women and local communities.

Below, STAP provides its advice.

*Note to STAP screeners: a summary of STAP's view of the project (not of the project itself), covering both strengths and weaknesses.*

**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?

See annex on STAP's screening guidelines.

The project rationale articulates well the problem associated with people's vulnerability to climate change, resulting from land degradation and unsustainable livestock practices. The proponents did a good job of explaining why tackling these problems matter in the context of reducing vulnerability to climate change, while improving livestock management. The problem description demonstrates the beginnings of a systems analysis, connecting key drivers of change - such as climate change, demographic shifts of nomadic herders and livestock, conflicts between herders and farmers - to an increase in degradation and vulnerability to climate change. To

demonstrate the changes in demographic shifts of nomadic herders, STAP highly appreciates the map on page 12, showing migration patterns and changes to livestock population.

In terms of an adaptation rationale, the project is clear that climate change is having an adverse effect on the targeted populations, and that these climate trends (e.g., increased temperature and decreased precipitation) will continue to negatively impact people. Although the targeted areas are briefly mentioned in the project justification section (before the rationale), STAP expects for the socioecological descriptions to be more fully articulated when the project is developed. It is also evident that livestock herders are starting to adapt by migrating from Nothern semi-arid regions to the South, due to extreme drought and lack of infrastructure for food storage. Further articulating these locally-based adaptations will help to design interventions that build on these efforts.

STAP is uncertain whether the proposed activities (i.e., strengthened national capacity for sustainable land management; improved sustainable land management; and knowledge management) would support achieving the desired change – that is, community resilience and sustainable land management. As currently presented, the outputs appear to be sub-activities, and the logic between the components is based on deep assumptions such as increased incomes and sustainable land management will result as a consequence of participation in value chains and blended finance. There are several uncertain outcomes related with this logic, especially as climate stressors and risks will impact livestock management, herders and communities capacities to adapt to climate change . It will be necessary to revisit, therefore, the theory of change during the project design to ensure assumptions are identified, and check the overall logic is necessary and sufficient to achieve the project objective.

As reiterated above, a necessary step to a robust logic will be to define the socioecological systems in each target area. This description will reveal what are the needs and what is important to each of the systems; thus, help develop interventions that help maintain the resilience of these socioecological systems. For example, many of the proposed activities assume that land and water resources will sustain livestock and crops and deal with demographic shifts that possibly place greater pressure on resources in the near to long-term. Accounting for opportunities and challenges arising from climate and non-climate risks and stressors associated with the foreseeable future, therefore, will be necessary.

*Note: provide a general appraisal, asking whether relevant screening guideline questions have been addressed adequately – not all the questions will be relevant to all proposals; no need to comment on every question, only those needing more attention, noting any done very well, but ensure that all are considered. Comments should be helpful, evaluative, and qualitative, rather than yes/no.*

**3. Specific points to be addressed, and suggestions**

When developing the project, STAP recommends addressing the following points:

1. The theory of change narrative describes how people are already adapting to climate change, and explains how the proposed project aims to build on current adaptation efforts. These efforts include strengthening policy frameworks and regulations, which is appropriate. STAP recommends applying policy cycle activities described at length in STAP's Policy Coherence Advisory Document (page 10). Not all activities may be needed by the project. However, collectively, the steps provide a framework for considering how LDCF interventions could help drive action on policy coherence – which is ultimately the purpose of outcome 1.1.

2. Within the context of strengthening the policy and regulatory framework, the project also aims to strengthen land tenure security through integrated land use planning. To properly include land tenure in an integrated land use planning approach, STAP strongly recommends including an assessment of the targeted socioecological systems, which is currently missing. This includes describing the local

institutional and customary arrangements of nomadic herders. Project developers can usefully apply FAO's Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure to component 1, specifically, and more broadly throughout the project to ensure place-based governance arrangements are not undermined. Another resource that can help with the design of integrated land use planning and governance includes "The contribution of integrated land use planning and integrated landscape management to implementing Land Degradation Neutrality: Entry points and support tools".

3. For the implementation of Component #, Output 1.2, it is suggested to work with regional platforms for Earth Observation and Spatial analysis, such as Digital Earth Africa (DEA). These platforms have established architectures that enable offering products to users under the concept of 'analysis ready data' (ARD). ARD is a concept that has demonstrated better rates of information uptake by non-experts worldwide. DEA is currently working in Tanzania, for example monitoring drought in Lake Sulunga as part of an early warning system). https://www.digitalearthafrica.org/why-digital-earth-africa/impact-stories/using-satellite-data-combat-drought-monitoring-lake-sulunga. Collaborative work with existing open access platforms such as DEA ensures the durability of the project outcomes, and it is an effort that connects to the aspirations of component #3 (particularly output 3.2.2) and helps in planning and prioritizing implementation of component 2.

4. Through component 2, the project aims to strengthen herders' and farmers' connections to markets with the understanding that doing so will lead to higher incomes and a greater adoption of sustainable land and livestock management. For these activities to be effective, several key assumptions (e.g., herders' and farmers' norms and values are in alignment with the proposed activities; and if not, they are willing to change their mindsets) will need to be explicitly identified in the theory of change and validated. STAP's theory of change primer is a useful resource for developing a systems-based logic, while STAP's Achieving transformation through GEF investments is a valuable resource to consider when thinking about categories of metrics for monitoring and assessing changes of values and norms, which are important for scaling. Additionally, STAP's note on alternative livelihoods may help inform component 2.

5. Besides assuming that herders and farmers will do the necessary to change their practices (some of which are probably deeply linked to their societal and individual values), there are multiple assumptions associated with private sector engagement or the use of blended finance, in outcome 2 on community resilience. For example, there is a strong assumption that climate change will not lead to a decline of agricultural productivity or negatively affect pastures. Plus, an assumption exists that herders and farmers generate sufficient income from crop production to satisfy their livelihood needs and pay back loans (output 2.2.4)). As currently written the significant assumption is that private sector engagement and blended finance will lead to positive outcomes that will reduce migrations. STAP strongly recommends, therefore, identifying the key assumptions and testing them in a way that generates rapid learning so that the project can adjust as necessary and avoid failures. Refer to STAP's blended finance note for a further understanding of the key issues STAP recommends taking note of in the design of blended finance interventions.

6. The project aims to strengthen climate-smart technologies, including for improving water availability and storage through infrastructure. As previously stated, designing the project by accounting for the needs and values of the project beneficiaries is important to the project's durability. This point is supported by current research that highlights how small water infrastructures in drylands can affect, possibly even negatively, the climate resilience of herders and agro-pastoralists as it can erode their traditional adaptation strategies, such as migration.

7. Furthermore, the PPG phase will benefit from a thorough desktop review on barriers to technology uptake, and on lessons learned from the implementation of similar projects in Tanzania and the region that need to deal with land tenure and land access, and the potential conflict between pastoralists and

farmers related to land tenure, and the scarcity of pasture and water during dry spells (highlighted as a moderate risk in this PIF).

8. To plan for the future, STAP recommends developing simple narratives describing the trends that characterize the interactions between the key drivers (e.g., climate change, market changes, conflict, population changes). These narratives should be built-in to the theory of change to ensure the logic is sufficient and necessary to achieve the proposed outcomes. Two resources that STAP highly recommends for the project developers to draw from for the development of future narratives are STAP's "Exploratory Future Narratives Primer" and the World Bank's Resilience Methodology.

9. Project developers are encouraged to embed sustainable land management practices within integrated land use planning – a comprehensive integrated approach that accounts for cross-governance, strong collaborative processs, policy coherence, among other elements. Refer to "The Contribution of Integrated Land Use Planning and Integrated Landscape Management to Implementing Land Degradation Neutrality" for further information on integrated land use planning.

*Note: number key points clearly and provide useful information or suggestions, including key literature where relevant. Completed screens should be no more than two or three pages in length.*

**ANNEX: STAP'S SCREENING GUIDELINES**

## Project rationale

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.)