

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10723
Project Title	Regeneration of Livelihoods and Landscapes (GEF-ROLL) Project
Date of Screening	November 29, 2020
STAP member screener	Graciela Metternicht
STAP secretariat screener	Guadalupe Duron
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Minor issues to be considered during project design. STAP has identified specific scientific and technical suggestions and welcomes the opportunities to discuss with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief.</p> <p>STAP acknowledges IFAD’s project “Regeneration of Livelihoods and Landscapes (GEF-ROLL) Project” that will be fully blended into a larger ROLL project that includes substantial funding from IFAD, OFID and the Government of Lesotho. STAP welcomes this good practice of leveraging funds from donors, seeking GEF funding to develop components of ROLL linked to GEBs, and to the development of local level interventions aimed at achieving LDN, strongly directed by local councils, and in close collaboration with traditional authorities (Principal and Area Chiefs) in five targeted landscapes (already defined).</p> <p>The larger ROLL project seeks to improve sustainable land management and strengthen communities’ resilience to climate change. The initiative also will contribute to Lesotho’s Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) targets by focusing efforts on restoring shrublands, grasslands, croplands, and rangelands.</p> <p>LDN plays a central role in the outcomes and vision of regenerated landscapes and livelihoods, and therefore STAP strongly encourages the project team to couple the graduation model with the Scientific Conceptual</p>

Framework for LDN. In doing so, the team will be able to identify the appropriate interventions required to reduce/reverse land degradation in the target sites; and proactively work with ground interventions that avoid further degradation of healthy landscapes while ensuring food security and livelihood of the landholders. The LDN SCF enables holistic, landscape approach thinking about approaches that are most suitable – rehabilitation, or restoration. STAP’s LDN guidelines and UNCCD’s Scientific Conceptual Framework on LDN offer guidance on the latter, and on elementary assessments (e.g. land potential and ecosystem resilience, integration with national and/or local land use planning, design of indicators) that should guide design of LDN interventions (based on participatory approaches).

STAP welcomes the project’s focus on behavioral change, and it recommends it be included in a revised version of the project Theory of Change, given the ‘high risk’ identified around low community participation and failure to adopt improved practices. As the project is designed, STAP recommends relying on social science to understand, and embed, the impact of social structures (e.g. culture, norms, values, agency, power dynamics, among others) on stakeholders’ decisions and actions; and to achieve the much needed transformational change this project envisages. STAP’s forthcoming advice on how to design project interventions that tackle behavior change will be useful in this regard.

STAP commends IFAD’s efforts to develop a theory of change, and it recommends the ToC be revised and strengthened to include identifying assumptions for each outcome. It also will be important to think about plausible future scenarios to deal with long-term changes, such as climate change and possibly other long-term drivers (e.g. changes in population; more infrastructure of hydropower dams; among other). Tackling these drivers, rather than the pressures of environmental degradation, is the only way to achieve transformational change that is sustainable.

	<p>Given the complex financial arrangements of ROLL and GEF-ROLL and the inter-dependences with other current non-GEF projects, STAP strongly recommends the establishment of a Project Scientific and Technical Steering Committee, that includes representatives of projects whose outputs are key input for this project; and that also include relevant national stakeholders and the Ministry of Education and Training.</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, and consistently linked to the problem statement.
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 global environmental outcomes.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	<p>Yes, potentially. The benefits are likely to be generated with a good theory of change, and careful monitoring of interventions. STAP recommends the linking of GEBs to drivers of environmental degradation in the country (e.g. new infrastructure such as hydropower, increased impacts of climate change) and to revise whether the said GEBs would be achieved when these drivers and their impacts are considered.</p> <p>STAP advises GEF-ROLL GEBs be differentiated from the larger ROLL benefits. The indicators of GEB to be achieved as reported in the PIF appear more related to the larger ROLL project, and that could cause an over-estimation of the GEBs the financing of GEF will deliver.</p>

<p>Outputs</p>	<p>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?</p>	<p>Yes, the outputs are likely to contribute to the outcomes. However, it will be important to define a good theory of change, the assumptions that underlie the outcomes, and put in place a robust monitoring system.</p> <p>As already stated, STAP strongly recommends to couple the proposed graduation model with the scientific conceptual framework of LDN, which includes participatory spatial land use planning, preparatory assessments that consider resilience of ecosystems and people, and a suite of approaches that facilitate mapping the enabling environment of the targeted landscapes.</p> <p>STAP reiterates the inclusion of Universities, polytechnics and the ministry of education and training to ensure the delivery of outputs related to component #3. Evidence exist from other interventions that reliance on private providers may not be durable over time.</p> <p>Many outputs of this project are heavily dependent on the EU funded project; coordination and cooperation through a project steering committee will be essential to ensure timely delivery of inputs that will feed into the GEF ROLL.</p>
<p>Part II: Project justification</p>	<p>A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.</p>	<p>GEF-ROLL aims to transform rural communities landscapes and livelihoods by adopting sustainable management practices through (i) Labour-based schemes and physical infrastructure development aimed at relieving immediate pressure in catchments experiencing high levels of poverty and land degradation (ii) Business development support for off-farm income-generating activities partially facilitated through existing projects. The ToC shows how the GEF-ROLL interventions in these areas lead to the project's goal which is: 'Regeneration of landscapes and livelihoods', leading to enhanced flow of agro-ecosystem goods and services, climate change resilience and household income diversification.'</p>

		<p>STAP encourages innovative thinking to be expressed in the ToC for fostering the adoption of SLM through business development (e.g. the project mentions PES, ‘what market needs to exist for this scheme to succeed, who needs to be involved, who benefits, etc). In this regard recent scientific literature (like Baumber, A. and Metternicht, G., 2020. Using Market-Based Instruments to Enhance Climate Resilience. The Palgrave Handbook of Climate Resilient Societies, pp.1-27 and Baumber, A., Berry, E. and Metternicht, G., 2019. Synergies between Land Degradation Neutrality goals and existing market-based instruments. Environmental Science & Policy, 94, pp.174-181) can provide ideas for the project team.</p>
<p>1. Project description. Briefly describe: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)</p>	<p>Is the problem statement well-defined?</p>	<p>Yes, the problem and its context are well defined. The root causes of the problems are overstocking which has led to overgrazing; declining soil fertility due to inappropriate land management practices; and climate change. If precipitation and temperature data is available for the project site, add this information to the project document.</p> <p>STAP wishes to note research (not mentioned in this PIF) on drivers of land use change in Lesotho, to be “drought and lack of water, land mismanagement, HIV/AIDS and ‘dependency syndrome’. These were acting together or in parallel with other factors such as changes in infrastructure and accessibility, increasing economic unattractiveness of agriculture and impacts of HIV/AIDS-related morbidity and mortality on labour availability and household socio-economic conditions, to cause land use changes. Perceptions of land users and managers on the biophysical environment and climatic constraints were additional central underlying factors driving land use change. Institutional factors were found to have a central role in</p>

		influencing land use decisions” (University of Brussels) . STAP encourages the team to pay attention to the aforementioned behavioral/social/cultural issues as driver of change, and hence as entry points to design interventions that achieve ‘transformational’ change for landscape regeneration and livelihoods.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Partly. STAP recommends elaborating on the barriers in the project document. At the moment, the barriers are described briefly and lack valuable details on how the barriers influence the desired change (e.g. how are the capacities weak to enforce regulations and policies? In what manner is there a weak capacity to implement cross-sectoral coordination?) It will be important to build-in the barriers and threats (e.g. climate change risks) in a theory of change to ensure the interventions are feasible. Additionally, consider enablers of, or opportunities for change. This includes opportunities, or motivations, for enabling actions that improve landscape management.
	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 on-going and future initiatives primarily in climate smart agriculture, integrated catchment management, agricultural production, livestock management and climate change. A good description is also provided on the ROLL project.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project’s benefits?	Somewhat. As said earlier, the GEF core indicators need to be mapped against the outputs that will result from GEF-ROLL, not ROLL. In addition, STAP suggest identifying environmental and social indicators to monitor sustainable land

		management, and climate resilient livelihoods. For the environmental indicators suggest focusing on the three UNCCD LDN indicators: land cover (physical land cover class), land productivity (net primary productivity, NPP) and carbon stocks (soil organic carbon (SOC) stocks), and to follow LDN guidance on the design of local indicators associated to ecosystem services that are relevant in the targeted landscapes.
	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 (when developing the theory of change) that complement the GEF's core indicators, and which track progress towards achieving sustainable landscape management and climate resilience.
	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	<p>Partly. Ongoing and past initiatives are listed in the baseline and coordination sections, but lessons are not described. Suggest elaborating on the (emerging) lessons – including lessons on scaling - , and how they will contribute to ROLL-GEF.</p> <p>STAP recommends the PPG includes a search of GEF database that have worked with ‘similar problems’ (e.g. the GEF funded PRAGA project of IUCN-FAO has developed an approach for landholders to assess the health of their land, this is highly relevant to his project). STAP also encourages the team to search for good practice of PES and ‘cash transfer’ in exchange for caring for nature (e.g. the Bolsa Floresta programme of Brazil), the LDN interventions in Brazil. Good practice of using the concept of learned watershed , implemented in Ethiopia in landscapes similar to the ones of Lesotho are examples of</p>

		knowledge transfer that can be highly effective for this project.
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	See above.
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	<p>A preliminary theory of change narrative is: “</p> <p>The ROLL-GEF resources will focus on sustainable management of the natural resource base, particularly in ecosystem hotspots and development of monitoring tools and procedures to enable measurement of biophysical and socio-economic change and effectively share lessons learned and project successes. The project will also mainstream sustainable landscape management, and contribute to Lesotho’s LDN targets. These actions will be achieved through three interlinked components: i) enhanced capacity in integrated landscape management; ii) landscape restoration; and iii) knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation.</p>
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	<p>See above. Suggest elaborating further the theory of change narrative in the project document. Additionally, STAP recommends including a theory of change diagram. Refer to STAP’s theory of change primer for guidance: https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer</p>
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project’s objectives?	<p>See above. Suggest elaborating further the theory of change in the project document. Additionally, STAP recommends including a theory of change diagram. Refer to STAP’s theory of change primer for guidance: https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer</p>
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	<p>No. In the theory of change narrative and diagram, STAP recommends defining the assumptions that need to be validated to meet each outcome.</p>

		Currently, four broad assumptions are listed in the PIF.
	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 drivers (e.g. market changes, effects of climate change), 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. For example, Lesotho is projected to experience more intense and frequent periods of drought. What alternative pathways may be required for the outcomes to endure impacts from long-lasting change, such as climate? Other external drivers may also be important, such as market and population changes. Refer to STAP's theory of change primer (table 2) and RAPTA for guidance on developing pathways, and more than one scenario: https://www.stagef.org/theory-change-primer https://www.stagef.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?	Yes, with a good theory of change, careful monitoring, and identification of several causal pathways that are necessary and sufficient to reach the project objective.
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	Not 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 articulated clearly. Indicators will be provided in the final project document. During the project design, STAP recommends addressing the following issues:

		<p>In component 1, STAP recommends identifying the assumptions related to: i) achieving an enhanced enabling environment and capacity for landscape management; and ii) improved collaborative landscape management and land restoration. As this component currently reads, there are several important assumptions related to shifts in behavior of policy makers, local community leaders, and natural resource users to motivate them to apply the technical guidelines, land use mapping, and other strategies aimed to strengthen sustainable land management. STAP recommends developing a theory of change, and making these assumptions, barriers, and risks, explicit in the diagram and narrative. Strategies for changing behavior should also be made explicit in the theory of change. Some of these strategies are identified in component 2 (e.g. performance-based incentives), and should be linked to the outcomes in component 1.</p> <p>In component 2, the same applies – i.e. identifying the assumptions, the risks, barriers and enablers of behavior change in the causal pathway, so they can be validated, and addressed. This includes identifying what behaviors need to change, what strategies will be used to address this shift in behavior, and describing how change will be achieved through shifts in behavior. Guidance on applying behavior change strategies includes the “Behavioural Problem/Solutions Matrix”: http://www.ijdesign.org/index.php/IJDesign/article/view/3952 STAP also recommends describing the social structures (e.g. values, norms, culture, agency, power dynamics, among other) that will guide stakeholders’ shifts in behavior.</p> <p>For developing restoration activities under component 2, STAP recommends considering a range of factors to assess whether restoration or</p>
--	--	--

		<p>rehabilitation is most appropriate. These factors include: conducting a land potential assessment, assessing the baseline condition of the land, identifying the proposed uses and ecosystem values, and assessing the resilience of the targeted system. Guidance on how to gauge appropriate responses for land degradation, restore or rehabilitate, along with land potential guidance, is available in STAP's LDN guidelines and UNCCD's Scientific Conceptual Framework on LDN: https://www.stagef.org/guidelines-land-degradation-neutrality</p> <p>In addition to monitoring and evaluating progress, and generating knowledge, component 3 should also look to foster reflection and innovation for scaling and transformational change. Refer to STAP's primer (table 2) for guidance on addressing barriers and enablers of change, including scaling, and for guidance on learning. Also, the theory of change for this project should be linked to the monitoring system described in component 3.</p>
	<p>Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?</p>	<p>Possibly. Recommend elaborating further the theory of change with various causal pathways to encourage adaptability to change, including long-term drivers, such as drought. More frequent and intense droughts are expected to increase in Lesotho. Refer to the World Bank's Climate Change Knowledge Portal for climate change trends in Lesotho: https://climateknowledgeportal.worldbank.org/country/lesotho/vulnerability</p> <p>The idea of the Fund is to be commended, and the team is encouraged to think innovatively on how to replenish this fund with cooperation from the</p>

		private sector. In this regard STAP recommends the team to look for experiences around biodiversity offset schemes such as the Australian Biodiversity Conservation trust . These schemes may be adapted to Lesotho in view of the environmental degradation that infrastructure causes.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Yes, the global environmental 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?	Yes, indicators are provided to measure progress. STAP is pleased to see that the UNCCD's land-based indicators will be used: land cover (assessed as land cover change), land productivity (assessed as NPP) and carbon stocks (assessed as SOC). STAP encourages the project team to rely on local monitoring systems to measure and report on these indicators. Additionally, the project developers should identify indicators of success for each outcome in the theory of change. Suggest also describing the methodologies that will be used to measure the indicators.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	The project's landscape interventions will focus on climate-smart approaches. Also, surveys will be applied in the target sites to become knowledgeable about the communities' vulnerabilities to climate change. This information will inform the project implementation.
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, in what regards the use of GEF funds to leverage larger funding from IFAD and other donors. Other elements of innovation include the project will focus on integrated approaches – across environmental sectors and scales (policymakers to land users) – to achieve sustainable landscape management and generate benefits in carbon sequestration, improved land cover, and ecosystems. STAP recognizes that there is room for innovation and transferring learnings and experiences (south-south cooperation) from other projects (GEF and Non-GEF) in related to

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) New methods of finance (e.g. see comments on a possibility for replenishment of the Fund) b) New forms of monitoring: Incorporate Earth Observation and GIS technologies for prioritization, baseline assessments, monitoring. See https://www.stapgef.org/earth-observation-and-gef for examples c) New business models (e.g. consider PPP and the use of market based instruments - PES is mentioned, though it lacks elaboration), d) in the monitoring (through identifying locally relevant indicators for LDN progress and improvement in conservation of biodiversity). e) Coupling the graduation model with the scientific conceptual for LDN. <p>The project presents potential for scaling up, barriers described are addressed and if ‘scaling deep’ (behavioral change respectful of cultural and social context) is pursued in the implementation of this project.</p>
	<p>Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?</p>	<p>Partially. There is an assumption that strengthening capacity on land use planning through incentives, performance-based schemes, and other behavior change nudges will lead to innovation and scaling.</p> <p>Recommend defining the important behavior assumptions required to achieve component 1 and component 2 outcomes. Additionally, STAP recommends relying on the theory of change, and its monitoring, to identifying opportunities for scaling and transformative change. The theory of change also should be used to address barriers, and enablers, of scaling. Refer to STAP’s primer on</p>

		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 drought), other long term drivers (market fluctuations), 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 climate, COVID-19 and other long-term drivers. 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 interventions will take place.		Geo-referenced information was provided, along with a map. STAP recommends following its guidance on maps in its Earth Observation document – see page A1-1. STAP guidance can be found at: https://www.stapgef.org/earth-observation-and-gef
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	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	The key stakeholders have been identified; and STAP recommends the inclusion of representatives of the educational and training sector (see earlier comments). Suggest reflecting whether there are other stakeholders (specific to investments) that need to be involved during the project development, and implementation. STAP recommends that 'champion's of the youth sector be identified and included in the design of interventions; STAP also recommends that interventions for LDN and SLM include actions to improve future prospects of this sector, whether through training, micro-finance of start up

<p>peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.</p>		<p>business, job opportunities (given that this sector experiences 38% of unemployment)</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>A description is provided on how stakeholders have been engaged thus far in developing the project, and how they will further engage in designing interventions. 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 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 contribute to gender</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>The PIF describes the gender differences in land management in Lesotho. Suggest detailing further this information at the project site level. The PIF also states that a gender analysis will be carried out, and a gender plan developed during the project design. STAP welcomes these actions.</p> <p>STAP recommends the use the following documents in the preparation of the PPG, as these were developed with 'gender-responsive actions' to LDN in mind:</p> <p>Collantes, V., Kloos, K., Henry, P., Mboya, A., Mor, T. and Metternicht, G., 2018. Moving towards a twin-agenda: Gender equality and land degradation neutrality. Environmental science & policy, 89, pp.247-253.</p> <p>A Manual for Gender-Responsive Land Degradation Neutrality Transformative Projects</p>

<p>equality: access to and control over resources; participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services. Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd</p>		<p>and Programmes. https://www.unccd.int/publications/manual-gender-responsive-land-degradation-neutrality-transformative-projects-and</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>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? 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>The PIF describes a series of risks to the project, including: weak implementation capacity on landscape management, low community participation, climate change risks, COVID-19 risks, and risks due to trade offs between environmental and social benefits. 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.</p> <p>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</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>Partly (see earlier comments and also below on projects of relevance that this PIF does not mention); albeit this, the project PIF evidences the knowledge of other GEF, LDCF and non-GEF projects being considered.</p> <p>Given the complex financial arrangements of ROLL and GEF-ROLL and the inter-dependences</p>

		with other current non-GEF projects, STAP strongly recommends the establishment of a Project Scientific and Technical Steering Committee, that includes representatives of projects whose outputs are key input for this project; and that also include relevant national stakeholders and the Ministry of Education and Training.
	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 is welcome by STAP.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	See above. STAP calls attention to the learnings of the GEF small grant programme on engaging herd-boys to conserve biological diversity in Lesotho , and encourage the GEF-ROLL team to reflect on those learnings and mainstream as needed in this project. STAP also recommends to search the database of the SGP as there are several projects that provide learning and new knowledge on how to engage youth in sustainable land management, whereas creating opportunities for a better future .
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	It is unclear how learning from previous projects was imbedded in ROLL-GEF. 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?	Yes, component 3. Additionally, the theory of change should be linked to the monitoring system.
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 identifies several knowledge management efforts and approaches the project will rely on. As the project stakeholders develop the knowledge management plan, consider indicators for knowledge management. Additionally, suggest linking the theory of change to component 3 as both will be needed to manage knowledge and learning.

	<p>What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?</p>	<p>The PIF states that knowledge will be generated as a result of its monitoring, evaluation and knowledge component. Dissemination of results will be made through IFAD's partnerships on landscape management, and will include other efforts. Cross learning between Kenya and South Africa (countries involved in the ROLL project) will also take place.</p>

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.

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.