STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE

GEF ID	**11407**
Project title	**Integrated Landscape Management for Sustainable Ecosystem Services and Community Livelihoods in Wami-Ruvu River Basin**
Date of screen	**31st Nov 2024**
STAP Panel Member	**Mark Stafford Smith**
STAP Secretariat	**Guadalupe Duron**

1. Summary of STAP's views of the project

STAP welcomes Tanzania's project "Integrated Landscape Management for Sustainable Ecosystem Services and Community Livelihoods in Wami-Ruvu River Basin." STAP is pleased with the initial description of future narratives, particularly with how it is based on the interactions between key trends in drivers, such as climate change, and population pressure on water and land resources due to shifting norms of transhumance pastoralists.

Further attention is necessary to the impacts of climate change in Tanzania. Observed and projected data show temperatures increasing above the global average as early as next decade, and incrementality into the future. Tanzania and UNEP are strongly recommended to design the project accounting for climate risks, and the different interactions with other key drivers – similar to how it described its initial future narratives. Downscaled data to assess flood risks is recommended.

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 is well explained. It includes a description of the ecosystems (forests, wetlands), the land users (farmers, agropastoralists, transhumance pastoralists), demographics and socioeconomic traits of the communities living in the Wami-Ruvu Basin. The rationale also includes a description of the drivers of biodiversity and land degradation as land use change (e.g. deforestation and agricultural extensification), small-scale mining, fires, and invasive species. Floods and droughts are also described as drivers of biodiversity loss and land degradation.

The rationale also includes a description of the interactions between climate change and increased population pressure, mainly from transhumance pastoralists shifting away from traditional transient routes and instead targeting rivers. These situations have also given rise to conflicts between farmers and transhumance pastoralists over water resources. Conflicts are expected to increase in the future as a result of increased impacts from drought.

Several maps usefully display the target sites in the rationale section, and these changes in practice lead to increased pressure on water resources (map on page 15, for example). A valuable flow diagram depicting the various interrelationships between climate change hazards and primary and secondary impacts on the environment, livestock, and livelihoods is also provided. This diagram enforces a rationale that the project can

feasibly result in climate adaptation benefits. Designing with this intent should be an objective for the project developers.

A good description of four key drivers of future narratives is also provided: climate change risks, population pressure (but this should perhaps also note on-going or even increasing demand for charcoal from growing city populations), and changed behaviors resulting from climate impacts that alter transhumance practices and increase pressure on already limited water resources. A fourth driver is recognized as continued settlements in buffer zones. The next section provides some recommendations on how to strengthen these narratives.

STAP notes that a key barrier is policy coherence (p.18/19), partially addressed by the oversight of the VPO – this may benefit from some more explicit monitoring, as discussed below.

STAP notes, however, that a baseline description is missing in the rationale. Attention to the baseline will help define the additionality, mainly how this project will build on this baseline, and lessons learned.

The project description is also well explained. A theory of change figure and a description of its logic are provided. The relationships between the components and how they can ultimately inform the project objective are clear. Detailed descriptions of the expected outcomes and outputs are also given. In the following section, STAP further recommends strengthening the components and paying careful attention to the assumptions and risks.

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

Below, STAP proposes several recommendations to strengthen the project during its design:

1. The initial description of key drivers of future narratives is good. It recognizes the interactions between climate risks, populations, and changes in transhumance pastoralists' traditional ways, which provoke conflicts with farmers. A fourth driver is recognized as increased populations in buffer zones near rivers due to a government policy. However, these are not then elaborated into some explicit different futures based on some actual combinations of these drivers and their interactions. STAP suggests two issues to strengthen the description, and application of, future narratives:
    a. The intent of future narratives is to provide some alternative pictures of the future in relation to drivers over which the project has no control. Thus, the missing step is to take these drivers and articulate 3 or 4 ways in which different realistic combinations of them may interact to create a future in which the results of the project must still work. It sounds as if changes in pastoralists behavior is likely to occur regardless of future uncertainty, in which case this should simply be factored into all narratives, and the differentiation of the narratives should be based on the drivers that are uncertain. STAP's Advisory Paper provides further advice on this future narratives process.
    b. Identify non-climate contributors to vulnerability, and describe whether they could exacerbate or ameliorate climate risks. For example, policies may drive land use decisions that exacerbate the impacts of climate change, as illustrated by the fourth driver mentioned earlier.
    c. Once an analysis of the interactions between the key driver trends is done, identify which interventions are likely to be robust options that will work in any of the futures and thus help to deliver enduring outcomes. The reference to IWRM as being a 'robust' approach to different (climate) futures on p.28 is a good example of this, but it is not explicitly tied to the future narratives – is it also robust to the different population and social futures? (yes, probably!).

2. Strengthen the theory of change in the following ways:
    a. For component 1, STAP suggests an additional assumption than that listed in the theory of change figure. Outcome 1.1 assumes that social structures (cultural and gender values and norms) that characterize the communities, the water user groups, and other stakeholders involved in managing water resources have been accounted for. The diversity of values within the water platform(s) should not be undermined. Therefore, this assumption and associated risks that remain once the project logic is developed should be clearly defined. Those challenges around entrenched interests and difficulties in shifting social norms should be addressed in project design, with any remaining risks captured in the risk table.
    b. For component 2, define assumptions that climate-smart agriculture, nature-based solutions, other land management practices, and engaging with the private sector will improve biodiversity and provide ecosystem services for farmers and pastoralists. Climate change impacts are likely to affect all these interventions and outcomes. Therefore, the project should be designed to account for climate risks – observed and projected (to 2050). UNDP's Human Climate Horizon provides climate data for Tanzania, which shows average annual temperatures will be higher than the global average within the next decade. Use climate data or information to design the project. If downscaled data is available for the basin, this would be better for flood data.
    c. It is good that assumptions are explicitly identified (ToC figure, p.25) – however, some of these are fundamental challenges that should be designed in to the project. For example, "A.5 lessons being adequately captured and compiled…" is under the control of the project; whether the dissemination of those lessons triggers changed behavior in stakeholders, on the other hand, might be an assumption that needs testing through monitoring. At least A.1, A.4, A.5 (maybe A.6) should be revisited to ask whether they are really aspects of necessary design, and if so possibly amend these; A.2 and A.3 are definitely critical assumptions, and these (plus any amended other ones) should then appear in the MEL program later on, and probably in the risk table with what will be done if the assumptions turn out to be incorrect.
3. In component 1, a critical (and very promising) element of ensuring that there is policy coherence across Ministries seems to be the executive sponsorship of the VPO (p.26, etc). This coherence is repeatedly noted as important through component 2 also. On p.34 the close coordination support of the VPO is again emphasized, which is good. However, this is such a critical aspect of ensuring a key requirement of the project, that it should appear in the risk table as a risk (despite the good design), which could be mitigated somewhat by close monitoring of the level of engagement of the VPO with the project. This should probably appear in the Institutional and Policy row of the risk table; we appreciate the wording may need to be chosen carefully, perhaps around "charting the on-going alignment of the project with the priorities of the VPO"
4. In component 2, alternative livelihoods are presented as an option to reduce pressure on ecosystems. STAP notes, however, that switching to alternative livelihoods may not always be easy for communities. Thinking through the logic, including assumptions and enabling factors, that produce outcomes supporting alternative livelihoods will be necessary. STAP offers advice on alternative livelihoods in its background note.
5. As mentioned above, challenges and barriers must be accounted for in the project logic during the project's design. The risk table should include risks that remain despite good project design – a good example of both aspects is provided by the Institutional and Policy row – the items currently in this are good design but should be done anyway; the questions is whether these will be enough to ensure policy coherence. For this, as noted above, some additional risks around loss of alignment with VPO priorities may be a more relevant risk despite the good design, which could be tracked as mentioned above. Attention to links between risks and their compounding effects is also necessary – for example, climate risks may affect the impact of restoration/conservation efforts which will be supported by payments for ecosystem services – which might be considered an innovation risk in the Wami-Ravu basin. Further guidance on risk is available in STAP's note on Clarifying risks in GEF projects, with a focus on innovation risks .

6. The text on charcoal harvesting as a challenge on p.13 suggests there are important drivers of demand for illegal logging that are not explicitly addressed in the proposal; this demand comes mainly from cities and the experience (e.g.) of Mexico is that if the demand is not reduced where it happens, then the incentives for illegal logging will continue. This may be another risk that should appear in Environmental and Social, where mitigating measures may require some engagement to provide messaging to initiatives encouraging electrification in cities or a change in attitude among users of charcoal to reduce this demand.
7. The project can feasibly achieve climate adaptation benefits. STAP suggests designing the project with this intent. STAP's typology of adaptation benefits and STAP's decision tree for adaptation rationale can be useful in formulating the climate adaptation additionality.

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

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.)