

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10792
Project Title	Adaptive Agriculture and Rangeland Rehabilitation Project (A2R2) - Somalia
Date of Screening	May 28, 2021
STAP member screener	Edward Carr
STAP secretariat screener	Guadalupe Durón
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Minor issues to be considered during project design</p> <p>STAP welcomes IFAD’s proposal “Adaptive Agriculture and Rangeland Rehabilitation Project (A2R2) – Somalia”. The project aims to enhance the climate resilience of poor households in southern Somalia through sustainable land and rangeland management, and biodiversity conservation. The project will place an emphasis on the socio-cultural context to design and implement interventions.</p> <p>STAP notes that the project sites are still to be identified. When the sites are identified, STAP encourages IFAD and Somalia to design and implement the interventions using systems thinking with an end of goal of achieving resilience of the targeted social-ecological system. Assessing for resilience will be important given the various long-term drivers (conflict, climate change, and other drivers of displacement) affecting stakeholders capacity to adapt and, or, achieve transformational change. In the screen below, STAP recommends two resilience assessment tools to use.</p> <p>STAP is pleased the project will consider scenario planning during the PPG phase (scenarios from RCP 4.5 through RCP 8.5). To strategically plan for future climate scenarios, STAP recommends developing impact pathways associated with each scenario. This planning process will help identify opportunities for adaptation, or to seek more fundamental transformational change.</p>

	Below, STAP offers further guidance on these issues.	
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 related 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 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 reflect issues that can contribute to global environmental benefits and adaptation benefits.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Benefits are likely to be generated with good monitoring, evaluation, and learning.
Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project. Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?	Yes, the outputs are likely to contribute to the outcomes.
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
1. Project description. Briefly describe: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)	Is the problem statement well-defined?	Yes, the problem is well-defined. The socio-economic context is described, which helps explain the root causes of degradation. For biodiversity, the drivers are associated with hunting and poaching, deforestation for charcoal making, agricultural expansion and mining. Climate change impacts (floods, droughts) and conflict exacerbate these drivers. The drivers for land degradation are also described comprehensively. These include overgrazing, deforestation for fuelwood and charcoal production, unsustainable agricultural practices (e.g. burning of animal manure and low usage of soil and water conservation). Weak governance, high population density, conflict and war, lack of land tenure are examples of indirect drivers.

	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	<p>Yes, the barriers are well described. Somalia's weak governance and institutions frameworks are not dealing appropriately with land and forest degradation, overgrazing, and other unsustainable land and water practices.</p> <p>Conflict and climate change impacts are further hampering communities' abilities to adapt to climate change. The PIF also mentions that a loss of traditional grazing and forest management practices are influencing degradation of resources.</p>
	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?	Yes, rangeland and forest degradation are a result of multiple drivers, which are being exacerbated by climate change impacts and conflict. The project could benefit from the combined GEF (biodiversity, land degradation) and LDCF resources.
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Yes, a baseline narrative is provided. The description focuses on baseline projects, and demonstrate how these past and on-going initiatives will contribute to this project. The links are clear between the RLRP activities and the LDCF value added.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Not yet. However, STAP expects for the baseline to be quantified during the PPG with metrics that complement the core indicators. For example, suggest looking into whether Somalia's land degradation baseline data (as part of its LDN target setting exercise) is relevant for this project. For climate change impacts (droughts and floods), suggest using two scenario (the most targeted to the project area) baselines to consider how the interventions will be affected by rainfall and temperature variabilities in the future. For biodiversity, STAP is pleased the project will rely on B-INTACT to quantify a biodiversity baseline.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Yes, but suggest complementing the core indicators as suggested above.
	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;	See above.
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	Partly. Suggest describing how lessons or best practices from baseline initiatives will contribute to 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>STAP appreciates the inclusion of a clear theory of change in the PIF. The project’s theory of change is described as: “GEF/LDCF funding through A2R2 will complement the RLRP, with a focus on increasing resilience and adaptation to climate change impacts, conservation of biodiversity and sustainable use of natural resources to achieve land degradation neutrality. This requires a multi-dimensional integrated landscape approach that takes into account the complexity of challenges and the diversity of poverty and vulnerability drivers and barriers to change in a context of insecurity. In order to support climate change adaptation, the project will invest in sustainable land and water management for a climate-resilient agriculture and to improve the livelihoods of the most vulnerable rural communities, especially women and youth.</p> <p>This will be achieved through mitigating the impact of a foreseeable increase in average temperatures, coupled with higher inter-annual variability in precipitations. The project will undertake concerted, planned and participatory actions for the restoration of rangelands together with the reinforcement of pastoralists' and agropastoralists' technical and land management capacities.</p> <p>At the institutional level, the project will provide support for the integration of sustainable land management and biodiversity conservation into</p>

		appropriate strategic development frameworks at all levels. It will concomitantly build the capacity of administrative staff in information collection and processing that will enable monitoring, evaluation and reporting. The project's knowledge management activities will enable the exchange of experiences among stakeholders, as well as the systematic analysis and documenting of lessons learned with a view to upscale successful results to other regions in the country. It will also enhance decision-making at local and national levels and inform policy development.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	See above.
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	See above
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	STAP suggests defining the assumptions in the theory of change, testing them as the project is implemented, and adapting the theory of change accordingly.
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	While there is not a consideration of adaptations in the theory of change, the risks section of the PIF covers a wide range of possible challenges that would require adaptations and some proposed means of addressing them. STAP suggests the project team develop the theory of change further and using it as tool for adaptive management. Refer to STAP's theory of change primer .
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?	With robust learning and adaptive management, as a result of monitoring and evaluation, the incremental activities can be reached. The same is true to strengthen adaptive capacity to deal with the various vulnerabilities and uncertainties posed by climate change, and conflict.
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	See above.
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits, and are they measurable?	Yes, the global environmental benefits are measurable. For the restoration and reforestation baseline, suggest looking into Somalia's LDN

and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)		<p>baseline as mentioned above. STAP's guidelines on LDN also can be beneficial for doing a baseline assessment. The project team is encouraged to conduct a land potential assessment (discussed in STAP's LDN guidelines) to inform the restoration and reforestation activities in Component 3.</p> <p>For climate baseline, STAP supports the project team's plan to develop climate scenarios. STAP suggests that these clearly integrate the different elements described in the PIF. These should project 20-30 years into the future. The scenarios can define two plausible climate futures for the project and therefore help the project team design the project by providing a means of assessing the robustness of interventions and durability of outcomes across a range of possible futures.</p>
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Possibly. Baselines for land restoration, biodiversity, and climate need to be explicitly quantified, monitored, and assessed. Additionally, it will be important to conduct a land potential assessment (as noted above), which describes the inherent site (e.g. rainfall amount, vegetation, hydrology, among other factors) and soil properties to determine the scale of the rehabilitation and restoration activities.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Yes, the 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?	<p>The PIF suggests that a landscape approach will be used to integrate rangeland management, forest management, agricultural productivity, and biodiversity conservation. A potential landscape approach the project team could use is the LDN framework developed by UNCCD.</p> <p>Whatever approach might be used, STAP recommends detailing it comprehensively in the project document. STAP would expect for the approach to be capable of dealing with trade-offs</p>

		<p>between benefits and competing demands (restoration and reforestation versus fuelwood demand and charcoal production), as well as indirect effects (e.g. leakage) from reforestation and restoration efforts.</p> <p>Likewise, suggest detailing the methods that will be used to improve climate adaptation capacity. What are trade-offs between climate adaptation and other proposed benefits? Will there be winners or losers (and who are they?) What are the barriers (e.g. socio-cultural, technical), and enablers (e.g. enabling conditions), to achieve climate adaptation <u>goals</u>?</p>
	<p>What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?</p>	<p>A variety of interventions are aimed to increase communities' ability to adapt. Some of these reduce the sensitivity of local livelihoods to climate impacts, such as improved water infrastructure to strengthen water security for crops and strengthened capacity on soil and water conservation and climate-smart technologies/practices. Others improve adaptive capacity, such as increased access to finance for agricultural productivity to lessen economic risk. This range of intervention benefits should produce a resilient overall portfolio of activities.</p> <p>As noted above, for the purposes selecting and designing interventions for durable results, it would be valuable to develop two climate scenarios, and develop impact pathways for them. These alternative pathways will help the project interventions be robust enough to deal with long-term drivers, such as climate change impacts. Otherwise, the project is at risk of maladaptive outcomes – i.e. interventions possibly increasing vulnerability to climate change or undermining adaptive capacity in the future. Refer to the following resource on climate scenario planning:</p>

		https://www.climatelinks.org/resources/integrating-climate-risk-long-term-planning
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?	The project is clearly innovative in the Somalian context. Integrative planning is innovative given the context of the project, particularly where the project seeks to integrate rangeland and land management with biodiversity conservation. There are also technical innovations for Somalia, such as the use of solar energy to operate irrigation pumps. Additionally, climate smart technologies will be introduced via the farmer field schools.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	<p>The project aims to scale-up impact by disseminating knowledge and best practices from climate adaptation, and sustainable rangeland/land management.</p> <p>It is common practice that scaling of an innovation requires paying attention to social structures (cultural norms and values, gender), as well as institutional arrangements, among other social factors. Evidence for the need to pay attention to this lies in the PIF itself, which notes a number of barriers to women’s participation in agriculture or non-farm employment. The project could usefully develop a theory of change for scaling that identifies and addresses the barriers and enablers within the social structures of the populations in the project areas in order to achieve the scaling objective.</p>
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Given the extent and severity of drought, it is likely that a combination of incremental adaptation and transformational change will be needed in the target sites. Therefore, it will be imperative to look for opportunities to adapt, or transform, as the project is implemented. A good theory of change that assesses for resilience will be needed. The following resilience assessment methods would be valuable to use for the design and implementation of the project: Wayfinder and RAPTA . STAP’s theory of change primer also will be helpful in

		designing impact pathways based on systems thinking.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		In the final project document, please ensure to provide a map of the target sites, displaying the different land uses.
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.	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	The stakeholders have been identified to the extent possible, given the lack of contact during the pandemic. As the project is developed and implemented, STAP recommends assessing whether the appropriate stakeholders are being involved to carry out, and develop the desired agency, the activities.
	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?	The stakeholders are described although they might change as the project is implemented. Suggest revisiting the roles as the project matures.
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	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	STAP is pleased with the different activities (e.g. review the socio-cultural context; conduct a participatory gender-sensitive rural poverty analysis) the project will implement to ensure that gender differentiated risks and opportunities are identified. In addition to the proposed activities, STAP encourages the project developers to identify the

<p>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>gender assumptions in the project to achieve the project objectives on climate adaptation, sustainable land management and biodiversity conservation. The following paper identifies common gender assumptions (e.g. women are a homogenous and vulnerable group) in climate adaptation projects which might apply to this project as well: Lau, Jacqueline D., et al. "Gender equality in climate policy and practice hindered by assumptions." <i>Nature Climate Change</i> 11.3 (2021): 186-192.</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>The PIF contains descriptions of gender disparities that suggest such barriers might exist. STAP recommends considering carefully whether gender considerations hinder the participation of an important stakeholder group.</p>
<p>5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design</p>	<p>Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control? Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?</p> <p>For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately? • Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed? • Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with? 	<p>The risks are valid, and it would be valuable to embed them in the theory of change of the project. Because these risks are highly variable across the country, when the target sites are clear, it will be valuable to identify the risks in each site and explain how they will be dealt with in a theory of change.</p> <p>For climate risks, as noted above STAP suggests the project team develop climate scenarios that integrate the different elements described in the PIF. These should project 20-30 years into the future. Refer to the following resources on scenario planning:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures? 	https://www.climatelinks.org/resources/integrating-climate-risk-long-term-planning https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1462901119309712
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.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes, there is adequate recognition of other projects and how they complement this initiative.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	See above.
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	See above.
	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, through component 4 on knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation.
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 project's knowledge managing system will focus on monitoring and evaluation, and capturing learning as a result of these processes. This learning will be used to improve practices on agricultural sustainability (public-private partnerships described in the project), to induce innovation, and foster scaling up of best practices, and knowledge. As suggested previously, the project could useful develop a separate theory of change on scaling to specify the desired change needed, and how to achieve this change – while addressing the risks, assumptions, and barriers that underlie scaling outcomes.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	Consultations with stakeholders will define the needs for developing and disseminating knowledge products.

Notes

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
<p>1. Concur</p>	<p>STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. The proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.</p>
	<p>* In cases where the STAP acknowledges the project has merit on scientific and technical grounds, the STAP will recognize this in the screen by stating that <i>“STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal and encourages the proponent to develop it with same rigor. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design.”</i></p>
<p>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:</p>
	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;</p>
	<p>(ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</p>
	<p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>

<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>