

## STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
<b>GEF ID</b>	10706
<b>Project Title</b>	Strengthening participatory natural resource management processes for sustainable economic development, conservation of biodiversity and maintenance of carbon stocks in Amazon Wetlands.
<b>Date of Screening</b>	November 19, 2020
<b>STAP member screener</b>	Rosie Cooney
<b>STAP secretariat screener</b>	Virginia Gorsevski
<b>STAP Overall Assessment and Rating</b>	<p><b>Concur</b></p> <p>STAP welcomes this project from FAO to conserve biodiversity and maintain carbon stocks in the Amazon wetlands. This is a targeted and well researched project that builds on the successful model pioneered by the Mamirauá Institute.</p> <p>The main driver of deforestation in Brazil is from export markets for agricultural and forest products, minerals and energy and the development of transport infrastructure (p. 22), and while this project does not address these issues through this project, it makes a strong case for community-based natural resource management in critical ecosystems such as mangroves and floodplains, which are both highly biodiverse and which provide important ecosystem services. See STAP guidance document on <a href="#">Local Commons for Global Benefits</a> for more information on guidance for GEF programs and projects which involve lands and resources legally or <i>de facto</i> used and managed by indigenous peoples and local communities,</p> <p>The success of this project will likely hinge on whether or not local people will benefit more from biodiversity-friendly value chains than illegal extraction, as is currently the case. This is listed as a moderate risk (p. 56) and the mitigation measure of ‘mapping bottlenecks...to develop a mitigation plan’ does not provide much reassurance. This reaffirms the need for a more detailed ToC that better incorporates and directly addresses these types of risks.</p>

	<p>STAP is pleased to note that the project includes a Theory of Change (ToC) which appears to summarize the project components, outcomes, outputs and barriers in a graphical depiction. The ToC could be further improved by clarifying and articulating causal pathways working backwards from the recognition of underlying risks and assumptions (currently listed separately) including monitoring and evaluation.</p> <p>STAP is also happy to see a Climate Risk Assessment that integrates climate change considerations into each of the different components. FAO may wish to consult with Conservation International on the results of a recent GEF-funded project called <a href="#">SPARC</a>, which compiled extensive data to analyze the potential impact of climate change on biodiversity, including for <a href="#">Brazil</a>.</p>	
<b>Part I: Project Information</b> <b>B. Indicative Project Description Summary</b>	<b>What STAP looks for</b>	<b>Response</b>
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes. The project objective is “to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity and maintain carbon stocks in varzea floodplain forests and mangroves wetlands of Amazonia.” This responds to the problem that these land cover types, including species contained therein (i.e. caiman, crabs, etc.) are currently unsustainably harvested.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project’s objectives?	The three main component are 1) strengthen enabling environment and capacity; 2) provide TA to implement plans for agroforestry, pirarucu, etc.; and 3) M&E/KM. Combined, these components do support the objective in general.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.  Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	Possibly, though adaptation benefits are not explicitly discussed in the project document.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes.

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?	The main products are: impact assessments, capacity building programs, monitoring systems, establishment of local organizations, sector plans, investment plans, value chain assessments, knowledge management and communication strategies, a geospatial platform. All of these are valuable; however, without implementation of the technological improvements leading to changed practices by local people, they are just plans and programs that won't necessarily lead to reduced pressure on biodiversity.
<b>Part II: Project justification</b>	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
<b>1. Project description.</b> <b>Briefly describe:</b> 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. STAP appreciates the many references to scientific journal articles throughout this section. Also encouraging is the fact that analysis using remotely sensed data was conducted prior to the submission of the PIF to articulate changes in land cover of the 3 zones (p. 24). More information on the method would be welcome, particularly with respect to conclusions reached regarding drivers of land use change. Is the analysis using active fire data as a proxy for human activity? If so, this needs to be explained and substantiated.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes. Data and references cited extensively. Threats and barriers to the mitigation of threats to the varzea and mangroves are clear (p. 27)
	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?	N/A
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Yes.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Yes in terms of ha under improved management (using METT scores). Specific targets are mentioned with regards to loss of particular species (i.e. pirarucu, caiman, and crab) though not

		specified. Targets also listed for number of mangrove trees to be selectively logged (10-20% reduction) – baseline data not available – perhaps this will be collected as part of the monitoring activity.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Good baseline information on ongoing activities – especially GEF projects such as the ASL Impact Program. The project should also be aware of other, non-GEF projects, where there might be overlap (i.e. bilateral – USAID or the Betty and Gordon Moore Foundation).
	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;	N/A
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	N/A
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	N/A
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	The TOC is presented (33-35) including underlying assumptions. According to the diagram, biodiversity will be sustainably used and conserved and carbon stocks maintained through activities that support improved governance through strengthened enabling environment, technical capability and enhanced knowledge and communication. Much of the project builds on prior successes of “Mamiraua model.”
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	See above – all well described in the TOC.
	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?	Yes.
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	Not really.
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected	GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?	The main drivers behind deforestation are listed as export markets for agricultural goods, forest goods,

contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing		minerals and energy and the development of transport infrastructure (p. 22). However, none of these are the focus of this project, which is aimed at promoting sustainable use by local communities for internal consumption. The value of this project is its focus on highly biodiverse and productive landcover types (i.e. mangroves and varzea). The title of the project includes "...maintenance of carbon stocks..."; however, this is not described further in the project, nor are activities planned to measure and account for carbon sequestration.
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	N/A
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, though if carbon is to be sequestered (as indicated in the title) than this should be incorporated into the project design and measured accordingly, including developing a baseline.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes. \$3.4 million in GEF funds for improved management of 972,776 ha in PAs and additional 33,242 ha in other areas.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Yes
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Indicators are defined though more work will be done to refine during PPG phase. More information is needed on the monitoring plan and GIS platform, which is listed in general terms.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Numerous activities are discussed in the Climate Risk Screening Annex.
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?	No
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	No. Rather, it is the Mamiraua model that has been successful in other areas that will be replicated here. Assuming it is successful, then this project should add to the evidence base and spur action in other areas with similar circumstances.

		However, implementing the Mamiraua model does inform transformational change, shifting governance and power dynamics to support greater community participation in natural resource decision-making and governance at local level.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Incremental adaptation will be required as more information is learned about the different land cover types and what will be the most successful interventions for changing behavior on the ground to lessen the pressure on mangroves and floodplains and the threatened species therein (i.e. crabs, caimans).
<b>1b. Project Map and Coordinates.</b> Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Several detailed maps are provided. However, there is no information on the exact geo-coordinates of each site (lat/long).
<b>2. Stakeholders.</b> 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?	For the most part, stakeholders have been identified. As the project progresses, there should be more information on the local groups and private sector partners that will be needed to implement the ‘technological solutions.’
	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?	Roles are listed (pp. 51-52)

<p><b>3. Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment.</b> 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 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>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Yes. Gender information is included throughout the project document and the project will make a concerted effort to target women as beneficiaries.</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>See above.</p>
<p><b>5. Risks.</b> Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible,</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>	<p>Risks are comprehensive. Climate risks are listed in a separate, detailed document.</p>

propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?</li> <li>• Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?</li> <li>• What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?</li> </ul>	
<b>6. Coordination.</b> 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, though more work could be done to review non-GEF projects (i.e. bilaterals such as USAID and foundations).
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Unclear
	How have these lessons informed the project’s formulation?	As 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; there are numerous (maybe too many) mechanisms that will be created as part of this project (i.e. working group, consultative committee, strategic advisory committee) (p. 60)
<b>8. Knowledge management.</b> 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?	Mamirau will participate in the KM platform of the ASL program. Other activities are standard i.e. strategic communications, websites, social media, etc.)
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	

Notes

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
<p><b>1. Concur</b></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 <b><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></b></p>
<p><b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b></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><b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b></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>