

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Part I: Project Information | | Response |
| GEF ID | 10418 | |
| Project Title | Building resilience through sustainable land management and climate change adaptation in Dodoma | |
| Date of Screening | 20-Nov-19 | |
| STAP member Screener | Mark Stafford Smith | |
| STAP secretariat screener | Guadalupe Duron | |
| STAP Overall Assessment | | <p>Minor issues to be considered during project design. STAP acknowledges the African Development Bank's project in Tanzania "Building resilience through sustainable land management and climate change adaptation in Dodoma". The project is a multi-trust fund initiative focused on strengthening Dodoma's climate resilience through integrated processes. It is ambitious and diverse, at times fragmented and disorganised (in the sense that important ideas may only appear late in the proposal) and would greatly benefit from a careful Theory of Change development process to ensure that the activities are necessary and sufficient to achieve the intended outcomes. In addition, the project could benefit from a systems analysis to demonstrate how the interventions interact; build on each other to produce an outcome that is greater than the sum of the parts; and, provide assurance against the parts affecting each other negatively. Tanzania has established already its land degradation neutrality (LDN) baseline, which are valuable measures to use for implementing the project's activities on sustainable land management. STAP's guidelines on LDN can assist with sequencing LDN interventions in an integrated manner. Tanzania is vulnerable to the effects of climate change, particularly floods and droughts. The urban sector has been identified as a climate adaptation priority sector. As the project is designed, STAP recommends that the project proponents rely on climate data, risks and vulnerability information and assessments to design interventions. Tanzania is one of the heaviest flood prone countries in East Africa, and intensifying rainfall episodes are likely to increase flood impacts to infrastructure - buildings and roads. Increasing temperatures also puts at risk sustainable land management activities. Below, STAP offers recommendations on strengthening climate resilience during the project design. Additionally, STAP queries whether the GEF-funded activities could have a more significant impact on how the \$138m of co-investment is deployed to construct the new ring road. For example, will the integrated nature of the GEF proposal be able to contribute to the planning and delivery of the global environmental benefits that are possible from the ring-road project? STAP offers guidance below on how to establish better links between the GEF investment and the baseline project.</p> |
| Part I: Project Information | | |
| B. Indicative Project Description Summary | STAP recommends that the proposers consider implementing major improvements in the following items: theory of change and contingency plan, innovation, risk assessment and management, knowledge management. | |
| Project Objective | Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis? | Yes. The problem diagnosis in section II connects with the project objective. |
| Project components | A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives? | Yes. The planned 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 encompass global environmental and adaptation benefits. |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated? | Yes, the benefits are likely to be achieved with a good monitoring plan. |
| 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? | |
| 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 statement is well defined. STAP appreciates the description of the drivers of land degradation provided by Tanzania's LDN target setting report. When designing the project, STAP recommends to add the climate data projections for temperature and precipitation for Tanzania, or the for the target area if this information is available. The time frame for the climate projections should also be added: this should be used to create some simple scenarios that encompass uncertainty in how the future will unfold (probably also with rates of population change, which may themselves be affected by feedbacks from the levels of economic success that the development of Dodoma achieves) so that the robustness to this future uncertainty of all the interventions in the proposal can be appraised. This would help take an adaptation pathways approach (see RAPTA) to identifying 'no regrets' interventions now as part of a better systems analysis of the interventions. STAP is happy to help with this. Sources for climate projections include: the World Bank's Climate Knowledge Portal: https://climateknowledgeportal.worldbank.org/country/tanzania-united-republic ; and USAID's climate risk profile: https://www.climatelinks.org/countries/tanzania#climate-info |
| | Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references? | See comment above. |
| | 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. The project will address land degradation and climate adaptation - two distinct objectives. The project is funded by the GEF and LDCF trust funds. |
| 2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects | Is the baseline identified clearly? | Yes, the baselines are identified. The baselines are provided in a narrative form (as opposed to quantifiable baselines), and supported by analysis done through Tanzania's LDN target setting program, and Tanzania's UNFCCC National Communications. |
| | Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits? | See comment above. |
| | Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project? | Yes. The baseline narrative describes activities that serve as foundation for incremental global environmental benefits and adaptation benefits. |
| | 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; | Yes, multiple baselines have been provided. However, climate data needs to be used to strengthen the LDCF baseline. |
| | are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and | Partly. Projects are listed and used for the baseline narrative. However, there is minimal information on the (emerging) lessons from these projects, and how they will be used to design the GEF-LDCF initiative. STAP suggests providing this information. |
| | how did these lessons inform the design of this project? | See comment above. |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project | What is the theory of change? | A brief description of the theory of change could be "Demonstrate an integrated approach for reducing pressures on the city's critical infrastructure, environmental and urban assets and increasing the city's climate resilience through integrated urban development planning for climate change adaptation and sustainable land management. In this regard, the GEF project will contribute to delivering efficient, integrated and sustainable development solutions all the while strengthening urban resilience (in particular infrastructure and livelihoods) in the face of climate change and variability. This will be supported through integrated urban management and by improving local urban planning for the municipality of Dodoma and the region. Given the land degradation and climate related challenges which characterize Dodoma city and its region, there is a need for an integrated approach that takes into account the nexus between land degradation drivers and climate risks. " |
| | What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes? | STAP encourages the project developers to develop a theory of change by describing the sequence of events that will lead to the project objective, and identifying the assumptions required to achieve the interim outcomes. A figure supporting the narrative would be valuable. |
| | · What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives? | See comment above. |
| | · Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions? | See comment above. |
| | · 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. However, if a theory of change is developed, and revisited as necessary, it will identify what adaptations may be necessary to reach the project objective. STAP's primer on the theory of change (http://www.stapgef.org/publications) can assist with developing a theory of change. |
| 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? | Uncertain. The global environmental benefits (e.g. soil organic carbon) were not defined. STAP recommends for the global environmental benefits to be defined. Additionally, STAP recommends applying UNCCD's Scientific Conceptual Framework for Land Degradation Neutrality" and STAP's guidelines on LDN to measure and monitor the LDN baseline using the three indicators (land cover, land productivity, and soil organic carbon). The scientific framework and STAP's guidelines can be found at: https://www.unccd.int/publications/scientific-conceptual-framework-land-degradation-neutrality-report-science-policy ; http://www.stapgef.org/publications |
| | LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change? | Uncertain. STAP recommends, however, identifying indicators for each of the adaptation benefits listed on page 45 (e.g. strengthen institutional capacities to mainstream climate resilient measures, etc.). Currently, it is unclear what are the indicators, and how the benefits will be measured and tracked. |
| 6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) | Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable? | See comment above. |
| | Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment? | Yes. However, it will be imperative to develop a theory of change to track the progress of the project. |
| | Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined? | See comment above. |
| | Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation? | See comment above. |
| | What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change? | Component 1-3 focus on climate change activities. See section 8 for further advice. |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 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 does not appear to be innovative in its current iteration. STAP recommends articulating innovation to be scaled, which may include, technological, financial, business model, policy, and institutional innovations. The project developers can refer to STAP's papers on enduring outcomes and innovation: http://www.stapgef.org/achieving-enduring-outcomes-gef-investment AND http://www.stapgef.org/innovation-and-gef |
| | Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors? | See comment above. |
| | Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability? | Uncertain. However, STAP recommends developing the project by applying STAP's recommendations on durability. The recommendations focus on key project design elements that plan for uncertainty, and abrupt change. The paper can be found at: http://www.stapgef.org/achieving-enduring-outcomes-gef-investment Another valuable resource is the Resilience, Adaptation Pathways, and Transformation Approach, which has a set of revised guidelines accessible here: https://research.csiro.au/eap/rapta/ |
| 1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place. | | The PIF includes geo-referenced information, and coordinates. |
| 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 stakeholder list appears to list key actors. As the project is developed, STAP recommends to specify how the stakeholders' roles, and their combined efforts, will contribute to achieving the global environmental outcomes. This information appears absent in the PIF. |
| | 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? | See comment above. |
| 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 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 | Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences? | Partly. During the project design, STAP recommends to think carefully about the gender differentiated risks and opportunities, and their response measures. Additionally, STAP recommends looking into Tanzania's gender and climate change strategy, and applying it in the project design. It appears the strategy was developed in 2011, although possibly it has been updated. See: https://www.climatelinks.org/resources/tanzania-climate-change-gender-action-plan |
| | Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed? | Uncertain. STAP recommends considering whether gender considerations hindered the full participation of an important stakeholder group, and if so, how were these obstacles addressed. |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <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?</p> | <p>STAP recommends performing a climate risk assessment, annexing the results of this assessment to the project, and developing the project based on this risk assessment. Key questions the project developers should ask during the project design are listed below. In Tanzania, both temperature and precipitation will be affected by climate change. In this regard, STAP recommends for the project developers to consider: 1) the period of time the intervention is expected to contribute to global environmental benefits, and how the activities may be affected by climate change; 2) how each intervention will be impacted by climate variability, or weather-related disasters (e.g. droughts); and, 3) how might climate, and non-climate stressors (e.g. population growth), interact to exacerbate climate risks? The project developers may wish to refer to U.S. AID's Climate Risk and Management tool: https://www.climatelinks.org/resources/climate-risk-screening-management-tool; and STAP's guidance on climate risk assessment: http://www.stapgef.org/stap-guidance-climate-risk-screening; or World Resource's Institute climate watch data: https://www.climatewatchdata.org/</p> |
| | <p>Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?</p> | <p>See comment above.</p> |
| | <p>For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p> | <p>See comment above.</p> |
| | <p>· 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?</p> | <p>See comment above.</p> |
| | <p>· Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?</p> | <p>See comment above.</p> |
| | <p>· Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?</p> | <p>See comment above.</p> |
| | <p>· What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?</p> | <p>See comment above.</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>Uncertain. Section 6 (page 61) does not appear to list key initiatives, or projects. STAP recommends describing relevant projects and how this project will build on their lessons and knowledge. During the project design, consider the questions below.</p> |
| | <p>Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?</p> | <p>See comment above.</p> |
| | <p>Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?</p> | <p>See comment above.</p> |
| | <p>How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?</p> | <p>See comment above.</p> |
| | <p>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?</p> | <p>See comment above.</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?</p> | <p>STAP is pleased to see the project will consider research gaps as a result of the information and knowledge gathered, and experienced. In addition to this activity, STAP recommends revisiting the theory of change to monitor outcomes - or the pathway to achieve the desired change. This process will generate learning and knowledge which can then be used to confirm, or readjust the theory of change.</p> |
| | <p>What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?</p> | <p>Unclear. STAP recommends giving careful thought to how the project's knowledge plan will contribute to scaling-up results, lessons and experience.</p> |
| <p>STAP advisory response</p> | <p>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</p> | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| 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. | |