Part I: Project Information		Response
GEF ID		10179
Project Title		Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management (SLM) for Large-Scale Impact in the Grazing Lands of Limpopo and Northern Cape provinces in South Africa
Date of Screening		28-May-19
STAP member Screener		Graciela Metternicht
STAP secretariat screener		Guadalupe Duron
STAP Overall Assessment		STAP rating: minor issues to be considered during the project design. STAP welcomes this IUCN-led project in South Africa focused on "Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management (SLM) for Large-Scale Impact in the Grazing Lands of Limpopo and Northern Cape provinces", which will contribute to the country's commitment to achieve Land Degradation Neutrality by 2030, by establishing enabling conditions for scaling-up SLM good practice. Proposed SLM practices include land restoration, market-finance, and management of institutions and governance. The project team is encouraged to apply the "Scientific conceptual framework for Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN)" because it provides guidance on how to pursue LDN through integrated land use planning, and it encourages coupling LDN interventions with existing national land use planning systems. The framework is based on multi-stakeholder engagement, and will help to monitor the achievement of the LDN target. The conceptual framework for LDN is also useful for baseline setting and priorisation of areas around this project, which is important for land use planning. The current description specifies 157,000 ha of degraded agricultural areas to be restored. STAP did not find a land use/land cover map that provided evidence of the spatial location of degraded areas, their current land use and land potential - all of which are essential elements for the effective selection of SLM for grazing lands of Limpopo and Northern Cape. Furthermore, the STAP recommends the team adopts the Land Degradation Neutrality Transformative Projects and Programmes check list that has been prepared to help country-level project developers and their technical and financial partners to design effective interventions. STAP recommends that the project team develop a theory of change to define the impact pathways and identify the interventions. The theory of change can also be used to reinforce component 4 on monitoring, evaluation and learning. Transformational change will require innovation and adaptive management. The theory of change is a useful tool in identifying the preconditions necessary to achieve transformational change, including the barriers to scaling. STAP recommends that the project's climate risk be assessed. In 2015, Limpopo was declared a natural disaster area due to drought, and climate projections for the region will continue to affect stakeholders Below, STAP provides further recommendations on how to strengthen the project design.
Part I: Project Information	**What STAP looks for**	**Response**
B. Indicative Project Description Summary		
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Partly. The project description summary (section B) does not include rangeland management in component 1. Suggest adding a focus on rangeland management to coincide with the component description on page 23-24.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.	Yes, the outcomes encompass global environmental benefits. The likelihood of the proposed benefits to be realised will increase if a theory of change is developed, and assumptions, stakeholders, external and internal factors that may act as barriers, are identified.
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	

	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	
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.
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 for the regions of Limpopo and the Northern Cape. The barriers are also described. The references cited in the PIF are useful as they support the problem analysis, and the scientific understanding of the proposed interventions. STAP suggests citing additional papers – particularly papers that are recent. The papers can be published, or unpublished. The following paper can be of use to the project developers: 1) Katikati, A., & Fourie, P. J. (2019). Improving management practices of emerging cattle farmers in selected areas of the Eastern Cape Province: the role of agricultural extension. South African Journal of Agricultural Extension, 47(1), 92-102.; 2) Mapiye. O. et al. (2018). Limitations and prospects of improving beef cattle production in the smallholder sector: a case of Limpopo Province, South Africa. Tropical Animal Health and Production, 2018, Volume 50, Number 7, Page 1711.; and, 3) Bett, B., Lindahl, J., & Delia, G. (2019). Climate change and infectious livestock diseases: The case of Rift Valley fever and tick-borne diseases. In The Climate-Smart Agriculture Papers (pp. 29-37). Springer, Cham. For component 2, STAP suggests applying the "Scientific conceptual framework for Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN)". The framework provides guidance on how to pursue LDN through land use planning. The framework is strongly based on multi-stakeholder engagement and governance, and it includes a section on these elements. The report can be accessed at: https://knowledge.unccd.int/knowledge-products-and-pillars/guide-scientific-conceptual-framework-land-degradation-neutrality
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	
	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?	
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Yes, the baseline is clear, and sufficiently robust to support incremental activities.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	
	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;	
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	The project document does not include a theory of change. STAP recommends developing a theory of change, and identifying the assumptions necessary to meet each outcome.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	
	· What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	
	· Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	
	· Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	
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, the proposed activities may lead to global environmental benefits.
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?	Yes, benefits are global. A core indicator has been identified for the project – area of degraded land restored. In the project document, STAP encourages the project team to identify outcome indicators, and to describe the methodology used to track their progress. The methodology for monitoring the core indicator also should be described.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	

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, the project will rely on innovative finance for land restoration, improvement of ecosystem services (water), and generation of global environmental benefits (soil carbon, biodiversity conservation). The proponents are encouraged to identify the factors (and how to address them) that may influence market transformation, including: 1) stocking rates and impact on soil erosion; 2) impact of climate change on animal disease; 3) institutional constraints (managing stock theft); 4) market and extension elements, and, 5) barriers to scaling which may be institutional in nature (e.g .managing vested interests). The following paper can be of use to the project developers: Mapiye. O. et al. (2018). Limitations and prospects of improving beef cattle production in the smallholder sector: a case of Limpopo Province, South Africa. Tropical Animal Health and Production, 2018, Volume 50, Number 7, Page 1711
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		No coordinates are provided. The document states that a map is available in the annex. However, STAP only was able to access an annex on taxonomy.
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?	STAP recommends for the project team to develop a stakeholder engagement plan that also assigns governance responsibilities.
	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?	
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?	Yes. Gender indicators will be identified during the project preparation phase. STAP also encourages the project team to describe the project's gender strategy, and to engage a gender specialist when developing the project methodology.

	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	
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	Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?	STAP recommends describing the project's climate risks. For example, Limpopo has been characterized by drought (Limpopo was declared a natural disaster area in 2015 due to drought.). How will drought affect farmers' livestock and agricultural production? The project proponents are encouraged to rely on the following questions during the project design: • 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?
	Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?	
	For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:	
	· 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?	
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?	
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	
	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?	

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?	STAP is pleased the project has a component on monitoring, evaluation and learning (component 4). STAP encourages the project development team to develop a theory of change as it can be used to test assumptions, improve the project through this learning, and instill adaptive management.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	
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 ***"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."***	
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.	