

## Report of the Chair of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) to the 56<sup>th</sup> GEF Council

### 1. Introduction

This report provides an update on STAP's work since the last Council meeting in December 2018.

Over the last 6 months STAP has worked on:

- (a) Impact Programs
- (b) Achieving more enduring outcomes from GEF investment
- (c) Climate risk screening
- (d) Local Commons for Global Benefits
- (e) Draft guidelines for Land Degradation Neutrality
- (f) other STAP activities; and,
- (g) reviewing projects for the GEF work program.

### 2. Impact Programs

In January, at the invitation of the GEF Secretariat, STAP participated in the committees which reviewed 150 expressions of interest for the Impact Programs (IPs), and also provided overarching comments on each of the IPs.

In March, STAP provided advice to the agencies on six issues STAP would look at in particular when screening the IPs to help promote innovation, integration, and transformation: innovation; barriers to transformation; interactions and trade-offs in global environmental benefits (GEBs); multi-stakeholder processes; theory of change; and monitoring, evaluation and learning (Annex 1)<sup>1</sup>.

As part of the June work program, STAP<sup>2</sup> examined the program framework documents (PFDs) using STAP's screening guidelines<sup>3</sup>, and against the 6 key issues. The main illustrative findings were:

- (i) All the IPs identified innovations, and could look more broadly at a wider range of innovation types. It was not always clear how or whether all the innovations could be scaled;
- (ii) The barriers to scaling and transformation were usually identified though the implications for program design were not always clearly described;
- (iii) Risks were usually well-described: they need to be explicitly addressed, with an explanation of how the trade-offs were to be managed, and what the implications were for design;
- (iv) A strong emphasis on stakeholder engagement, and usually good;
- (v) Theories of change were generally strong on goals, and sometimes more was needed on causal links, and pathways; and
- (vi) Monitoring, evaluation, learning and knowledge management were a central element of all the IPs.

---

<sup>1</sup><http://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Climate%20Risk%20Screening%20web%20posting.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> The Impact Program STAP reviewers were: FOLUR – Blake Ratner, Ferenc Toth, Mark Stafford Smith; Drylands – Graciela Metternich, Mark Stafford Smith; Amazon – Tom Lovejoy, Rosie Cooney; Congo – Rosie Cooney; GWP – Rosie Cooney; e-mobility – Saleem Ali; and chemicals in SIDS – Jamidu Katima.

<sup>3</sup> [http://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/STAP%20screening%20guidelines\\_0.pdf](http://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/STAP%20screening%20guidelines_0.pdf)

STAP finds that the agencies have begun to reflect climate concerns more explicitly in the IP PFDs, and to analyse the implications; this will ensure that the significance of climate change has been properly thought through, and whether different approaches might be more robust in dealing with future climate change.

Table 1: STAP's assessment of GEF programs on 6 criteria to help promote innovation, integration, and transformation

### **3. Paper: Achieving more enduring outcomes from GEF investments**

Investment in GEF-7 is increasingly seeking greater integration and more innovation, and for investments to be scaled to deliver transformational change and consequently much more impact. The IEO found that about 80% of completed projects achieved satisfactory short- to medium-term outcomes, and that these were likely to endure in the long-term in more than 60% of projects, with the remainder potentially facing risks to the long-term continuation of their benefits.

The GEF needs to be confident that global environmental benefits will endure. This paper<sup>4</sup> uses the term *enduring* to mean the long-term maintenance of outcomes and consequent impacts, rather than 'sustainability' which is often confused with environmental sustainability and sustainable development.

To assist the GEF Sec, Council, and agencies in thinking about durability, STAP reviewed available literature. There is an extensive peer-reviewed and grey literature<sup>5</sup> on achieving project outcomes and impact, which increasingly emphasises four principles or 'success factors' focused specifically on durability: engaging the right stakeholders; building the incentives for these key actors to act; incorporating adequate diversity and flexibility in project design and implementation; and underpinning it all with a systems thinking approach.

The simple logic chain here is that engaging key stakeholders and incentivising them will build stakeholder trust and motivation; building the capacity of stakeholders and institutions as part of incentivising them as well as emphasising diversity of inputs will help ensure enduring capacity and financing; emphasising diversity and adaptability along with a good application of systems thinking and learning will build resilience in the outcomes (as summarised in Figure 1). These three emergent factors are widely seen as indicators of the durability of the outcome processes that underpin enduring impacts.

---

<sup>4</sup> [http://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/DURABILITY\\_web%20posting\\_0.pdf](http://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/DURABILITY_web%20posting_0.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> <http://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/DURABILITY%20APPENDIX.pdf>



STAP Figure 1: Simplified chain of logic illustrating how emergent indicators of enduring outcomes relate to underlying design principles and design actions.

STAP's key conclusions from the literature:

- Enduring impacts need to persist in the face of long-term external changes, such as climate change, demographic change, or shifting demand for products. They also need to be designed to avoid or manage unintended consequences.
- There is a widespread assumption that scaling and transformational systems change imply greater durability; this may often be true, but it is not a strict causal relationship. It is important therefore to scale both for systems change, i.e. broad impact, and for durability, i.e. long-term impact.
- Larger investments do not necessarily guarantee transformational success, and this will not happen of its own accord.
- Transformation needs to be embedded in planning from the outset, may require additional financing after the initial GEF investment, require more innovation, and new, or additional, stakeholders.
- Systems change for transformation requires innovation which can occur in diverse ways, including technological, financial, business model, policy, and institutional innovation. Most transformational change involves more than one of these elements of innovation.
- Greater innovation brings the likelihood of higher failure rates, which are also opportunities to learn.
- Expectations for projects and programs need to be clearly articulated, and the GEF Council should decide on what is an acceptable risk appetite.

In an earlier paper, STAP made recommendations on how to improve integration in the design of GEF projects. There are common elements in this paper which builds on and extends those recommendations, and other previous STAP analyses, to show how to embed the requirement to

consider long-term durability more explicitly in project outcomes and impacts. Taken together, STAP recommends the following:

1. Articulate an explicit risk appetite and consequent expectations for enduring outcomes from GEF investment, with a low tolerance for programs failing to deliver enduring benefits, and transformational outcomes.
2. Apply systems thinking: Devise a logical sequence of interventions, which is responsive to changing circumstances and new learning.
3. Develop a clear rationale and robust Theory of Change to tackle the drivers of environmental degradation by assessing assumptions and outlining causal pathways.
4. Choose the innovations to be scaled, which may include technological, financial, business model, policy, and/or institutional innovation, and describe intended modes of scaling. Transformation at scale is likely to require multiple forms of innovation.
5. Analyse the barriers to, and enablers of, scaling and transformation. Assess the potential risks and vulnerabilities of the system's key components to measure resilience to shocks and changes, and the need for incremental adaptation or fundamental transformational change.
6. Maximise global environmental benefits, by improving integration, and by identifying positive synergies among multiple benefits, and avoid doing harm, by minimising negative interactions, by managing trade-offs, including climate risk.
7. Develop multi-stakeholder platforms, including with local communities, not just government, from inception and design, through to project completion, ideally building on existing platforms, and flexibly structured to evolve over time towards enduring transformational change.
8. Establish a monitoring, evaluation, learning, and knowledge management (MEL/KM) process to track the intended innovations, integration and transformation, including regular review of the theory of change, and learning during and after implementation.

#### **4. Paper: STAP Guidance on Climate risk screening<sup>6</sup>**

GEF investments are increasingly exposed to risks associated with climate change and natural disasters. At the same time, GEF funding contributes to the resilience of human and natural systems in the face of these risks.

Climate risk screening is needed not only to ensure projects are resilient to shocks, but also for transformation and durability. The 2018 STAP paper, "Integration to Solve Complex Environmental Problems"<sup>7</sup>, highlights the interrelationships between environmental and social challenges. And STAP's

---

<sup>6</sup> <http://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Climate%20Risk%20Screening%20web%20posting.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> <http://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/STAP%20Report%20on%20integration.PDF>

June 2019 paper on durability<sup>8</sup> further demonstrates that mitigating risks is important to ensure that the benefits of GEF investment endure over time.

In December 2018, the GEF Council approved a new Environmental and Social Safeguards policy; this says that, *“short- and long-term risks posed by climate change and other natural hazards are considered systematically in the screening, assessment and planning processes.... based on established methodologies, and significant risks and potential impacts are addressed throughout the design and implementation of projects and programs”*.

To meet this requirement, GEF agencies will need to demonstrate that policies and procedures are in place to enable them to conduct climate risk screening, and to develop and implement risk management plans. Between June and December 2019, the GEF Secretariat will assess GEF agencies against the new Safeguards policy and work with them to strengthen practices where needed. STAP stands ready to assist in this effort. STAP will convene a workshop on climate risk screening with GEF agencies and the GEF Secretariat to promote learning, compare screening efforts, and discuss best practices.

In response to the Council’s request to examine the effects of climate change on GEF projects, STAP has:

- (i) analysed a sample of GEF-5 and GEF-6 projects, and found that: climate information was often misinterpreted or misused or missing; risk assessments were often for the duration of the project, rather than the lifetime of the expected GEBs; assessments were often done late in the project cycle, well after the design and objectives had been developed; and where climate impacts were mentioned, there was rarely a plan for their amelioration. The Chair presented this information at the STAP open session on 22 May 2017.
- (ii) applied the World Bank and USAID climate risk screening tools to 24 GEF-6 projects. Some projects demonstrated innovative strategies for addressing climate risk, but many projects did not provide sufficient future climate information to enable climate risk to be addressed properly. The Chair presented these findings at the STAP Open meeting at the GEF Assembly in Da Nang on 23 June 2018<sup>9</sup>.
- (iii) At the June 2018 Council STAP issued clarified and codified screening guidelines<sup>10</sup>, which included a section on climate risk:
  - (a) 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?
  - (b) Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?
  - (c) Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?
  - (d) What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?

---

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.stapgef.org/achieving-more-enduring-outcomes-gef-investment>

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.stapgef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Vietnam%20Final%20cc%20Presentation-rb.pdf>

<sup>10</sup> [http://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/STAP%20screening%20guidelines\\_0.pdf](http://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/STAP%20screening%20guidelines_0.pdf)

(iv) since the Assembly, consulted the 18 GEF agencies about their approach to climate risk screening. Findings suggest that: 6 agencies had adopted an approach which identified the climate risks to a project, considered how climate risks might affect achievement of the project's objectives, and recommended action to ameliorate climate risk: 6 agencies did some, but all of these; and 6 either did not respond, or provided insufficient information to reach a preliminary view<sup>11</sup>.

In screening the IPs, among other things, STAP looked at managing trade-offs, especially with consideration of climate risk. This is an integral part of choosing the best implementation options during project design, after which options may be narrower.

The current STAP paper provides an overview of climate risks, risk assessment procedures, and tools based on the Intergovernmental Panel for Climate Change (IPCC) and scientific literature which will be helpful to those GEF agencies which are updating their climate screening processes.

Based on the IPCC, scientific literature, and STAP's earlier work, STAP proposes that at a minimum, each agency should use a risk screening process that includes four steps:

- (i) identify the hazards which may include short-term, or acute, shocks (e.g. extreme events of storm, fire or flood), and slow onset, or chronic, events that occur over a long period of time (e.g. drought);
- (ii) assess vulnerability (the propensity or predisposition to be adversely affected) and exposure (e.g. the presence people, livelihoods, species or ecosystems, and infrastructure);
- (iii) rate the risk according to a clearly defined scale (e.g., from very high to low); and
- (iv) identify measures to manage the risk based on the rating; this includes ameliorative actions, strategies, or policies to reduce the likelihood and/or consequences of risks or to respond to consequences. (It is also important to confirm that these adaptation or mitigation interventions do not themselves result in additional risks.)

The STAP paper includes information about the numerous organisations and institutions which provide *climate change data*, and the availability of *screening tools*. There is unlikely to be a single "right" tool for all GEF agencies. Data and tools are constantly changing and being updated. It is important for GEF agencies to select and use credible climate data, both near-term and longer-term, and robust tools for their climate risk screening.

STAP expects future PIFs to reflect basic information about climate risk, including how climate change could affect the proposed intervention, expected outputs and outcomes, with proposed action to manage significant risk. At the CEO-endorsement stage, a more detailed assessment of climate risk and a management plan for the amelioration of those risks should be provided.

STAP will continue to follow progress by GEF agencies towards the end. The STAP Chair will report on progress with climate risk screening in her reports and presentations to the Council. STAP looks forward to further discussing next steps and ways to support risk screening efforts at a workshop on climate risk.

## **5. Paper: Local commons for global benefits**

For the GEF Assembly in June, STAP provided five papers, on integration, knowledge management, plastics, food, and environmental security. Two more papers followed in December, on novel entities,

---

<sup>11</sup><http://www.stapgef.org/sites/default/files/documents/STAP%20Chair%27s%20Report%20to%2055th%20GEF%20Council%20FINAL.PDF>

and innovation. Local Commons for Global Benefits is the eighth and final paper STAP promised to guide GEF-7.

A large proportion of the world's land area is communally-managed or used by indigenous people and local communities (IPLCs), including a large part of the planet's remaining high-quality, high-biodiversity ecosystems. These lands are critical for achieving global environmental benefits - biodiversity, climate change mitigation, and addressing land degradation through the management and conservation of wild species, forests, and drylands – here collectively referred to as “wild resources”.

However, governance over much of these lands is weak. Communities have no legally recognized tenure – a fundamental basis for robust governance – over around 80% of this area. At the same time, central governments often lack the capacity and resources to manage these vast and often remote lands effectively. This creates *de facto* “open access” areas susceptible to uncontrolled and destructive exploitation, which may be via mining, logging, agricultural encroachment, hunting, or wildlife trafficking.

Strengthening community rights to manage land and resources is a promising approach to delivering biodiversity, climate change mitigation, and land degradation goals. There is evidence to suggest that where community-managed forests are legally-supported they perform as well as, or even better than, state-managed protected areas, in terms of avoiding deforestation, maintaining forest condition, and retaining carbon.

In GEF-7, this approach is particularly relevant for the Impact Programs on Sustainable Forest Management, and Food Systems, Land Use, and Restoration Impact Programs, and also for the set-aside funds for “Inclusive Conservation”<sup>12</sup> in the biodiversity focal area. This approach is also important for the GEF Small Grants Program which provides financial and technical support to communities and civil society organizations to generate global environmental benefits through community-based initiatives and action.

The importance of community-based management of lands and resources is also recognized by the Convention on Biological Diversity Aichi Target 18<sup>13</sup>, and the recognition of the importance of “other effective area-based measures” (OECMs)<sup>14</sup> alongside traditional state-run protected areas as a means to conserve biodiversity.

The extensive research literature yields some clear principles and fundamental design characteristics to guide interventions which support the establishment of robust governance of local “commons”: interventions often fail where these are not followed.

---

<sup>12</sup> \$25 million regional/global is set aside for geographies where IPLC territories overlap with globally significant biodiversity, which may also include important carbon stocks that are under threat.

<sup>13</sup> “By 2020, the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their customary use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, at all relevant levels.”

<sup>14</sup> An OECM is defined as “a geographically defined area other than a Protected Area, which is governed and managed in ways that achieve positive and sustained long-term outcomes for the *in situ* conservation of biodiversity, with associated ecosystem functions and services and where applicable, cultural, spiritual, socio-economic, and other locally relevant values.”

STAP recommends that where GEF programs and projects involve lands and resources legally or *de facto* used and managed by indigenous peoples and local communities:

1. An initial assessment should be undertaken to establish the extent to which IPLCs are present in and dependent on the intervention area, and also the extent of their current rights and capacities to use and manage lands and resources, as well as customary tenure and wild resource management practices.
2. When undertaking a project problem analysis particular attention should be paid to any institutional drivers, e.g. insecure and unclear IPLC land and resource tenure, that underpin negative environmental outcomes, e.g. deforestation, land degradation, and biodiversity loss.
3. Consideration should be given to how shifting the rights, incentives, and capacities for IPLCs could lead to transformative change.
4. Action to strengthen or establish community-based management needs to take into account the following fundamental design characteristics for successful community-based management:
  - (i) Support and encourage the establishment of secure land and resource tenure for IPLCs, including rights of access, use, management, equitable benefit-sharing, and exclusion of unauthorized users, through context-specific and locally appropriate approaches;
  - (ii) Improve the financial and non-financial benefits that communities can gain from culturally appropriate and self-chosen forms of sustainable use of wild resources and ecosystem services;
  - (iii) Support inclusive, equitable, and effective community governance, building institutions from the bottom up, guarding against elite capture, and supporting the capacity of communities to effectively and adaptively manage lands and resources; and
  - (iv) Support the development of inclusive and supportive governance at higher scales – national, regional, and international – including mechanisms for communities to exercise their voices in decisions that affect them.

## **6. Draft guidelines for Land Degradation Neutrality**

In 2015 the UNCCD introduced the new concept of Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN), which was later adopted as a target of Goal 15 of the SDGs, Life on Land: 120 countries have committed to pursue voluntary LDN targets.

In GEF-7, the GEF is supporting countries in their pursuit of LDN in the Land Degradation focal area, and the Impact Programs on Drylands, Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration, and Sustainable Forest Management. STAP therefore agreed with the GEF Secretariat that guidelines should be developed.

The objectives of LDN are to:

- maintain or improve the sustainable delivery of ecosystem services;
- maintain or improve productivity, in order to enhance food security;
- increase resilience of the land and populations dependent on the land;
- seek synergies with other social, economic and environmental objectives; and



- reinforce responsible and inclusive governance of land.

The fundamental aim of LDN is to preserve the land resource base, by ensuring no net loss of healthy and productive land, at national level. This goal is to be achieved through a combination of measures that avoid, reduce and reverse land degradation. Achieving LDN requires estimating the likely cumulative impacts of land use and land management decisions, and counterbalancing anticipated losses through strategically-planned rehabilitation or restoration of degraded land, within the same land type.

The guidelines will provide practical help to those developing projects, and a focus on laying the foundations necessary to achieve LDN through enabling policies, integrated land use planning, and preparatory assessments.

The complete guidelines will be presented in September 2019 at the UNCCD COP 14 in Delhi.

## 7. Other STAP activities

STAP chair delivered the Plenary talk on Resilience at World Water Week at the World Bank, April 4: <http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/490391554905967359/08-Rosina-Bierbaum-Climate-Change-Avoiding-and-Managing.pdf>

STAP Chair continues to serve as Science Adviser to the Global Commission on Adaptation (<https://gca.org/global-commission-on-adaptation/news>). Thirty commissioned background papers are under review and a synthesis report is being drafted and will be presented at the UN General Assembly in September.

STAP Chair, the Moore Foundation, and GEF Sec developed a Special issue of the journal *World Development* on “Commodity Agriculture”. The introduction “Toward sustainable agriculture in the tropics” was authored by JT Erbaugh, R. Bierbaum, G. Fonseca, G. Castilleja, and Steffen Brandstrup Hansen. *World Development*, 121: pp 158-162. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0305750X19301160>

The Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation is working with the STAP Chair to evaluate the durability of their own decadal environmental investments, and identify best practices for regional stakeholder engagement. It is possible that a joint workshop could be held with STAP, GEF, and the Moore Foundation.

## Novel entities<sup>15</sup>

An article summarizing STAP’s Assembly paper on novel entities has been submitted to the journal *Environmental Science and Policy* is in revision.

---

<sup>15</sup> <http://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/STAP%20report%20on%20Novel%20Entities%20-%20web.pdf>

## **Global Chemicals Outlook II, and the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm COPs 2019**

STAP served as part of the Steering Committee and reviewer of the Global Chemical Outlook (GCOII<sup>16</sup>), which was released at a side event at the recently concluded 2019 meetings of the Conferences of the Parties (COPs) to the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions.

## **World Bank Climate-Smart Mining Facility Conference**

STAP panel member for Climate Change, Saleem Ali, participated in the launch of the World Bank's Climate-Smart Mining Facility on May 1, 2019: he was part of a panel discussion on "Managing Material Impacts", which focused on how to reduce the material impacts of increased mining and include discussions on the pathways to reducing the amount of resources such as water and energy needed to produce low-carbon technologies. The Facility aims to help resource-rich developing countries benefit from the increased demand for minerals and metals and minimize the environmental and climate impact of mining activities

### **8. GEF projects reviewed**

In addition to screening the PFDs for the IPs (FOLUR, Drylands, Congo, and Amazon), and the Global Wildlife Program, e-mobility, and implementing sustainable and low non-chemical development SIDS, STAP also screened 35 projects, of which 12 were LDCF/SCCF, 4 biodiversity, 3 climate mitigation, 3 international waters, 3 chemicals and waste, 3 land degradation, and 7 multifocal area projects.

STAP has the following observations on climate risk screening in the current projects:

- Focal Area projects and MFAs

A few projects contained preliminary climate risk screening. Some projects identified potential climate risks but did not present information on mitigation/management measures to ameliorate these risks. Several projects did not consider how future projections of climate change could affect success, and durability of output/outcomes. For example, projects located in coastal areas should discuss the potential impacts of sea level rise, and a project in a disaster-prone region should consider how project output/outcomes could be designed to withstand extreme events.

- LDCF/SCCF projects:

Many projects appear to be development projects which address a climate-related component (e.g. water scarcity). There is scope to build adaptive (natural resource and livelihood investments), absorptive (disaster risk management), and transformative (improved governance and enabling conditions) capacity.

---

<sup>16</sup> UNEP, 2019. Global Chemical Outlook II. From Legacies to Innovative Solutions: Implementing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.  
<https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/28113/GCOII.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>



**Table 1: STAP’s illustrative findings for GEF programs against 6 criteria to help promote innovation, integration, and transformation**

	<b>Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration</b>	<b>Dryland Sustainable Landscapes</b>	<b>Amazon Sustainable Landscapes</b>	<b>Congo Basin Sustainable Landscapes</b>	<b>Global Wildlife Program</b>	<b>Global Program on E-Mobility</b>	<b>Chemical Development in SIDs</b>
<b>Innovation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Innovative in concept, structure and the combination of global and country-level engagements.</li> <li>-Emphasis is on policy and institutional innovation and less on technological, financing and business model innovation.</li> <li>-Would benefit from considering cultural norms or barriers which require innovative responses.</li> <li>-Innovations need to be identified at landscape, country, regional and global levels.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Several innovation types proposed, but mainly IT, finance and business models.</li> <li>-Innovation will be scaled through the global coordination project, which notes the need to scale ‘out, up, and deep’.</li> <li>-Does not explore cultural innovations that might be needed to scale deep.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Examples of innovation in technology, financing, institutions, and policy.</li> <li>-Including spatial land use monitoring and planning tools, smart-phone-based monitoring, new protected area financing models.</li> <li>-Not necessarily all ‘new’, but new to the Amazon Basin.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Policy and institutional innovations, e.g. strengthening tenure and management rights of IPLCs, integrated land use planning – not new but innovative in this regional context.</li> <li>-Builds on existing structures which increases the likelihood of durability.</li> <li>-Unclear how these innovations would be scaled, and hence barriers not clearly identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The program is innovative because of its value chain approach, e.g. from poacher to market; and innovative approaches are used to share knowledge and learning to expand and accelerate impact.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-This program focuses mainly on the inherent innovation of e-mobility, and on innovative public-private partnerships.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-This program is unique and innovative because of its geographical and topical scope.</li> <li>-To succeed the program should also consider cultural norms across SIDs when considering innovative solutions.</li> </ul>
<b>Barriers to Scaling and Transformation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The barriers to the adoption of innovations at the landscape level and in value chains are addressed, but the barriers to scaling and transformation could be better explained.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The barriers to change are described, including barriers to governance, and institutional.</li> <li>-The next phase needs to consider the barriers to scaling for systems change and durability, and their implications for design.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The barriers tend to reiterate threats and drivers, rather than the barriers to scaling and transformation of innovations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The program does a fair job of addressing the barriers to scaling and transformation.</li> <li>-Institutional, governance and vested interest barriers are considered under risks; given the program’s success depends on overcoming these barriers, these should be embedded and addressed more clearly in program design.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The barriers listed and described are well thought out and articulated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Key barriers are considered for the 17 child projects, but the program would be improved if system-wide barriers to upscaling were considered more thoroughly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The barriers to scaling and transformation from the local to the global are considered.</li> <li>-But barriers associated with institutional arrangements, cultural and vested interests are not considered.</li> </ul>

	<b>Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration</b>	<b>Dryland Sustainable Landscapes</b>	<b>Amazon Sustainable Landscapes</b>	<b>Congo Basin Sustainable Landscapes</b>	<b>Global Wildlife Program</b>	<b>Global Program on E-Mobility</b>	<b>Chemical Development in SIDs</b>
<b>Management of trade-offs and risks</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The primary emphasis is on local and regional benefits and the resulting GEBs.</li> <li>-Social and environmental risks mentioned, but more attention could be paid to tradeoffs, potential winners vs. losers.</li> <li>- Implications of long-term drivers, e.g. the impact of climate change on certain crops, would be useful.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Land Degradation Neutrality framework would be very helpful for managing trade-offs.</li> <li>- The program recognizes that adaptation may be required to address stressors, including climate, in order to be transformative.</li> <li>- Managing risks should be an integral part of program design, not just a risk treatment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Clear synergies between biodiversity and climate change.</li> <li>-The use of spatial planning and coordination between countries will help to identify potential trade-offs (and synergies). But trade-offs not explicitly addressed.</li> <li>-Useful to consider further reducing over-exploitation of wildlife, by integrating sustainable wildlife management into planning and capacity building.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clear synergies presented between biodiversity and climate change goals, e.g. reducing deforestation and forest degradation.</li> <li>- The use of spatial planning and coordination between countries will help to identify potential trade-offs (and synergies).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The program addresses trade-offs and risks well, particularly the link between biodiversity and climate change adaptation benefits.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Positive links with the Cities IP. Coordinated activities will maximize synergies and avoid overlap.</li> <li>- The electricity source should maximise the reduction of GHG emissions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is more potential to generate co-benefits than is recognized in the PFD, which focuses mainly on international waters.</li> <li>- Climate risk recognized, with a more detailed analysis planned.</li> <li>-A more detailed analysis of both positive and negative interactions would be useful.</li> </ul>
<b>Multi-stakeholder processes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Multi-stakeholder processes are at the heart of the design.</li> <li>-Their feasibility and potential effectiveness should be assessed - to determine value added vis-à-vis existing platforms and initiatives.</li> <li>-Important to ensure that all the child projects are engaged with global and regional platforms.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Knowledge will be managed and exchanged through regional and global stakeholder platforms.</li> <li>-Platform objectives should be specified, and how progress will be monitored should be explained.</li> <li>-When the global coordination project is developed the TOC should be revisited to see if additional or different stakeholders are required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Strong emphasis on multi-stakeholder processes. Private sector and IPLCs well integrated.</li> <li>-More attention could be paid to the barriers to achieving IPLC engagement, given its importance for long term durability of impacts.</li> <li>-Should explore how strengthening tenure could have a positive impact on carbon storage/deforestation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Success depends on harnessing and integrating multiple stakeholders, because governments have severe capacity constraints.</li> <li>-Stakeholders are well-integrated in program components; this should contribute to secure, long-lasting changes that are socio-economically equitable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-A wide range of stakeholders have been highlighted, and are well-integrated in program design.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Detailed evidence of multi-stakeholder engagement, especially for training.</li> <li>-Need to acknowledge that e-mobility has implications for 'energy justice', because growth has largely occurred in high-income markets, especially for electric cars.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-A range of stakeholders have been identified and consulted and preliminary roles identified: needs to be articulated further.</li> <li>-The program would benefit from including academic and research institutions (particularly local ones).</li> </ul>

	<b>Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration</b>	<b>Dryland Sustainable Landscapes</b>	<b>Amazon Sustainable Landscapes</b>	<b>Congo Basin Sustainable Landscapes</b>	<b>Global Wildlife Program</b>	<b>Global Program on E-Mobility</b>	<b>Chemical Development in SIDs</b>
<b>Theory of Change (TOC)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Coherent TOC summarizes the logic, and links the problem analysis, intervention structure, key assumptions and planned outputs.</li> <li>-Additional attention to causal links and feedback mechanisms deserved.</li> <li>-Program should consider developing a TOC for each of the value chains to clarify change pathways.</li> <li>-Long term outcomes and GEBs are clearly specified, causal links less so.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The program includes a TOC that describes the long-term outcome, assumptions, and key barriers well.</li> <li>-The TOC should include a description of the pathways needed to reach the program's goals. E.g. separate, linked theories of change to address drivers, barriers, and enablers of transformation and scaling.</li> <li>-Developing a theory of change for child projects would be helpful.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-TOC should include a clear description of how the proposed interventions will tackle and change root causes of deforestation and degradation.</li> <li>-Breaking down the activities and outputs under each component would help to add clarity and improve the overall quality of the TOC.</li> <li>-A very broad array of possible interventions is presented which makes the conceptual analysis more difficult especially in relation to reducing illegal deforestation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-TOC should be explicit about how the IP's objective relates to actual forest extent, condition and governance, and how the program's components will lead to the goals.</li> <li>-The program logic should clearly link the root causes and proximate threats to program structure and outputs, and also identify clearly critical assumptions in the value chain.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The TOC is well-done and clearly explained in both the narrative and through the use of a diagram.</li> <li>-The risks presented are realistic and clear, and the complexity and uncertainty of the program is recognized.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The program presents a fairly detailed TOC – the diagram provided is well-argued and presents assumptions and differentiates outputs and outcomes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The TOC is fairly detailed with the assumptions and proposed interventions geared towards intended transforming the use and management of chemicals.</li> </ul>
<b>Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-KM is a central element of the program, but metrics and indicators needed.</li> <li>-It is not clear how learning will be applied to support adaptive management during program implementation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The coordination project will monitor and manage the program, and should have its own TOC, as well as measurable indicators for monitoring and assessing outcomes.</li> <li>-Implementation of child projects should be flexible, to be able to adapt to changing circumstances.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-A lot of emphasis on learning across projects and sharing best practices, but a real need to track the M&amp;E outcomes to KM in order to ensure direct feedback to all the child projects.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Coordinating mechanism will need to ensure sharing of information and for adaptive management.</li> <li>-Platform should be interactive, with near real-time information, to target interventions and adapt accordingly.</li> <li>-Need to incorporate lessons from other programs working in the Congo Basin.</li> <li>-Need for metrics.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The monitoring, evaluation and learning aspect is sound, with a good focus on sharing lessons across the program, and will develop a specific GWP tracking tool.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The program provides a detailed MEL process which is articulated through the organizational management of the program.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-MEL through annual standard reporting mechanisms,</li> <li>-Will require a well-established system of reporting, regular availability of quality and reliable data, efficient coordination among all SIDs and stakeholders.</li> </ul>

