

# Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility  
(Version 5)

## STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: @@@@ @@, @@@@  
Screener: Sarah Lebel  
Panel member validation by: Ferenc Toth  
Consultant(s):

### I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

FULL-SIZED PROJECT	LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	8010
PROJECT DURATION:	4
COUNTRIES:	Burundi
PROJECT TITLE:	Natural Landscapes Rehabilitation and Climate Change Adaptation in the Region of Mumirwa in Bujumbura and Mayor of Bujumbura through a Farmer Field School Approach
GEF AGENCIES:	FAO
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Water, Environment, Spatial Planning and Urban Development (MWELPU)  Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAE)
GEF FOCAL AREA:	Climate Change

### II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):  
**Major issues to be considered during project design**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the FAO proposal "Natural landscapes rehabilitation and climate change adaptation in the region of Mumirwa in Bujumbura and Mayor of Bujumbura through a farmer field school approach". The project aims to introduce an integrated landscape-based approach to reinforce production resilience and to protect the natural environment in the selected areas. STAP believes the PIF has some major scientific and technical deficiencies, and notes below some of the key areas to be strengthened.

1. While STAP welcomes the attempt to describe the natural environment, including climate and its projected changes, it believes the information provided in the PIF to be erroneous. Specifically, it is surprising to find very cold annual average temperatures for Burundi. With regards to climate projections, information provided is very vague. First, it will be important to establish what was the baseline period, what models were used, and what is the projected range in changes in temperature. Moreover, why present information on temperature and not precipitation, when identified threats are floods and droughts? Climate change projections are very coarse and qualitative. Quantitative climate change scenarios with reasonable detail will be for meaningful impact/vulnerability assessments and response strategies. Importantly, it will be essential to identify what are the potential impacts of those changes in the climate. Understanding what are the projected changes in the climate will be the first step to help identify the appropriate adaptation strategies, as per the criteria outlined in the PIF under Component 4. A 2014 report on climate change projections for Burundi, aimed at policy-makers can be found here: [http://www.adaptationcommunity.net/?wpfb\\_dl=249](http://www.adaptationcommunity.net/?wpfb_dl=249). While this report has the advantage of providing relevant information targeting Burundi specifically, STAP believes information provided in the IPCC AR5

WGI and WGII may be more easily interpreted for practitioners unfamiliar with jargon associated with climate change projections.

2. The diagnoses of current trends is bleak and partly erroneous. "Increasing land degradation due to unsustainable and intensive land use" is not a consequence of climate change. True drivers of degradation are correctly summarized in the opening paragraph, none of which are related to climate. These drivers should be eliminated before one can realistically think about CCA. Projects to tackle some of these drivers are mentioned in the baseline scenario and in Table 1 but it remains unclear to what extent they will be able to mitigate the ongoing degradation.

3. Under barrier #1, another false diagnosis: decrease in vegetation is not "climate-induced soil erosion". The PIF presents a value of 100/t/ha for soil erosion. While this value may be realistic on steep slopes, it is extremely high, and the reference used dates back to 1989. Attributing this figure to anthropogenic climate change in the late 1980s is rather contentious. Moreover, the following sentence refers to banana production having protected soils from erosion until recently. It is unclear whether this figure is representative of soil erosion rates over the past 25+ years under banana production, or of the current rates. This needs to be clarified, along with a description of the current soil quality.

4. STAP is concerned that the project's aim to introduce an integrated landscape-based approach (stated under barrier #1) is not actually being addressed. STAP recommends to define the terminology adequately before proceeding further on this issue, and thereby better define the scale of interventions. A good place to start is with this 2016 paper by Reed et al. (<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/gcb.13284/full>, Open Access), which STAP believes will help better define the right types of interventions for this project.

5. STAP is concerned about the nature of the interventions described in Component 3. Over the 3 activities proposed, only the third on ecotourism seems to be linked to the diversification of rural value chains. Moreover, STAP would like to emphasize the importance of ensuring that proper life-cycle analyses and market analyses are conducted prior to the implementation of such activities involving developing handicrafts. What are the raw materials used, what are the human and environmental health implications? Is there a sufficient market for the products, and will the costs to consumers be reflective of the labor and material costs?

6. STAP is concerned about the content and quality of the risk assessment in A.4.Risks. Item 1: Occurrence of extreme weather events is an existing risk rather than an additional factor that might emerge during the project. The proposed mitigation measures are in fact the overall project objectives and not possible actions to be undertaken in response to possible events during the project. Item 2: Lack of capacity is a known fact, not a risk. Several other possible risks are ignored, most importantly the failure to restrain current drivers of degradation that would make restoration and CCA activities elusive.

7. Overall, STAP believes that this PIF perhaps tries to achieve too many objectives, and that the Theory of Change is poorly defined. This leads to a proposal which appears disjointed, with some obvious deficiencies in the presentation of the evidence base.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Concur</b>	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple "Concur" response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
<b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised.</li> <li>(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.</li> </ul> <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>
<b>3. Major issues to be considered during</b>	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:

<b>project design</b>	<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.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP's concerns.</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>
-----------------------	---