

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: December 20, 2013

Screeener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Anand Patwardhan
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 5419

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Cambodia

PROJECT TITLE: Strengthening the Resilience of Cambodian Rural Livelihoods and Sub-national Government System to Climate Risks and Variability

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Environment

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):
Consent

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP is pleased to acknowledge UNDP's proposal on "Strengthening the resilience of Cambodian rural livelihoods and sub-national government system to climate risks and variability". The proposal does a good job of describing thoroughly Cambodia's vulnerability to climate change, and defining the main barriers hindering climate change resilience in the agricultural sector – "predominantly focused on rice cultivation and subsistence farming. STAP also is pleased to note the various commitments to address vulnerability reduction by applying gender-disaggregated approaches, as well as mainstreaming gender into the various components at during the project design. Undoubtedly, a gender emphasis will be crucial given the proportion of female farmers in Cambodia (footnote 5, page 4).

STAP believes the proposal could be strengthened further by addressing the following recommendations during the full development of the concept.

1. STAP recommends defining a project objective, which appears to be missing in the project framework on page 2.
2. The proposal presents a comprehensive description of the problems facing Cambodia in terms of addressing long-term adaptation. The proposed activities are equally comprehensive by suggesting integrated approaches focused on strengthening capacities on climate resilience at the district, community and household level, combined with interventions addressing small-scale water infrastructure for the agricultural sector. This approach is holistic and supportive of the decentralization and deconcentration (D&D) efforts in Cambodia on integrating long-term climate risks throughout the various local development planning processes. It may be helpful to categorize further these interventions along the lines of institutional, infrastructural, and community resilience measures. , UNDP may wish to reference the following paper discussing these categories based on LDCF adaptation projects in Asia, including Cambodia:
3. For component 2, UNDP may wish to rely on FAOSTAT to provide yield data on rice, and other indicators (arable land) useful in categorizing agricultural productivity in Cambodia. FAOSTAT can be found at: <http://faostat3.fao.org/faostat-gateway/go/to/home/E>

4. Farmers' adoption of the System of Rice Intensification (SRI) will depend on their socioeconomic status and knowledge of the biophysical conditions of their land. These factors are likely to influence the risks farmers may take in adopting an SRI approach – for example, SRI adoption is known to be labor intensive particularly for farmers adopting the practice for the first time. Land-poor, or households with limited labor, may face greater risks in adopting SRI and other climate-resilient measures. Furthermore, while SRI may be an attractive approach for increasing productivity and returns to farmers, its role in the context of climate change adaptation and climate resilience needs to be defined explicitly.

5. Therefore, STAP suggests describing the conditions that may affect the adoption of SRI, as well as the other proposed climate resilient practices described in component 2. The proposal also needs to consider the implications in terms of risks, costs, and other institutional requirements needed to implement diversification as an adaptation strategy. For example, will existing agricultural systems (including extension systems) support diversification, and how will this happen. STAP encourages UNDP to define the risks that small-holders may face in trying to adopt climate resilient measures. These risks could be described in section B.4.

6. STAP encourages UNDP to identify indicators to measure and monitor the adaptation benefits. This will enable monitoring the adaptation outcomes and strengthen the additional cost reasoning.

7. Further references that may help during project development:

a. International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability, Volume 11, Issue 1, 2013, Assessing the potential of SRI management principles and the FFS approach in Northeast Thailand for sustainable rice intensification in the context of climate change DOI: 10.1080/14735903.2012.658648, Abha Mishra, Prabhat Kumar & Andrew Noble.

b. Climate and Development, Volume 5, Issue 1, 2013, The stress of climate change on water management in Cambodia with a focus on rice production, DOI:10.1080/17565529.2013.771570, Thomas Murphy*, Kim Irvine & Mickey Sampson, pages 77-92.

c. Sovacool, B. et al "Expert views of climate change adaptation in least developed Asia". Journal of Environmental Management 97, pages 78-88. 2012.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	<p>STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved.</p> <p>Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.</p>
2. Minor revision required.	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency: (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.</p>
3. Major revision required	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>Follow-up: (i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</p>