

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: October 18, 2012

Screeener: Guadalupe Duron

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

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT SPECIAL CLIMATE CHANGE FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 5147

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Georgia

PROJECT TITLE: Enhancing Resilience of Agricultural Sector in Georgia (ERASIG)

GEF AGENCIES: IFAD

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Agriculture (MOA)

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): **Minor revision required**

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP acknowledges the proposal "Enhancing Resilience of Agricultural Sector in Georgia" by IFAD. The proposal provides a comprehensive overview of the main challenges Georgia faces in the agricultural sector, in part driven by climatic variability and climate change. The data and information presented are useful in understanding the complexities driving the decline of agricultural productivity, and how communities and small-holders may be affected by future climate change outcomes. Nonetheless, STAP would like to have seen greater detail on the types of adaptive interventions proposed by IFAD among other aspects. STAP recommends, therefore, addressing the following points during the development of the proposal to strengthen further the scientific and technical underpinnings.

1. Some of the outcomes and outputs appear to be activities. Therefore, it would be useful to review these sections during the project development to ensure that outcomes represent the major downstream achievements to which the project will contribute; outputs are the project deliverables by the end of the project period; and, the activities are the processes leading to outputs.
2. While providing the additional cost reasoning for the adaptation interventions, it is important to characterize the non-climate stressors and risks for small-holder agriculture in the baseline – for example, why has the agriculture sector shifted from export-driven to subsistence? What is the availability of credit and income diversification options for small-holders? What are soil fertility conditions? These aspects are all important elements of the current vulnerability of the system, and it is important to consider the interaction in these areas between future climate change and the existing stresses and risk factors. Additionally, STAP suggests defining what types of soil and water conservation technologies will be used. Essentially, STAP recommends defining more clearly the adaptation activities and their contribution to the adaption benefits (e.g. adaptive capacity), along with how these benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation.
3. Further, the proposal suggests that many actions such as integrated watershed management plans or other measures to manage current climate variability may not fall within the baseline. STAP suggests clarifying this aspect in the baseline situation - and as described on page 6 there are existing weather-related risks. The central question, therefore, is the way in which climate change might alter the existing weather-related risks – through magnitude, frequency, or by creating new kinds of risks. This articulation is important for strengthening the additional cost reasoning.
4. The table in section B.2 is a useful tool to display the additional reasoning information. When the proposal is developed further, it would be useful to label the columns.

5. Under component 2, the project proponents may wish to consider conservation agriculture based on reduced, or no tillage. Besides retaining the soil, conservation agriculture can contribute towards improving soil structure and soil-water dynamics; therefore, targeting soil fertility and a host of sustainable soil management conditions that can contribute towards reducing small-holders' vulnerability to climate change. Besides the partners already identified by IFAD, it also may wish to consider looking into the CGIAR's work in Georgia on sustainable agriculture – for example, ICARDA who is testing and validating conservation agriculture practices in the region. For further information, please visit the following link - http://www.icarda.org/cac/gallery_images.asp?gallery_id=27

6. Under component 3, STAP recommends specifying further the climate index- based performance – including the type of index (e.g. – rainfall, other), and the source for climate data, and/or technologies, that will be used. Furthermore, it would be useful to outline the benefits and challenges of using climate index-based performance – including references to pilot studies (published and anecdotal) documenting these aspects.

7. STAP recommends integrating gender more thoroughly in the proposal. Currently, gender-related issues are only briefly noted, including in section B.3. Similarly, the intended socio-economic benefits and its links to adaption benefits are not defined explicitly in B.3.

8. Under risks, STAP recommends adding poor availability of robust and good quality climate data as a potential risk for implementing successful climate index-based insurance systems.

<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>