

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: 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: 5125

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Lebanon

PROJECT TITLE: Sustainable Agricultural Livelihoods in Marginal Areas (SALMA)

GEF AGENCIES: World Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: GoL, Ministry of Agriculture

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 welcomes the World Bank's proposal "Sustainable Agricultural Livelihoods in Marginal Areas (SALMA) in Lebanon. The proposal addresses an important climate-sensitive sector in a vulnerable region; and the project matches the focal area strategic objectives well. That said, STAP believes that the project could be strengthened further by a more comprehensive description of the intended interventions. Currently, these are lacking in detail, and it is therefore difficult to assess and validate the scientific and technical underpinnings of the proposed interventions. STAP recommends addressing the following points during the proposal / project development:

1. STAP recommends providing further detail on each component, and its expected outcome. Also, it suggests detailing explicitly the adaptation benefits expected and indicators for each benefit in the full proposal. Currently, the benefits are not specific in the description of the adaptation activities in B.2. Likewise, STAP recommends including the baseline data, or a timeline when the data will be collected, as well as explain how the baseline will be measured and monitored during project implementation. Furthermore, STAP recommends defining further to what extent the baseline activities will help in addressing future climate change. This information will strengthen the additional cost reasoning of the intended interventions.
2. In the project overview, STAP recommends detailing farmers' access to markets in the targeted region (proximity to markets, etc.). This information is important for evaluating farmers' ability to successfully adopt high value horticultural crops as a result of irrigation.
3. To further understand the climate change risks facing the targeted regions, STAP recommends adding climate change projections for Lebanon, or the project region if possible, in the project overview section. One source for this information is Lebanon's climate change profile from UNDP and the University of Oxford School of Geography and the Environment <http://www.geog.ox.ac.uk/research/climate/projects/undp-cp/index.html?country=Lebanon&d1=Reports>
4. Under component two, STAP recommends detailing further what tree species will be used in the afforestation efforts. If the tree species are not native, STAP suggests the World Bank undertakes a risk assessment in the use of exotic species during project development.
5. Additionally, it would be useful for the full proposal to consider the implications of climate change on the tree seedlings, and other forest area changes. Information in the IPCC Special Report on Extremes (Managing the risks of extreme events and disasters to advance climate change adaptation, IPCC 2012) may be relevant.

6. Under component 3, STAP recommends defining the methodology that will be used to train the project recipients to estimate and monitor the carbon stock changes. One potential methodology (and tools) the World Bank may wish to consider is the UNEP/GEF Carbon Benefits Project, which is setup to use Tier 1, 2, 3 default values (The GEF Secretariat has further information on this methodology and suite of tools.).

<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>