

# 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: March 20, 2015  
Screener: Kristie Ebi  
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:	7997
PROJECT DURATION:	4
COUNTRIES:	Uganda
PROJECT TITLE:	Integrating Climate Resilience into Agricultural and Pastoral Production in Uganda, through a Farmer/Agro-Pastoralist Field School Approach
GEF AGENCIES:	FAO
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF)
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):  
**Concur**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the FAO proposal "Integrating climate resilience into agricultural and pastoral production in Uganda, through a farmer / agro-pastoralist field school approach." The proposal aims to improve knowledge management and through the implementation of field-based adaptation strategies at multiple levels. The overall objective is to institutionalize a knowledge management process through agro-pastoral / farmer field schools (APFFS).

STAP looks forward to further details in the full proposal. Issues that should be addressed in the full proposal include:

1. The proposal states that climate-resilient APFFS are currently implement in only small fragmented areas (n=4,000) and that these are not assessments of climate resilience. And yet, the components repeated state they will upscale experiences, lessons learned and best practices from these APFFS, including those from other countries and projects. It would be helpful to understand how these experiences, lessons, and practices will provide the basis for climate-resilient agricultural practices if that is not a goal of the current APFFS. STAP suggests providing more clarity on what lessons have been learned from the APFFS in Uganda, how that information was collected, who decided on the lessons learned, and how those lessons learned were / will be evaluated to determine if they are appropriate to increase climate resilience in the pilot sites in the cattle corridor. STAP suggests providing similar information on best practices. Further, the full proposal should describe how lessons learned / best practices will be identified in the proposed project.

2. STAP would appreciate information on how "climate resiliency" will be determined, including under what scenarios, projections, and time frames. For how long might the agricultural practices be considered resilient (e.g. to what further increases in temperature and changes in precipitation)? STAP would appreciate fuller details on which climate change projections will be used in the proposed project, including

the time frame(s) of interest and why particular model(s) were chosen. It would be helpful to know who will choose the models and how the projections will be communicated to the stakeholders. It also would be helpful to incorporate different possible future socioeconomic development pathways when considering which adaptation options could be more resilient in coming decades.

3. The PIF mentions a variety of methods and tools, such as resource mapping, SEAGA, and SHARP, that should be described in the full project proposal.

4. Watershed management and commercial fishing systems are mentioned in component 2 but not described further. STAP would appreciate further information on how these will be incorporated into the project.

5. STAP would appreciate further detail on what investments are needed to operationalize the DSIP and Water for Agriculture Production Strategy.

6. STAP cautions that implementation of irrigation systems are associated with increased rates of malaria in other regions. It would be important for the project to include the Ministry of Health as a key stakeholder and to possibly include a health expert to consult on potential adverse health consequences of different types of agricultural practices. Further, the technical training could include a component to raise awareness of the potential health impacts of adaptation activities in agriculture.

7. Component 4 states that the current situation is there isn't an integrated assessment of climate resilience. STAP would appreciate further details in the full project proposal on how this will be achieved.

8. The PIF states the local climate risk in the pilot sites is high, and that disaster risk management in one area will be used to reduce this risk. How disaster risk management will be undertaken in the other pilot sites is not clear. STAP would appreciate description of what disaster risk management activities will be undertaken during the full project to reduce the risk.

9. The baseline projects on which the proposed project will build have / had funding of several hundred million US dollars. In addition to providing information on how the proposed project will coordinate with on-going projects, it would be helpful to describe relevant components in sufficient detail to ensure there will not be overlap between the various projects.

10. The full project proposal should provide a detailed description of the monitoring and evaluation plan. It also would be helpful to have details of the dissemination plan for the lessons learned.

11. STAP encourages including an explicit activity to develop a plan for scaling-up, including the amount of human and financial resources required.

12. STAP appreciates the comprehensive efforts to include gender throughout the PIF and looks forward to further development of this aspect in the full project proposal. However, it was surprising given this strong focus that the ministry or department responsible for women and children was not listed as a key stakeholder. Further, the PIF states that minimum female participation in APFFS will be 30%, and that equal participation of men and women in project conception, approval, and implementation will be ensured; it would be helpful to clarify this.

13. Anti-corruption measures, screening of NGO partners, and fund and administrative controls to prevent fraud should be described in the full project proposal.

14. The Africa Innovations Institute is another possible NGO partner.

15. The Framework of the Uganda National Climate Change Policy includes the objective to integrate climate change issues into planning, decision-making, and investments in all sectors. It would be helpful to understand how the proposed project contributes to broader climate change resilience in Uganda, not just in agriculture, and how the project will engage with a broad range of stakeholders to facilitate sustainable development for Uganda.

<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

	<p>“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.</p>
<p><b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b></p>	<p>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:</p> <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, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</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>
<p><b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b></p>	<p>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:</p> <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>