

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: 5 February 2008

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Michael Stocking

I. PIF Information

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3373

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: P088887

COUNTRY(IES): Madagascar

PROJECT TITLE: SIP: Watershed Management

GEF AGENCY(IES): World Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Environment and Water and Forests.

GEF FOCAL AREA (S): Land Degradation

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): LD-SP1 & LD-SP2

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: Strategic Investment Program for Sustainable Land Management in Sub-Saharan Africa (SIP)

Full size project GEF Trust Fund

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

1. 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

2. While welcome as a strategic investment to tackle serious land degradation, the project proposal has a number of flaws which, in STAP's opinion, will render it problematic. First, this project has no science-based validity on REDD, and the linking justification from forests to production landscape is tenuous. The largest GEF-funded Component is No 3 (Watershed Development) and the only clue as to what it involves is hidden in the Project Framework. From Column 3 of the PF, it appears that the project is probably a standard watershed development and soil conservation project, the type of which has failed many times for a variety of social, cultural and technical reasons. The project appears to be lots of on-the-ground activity in terms of plans, frameworks, training and technical interventions. Such efforts have been tried in the past and the record of success is very patchy, unless truly innovative and participatory approaches are used. Second, STAP encourages the World Bank to state explicitly what global benefits the project will deliver. At present, this is absent in Section A where there is no explicit mention of how GEF-interests in GEBs will be monitored and measured. The presumption is that GEBs will not be measured, thereby missing the most critical evidence of attainment of global environmental benefits. Without such information this type of project would usually be ineligible for GEF financing. Third, STAP wishes to encourage strengthening the climate variability and change aspect of the watershed development component. For example, the proposal does not specify how the project intends to build capacity on climate variability and change, or what tools and methods land users will be encouraged to learn and use as part of the watershed management approach. These are crucial aspects if the project is not to follow a standard watershed management pathway that often is unrelated to the needs and aspirations of land users as well as the delivery of GEBs. STAP is concerned that the project will, in effect, undertake only standard activities of an agricultural/water engineering kind, with very little attention to delivering GEBs. The incrementality of the project is largely missing. One possible way to include this would be to cross-reference to SIP objectives and outcomes and to show how in the specific circumstances of Madagascar these relate to what this project and its components will achieve in terms of outcomes and outputs. However, at the moment, this information is not available in the PIF. Fourth, the project justification does not provide scientific evidence, or estimates, of carbon emissions resulting from deforestation in Madagascar. As a result, it is not clear what are the stated "global costs" to the overall production landscape that result from carbon emissions. More explicit details on the points above would strengthen the scientific validity of the project objective feature on "accounting for the superimposed effects of climate change".

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	STAP acknowledges that on scientific/technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasising any issues that could be improved and the proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor revision required.	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. One or more options that remain open to STAP include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (ii) Setting a review point during early stage project development and agreeing terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review <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>
3. Major revision required	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical omissions in the concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. Normally, a STAP approved review will be mandatory prior to submission of the project brief for CEO endorsement.</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>