

# 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 04, 2013

Screeener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Annette Cowie  
Consultant(s):

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT**    **GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 5522

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Libya

**PROJECT TITLE:** Sustainable Land Management and Conservation of Oases Ecosystems in Libya

**GEF AGENCIES:** FAO

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Environment General Authority (EGA), Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Marine Resources (MALMR)

Agriculture Research Center (ARC), The Grain Production Authority (GRA)

**GEF FOCAL AREA:** Land Degradation

### 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): **Major revision required**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP acknowledges FAO's proposal on "Sustainable land management and conservation of oases ecosystems in Libya". STAP believes further details are needed to define the global environmental problems in relation to land degradation. Furthermore, the components and their expected outcomes are too broad. For these reasons and other shortcomings listed below on project design, STAP rates the proposal major revision. STAP looks forward to FAO addressing the recommendations in the full proposal.

1. STAP highly encourages FAO to define further what specific problems the proposal will address, and how they will be tackled. Specifically, a coherent link is needed between the components, the project objective and the problem it seeks to address.
2. The proposal states it will target oases, but it states it will target "each agro-climatic zone" on page 16. STAP recommends defining clearly what agro-ecosystem is being targeted in the proposal. Furthermore, it is unclear whether the proposal will focus on conventional conservation farming practices (reduced tillage, efficient irrigation), or promoting traditional practices with traditional species (dates). Which methods will be used to determine the sustainable land management practices to be promoted? And how will adoption be facilitated
3. STAP appreciates the detailed narrative on global environmental benefits. However, STAP recommends identifying indicators for each of the proposed benefits outlined on page 16. It also would be useful to define the methodology used for estimating and monitoring each global environmental benefit.
4. STAP suggests adding climate change data in the project description. One possible source for this information is the World Bank's Climate Change Knowledge Portal "http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportal/index.cfm?page=climate\_data". Including this information will strengthen further the project's rationale on address sustainable land management within the context of climate change adaptation.
5. Furthermore, STAP encourages FAO to investigate what impact conservation agriculture has on reducing the communities' vulnerability to climate change. Once the project developers have defined the project sites, therefore, it would be useful to detail the following aspects in the proposal: i) why these communities are vulnerable to climate change risks (e.g. droughts); and, ii) how will conservation agriculture (and other adaptation measures "such as resilient crops) reduce the communities' vulnerability to drought, and/or increase their adaptive capacity to address

climate risks. These aspects will help define the vulnerability context of the affected communities, as well as their livelihood responses. The project developers may wish to consult further the GEF's "Operational Guidelines on Ecosystem-Based Approaches to Adaptation", GEF/LDCF.SCCF.13/Inf.06. October 2012. Adopting an ecosystem based approach will contribute to the outcomes of component 2 and 4.

6. To strengthen the project description narrative on the evidence of conservation agriculture on agricultural productivity and ecosystem services in North Africa (Tunisia and Morocco), the project developers may wish to draw from the following paper “ Kassam, A. et al "Conservation agriculture in the dry Mediterranean climate". Field Crops Research. 132, pages 7-17. 2012. The paper also highlights the need for a detailed assessment on the ecological and socio-economic conditions under which conservation agriculture could be adapted successfully by small-landholders in dry areas. Perhaps FAO can contribute to this evidence by designing and implementing the project in ways these relationships can be scientifically established.

7. One potential constraint for the adoption of conservation agriculture is access to affordable equipment by small land users. STAP suggests for this aspect to be defined as a risk associated with the sustainability of the project. Equally, STAP encourages FAO to define mitigation measures (section A.3). To explore options on conservation agriculture equipment, FAO may wish to consult the following source of information at Cornell University “<http://conservationagriculture.mannlib.cornell.edu/pages/resources/equipment.html>

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	<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>
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	<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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions.</li> <li>(ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.</li> </ul>
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	<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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(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.</li> <li>(ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</li> </ul>