

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: May 10, 2016
Screener: 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:	9407
PROJECT DURATION:	4
COUNTRIES:	Regional (Egypt, Jordan)
PROJECT TITLE:	Healthy Ecosystems for Rangeland Development (HERD): Sustainable Rangeland Management for Biodiversity Conservation and Climate Change Mitigation
GEF AGENCIES:	UNEP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	IUCN
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):
Concur

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP acknowledges UNEP's proposal "Healthy Ecosystems for Rangeland Development (HERD): sustainable rangeland management for biodiversity conservation and climate change mitigation. The PIF highlights the importance of rangelands for the global environment, and pastoral livelihoods. STAP appreciates the strongly evidence-based proposal that focuses on the human dimensions in rangeland management: community-based, participatory approaches, capacity-building, tenure, and learning. STAP is pleased to see the strong integration across scales, and linkages to other programs, and national strategies. STAP appreciates the clear and viable strategy for scaling up and out, and the well-developed approach to gender and knowledge management.

To strengthen the project design STAP recommends addressing the following points:

1. Once the target sites are known, STAP suggests detailing the rangeland characteristics. For example, what type of rangelands will be targeted (e.g. deserts, wetlands), what is the native vegetation, what animals graze in the rangelands, what are the socioeconomic characteristics of the pastoral communities? It also will be important to describe the rangeland management practices in the project sites, and take into consideration the multi-functional aspects of rangelands. If there are studies (published, or unpublished) about the specific rangeland sites it would be useful to reference them in the project design, especially regarding the local ecology. UNEP may wish to consider the following paper on the importance of managing the landscape heterogeneity of rangelands based on experience from Southern Africa: "Multifunctional Rangeland in Southern Africa: Managing for Production, Conservation, and Resilience with Fire and Grazing. 2013. McGranahan, D., et al. <http://www.mdpi.com/2073-445X/2/2/176>. STAP also suggests reviewing the results of the recent evaluation of the GEF funded Grasslands program in South Africa.

2. Once the target sites are defined and the types of rangelands specified, STAP recommends detailing the specific drivers of rangeland degradation. Currently, the drivers are too broadly defined to understand the root causes of rangeland degradation in the target sites. STAP appreciates that some of this analysis will be done under component 1 and 2. Therefore, it encourages UNEP to carry out a comprehensive problem analysis during the project design as it will strengthen the project rationale. The components were not detailed sufficiently, and this hampered understanding how the interventions could meet the objective.

3. It also would be useful to provide more information on biodiversity, and ecosystem services provided by rangelands. Biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services are key features of the objective, and the PIF (e.g. the project aims to increase knowledge about the value of rangelands and their ecosystem services “component 4”).

4. On global environmental benefits, STAP recommends specifying the methods that will be used to measure the benefits, and how they will be monitored. It also would be useful to clarify whether the project will monitor all the benefits listed in the PIF (e.g. climate adaptation, climate mitigation, biodiversity conservation, desertification, ecosystem services), or just indicators related to land degradation/desertification.

5. The PIF identifies the need for increased collaboration between multi-stakeholders to strengthen rangeland management in Jordan and Ethiopia. STAP recommends describing how these consultations will be done in a way that ensures the appropriate participation of the stakeholders. Potential conflicts between stakeholders and ways to address them should be considered, given the diversity and possibly competing interests in the group. Additionally, STAP encourages learning across sectors so that rangelands feature more prominently across policy sectors.

6. STAP proposes strengthening the climate risks and mitigation measures in section 4. STAP suggests using the resources provided in the CGIAR portal on climate change: <http://ccafs-climate.org/>

7. Additionally, STAP suggests considering ways to assess resilience and measures that will be needed to address stresses, such as climate change. For example, will there be a need to assess the number of animals and available forage based on rainfall patterns? Planning for adaptive management will be important in addressing climate, and other stresses/shocks, that risks the project's sustainability. STAP recommends applying the Resilience, Adaptation Pathways and Transformation Assessment (RAPTA) Framework to assess resilience and opportunities for adaptation and transformation to address change. Further information about the RAPTA and its guidelines are available at: <http://www.stapgef.org/the-resilience-adaptation-and-transformation-assessment-framework/>

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Concur	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple “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.
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	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>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised.</p> <p>(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>
3. Major issues to be considered during	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>project design</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>
------------------------------	---