

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: 17 March 2008

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Michael Stocking

I. PIF Information

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3377

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: P099709

COUNTRY(IES): Mali

PROJECT TITLE: SIP: Restoring agricultural and pastoral productivity

GEF AGENCY(IES): World Bank and UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Environment and sanitation

GEF FOCAL AREAS: Land Degradation,

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

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: Strategic Investment Program for SLM 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): **Consent**

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP would like to raise a number of observations that should further strengthen the proposal in the context for GEF funding and the requirements to deliver global environmental benefits and to demonstrate impact in terms of sustainable change in environmental attributes. As this project has substantial intended linked benefits for the environment and development, STAP also raises methodological concerns.
 - 1- The proposal does not identify clearly what participatory methods will be used to design an SLM approach. There are a large body of methods and substantial experience, which STAP recommends to be consulted in choice of overall approach to engaging local communities, especially the poorest. It would be helpful to specify the methods clearly to ensure the appropriate stakeholders are included in developing the approach, and to verify the appropriate mechanisms are used to encourage participation.
 - 2- The proposal does not include how the the five global benefits the project intends to achieve will be measured and monitored. For example, what methods will be used to measure an increase in vegetation? An increase in carbon sequestration? And for POPs, what specific POPs will the project address? How will changes in these aspects be tracked within the project and what mechanisms are proposed to ensure that beneficial change is monitored after the project completes? These issues should be clarified further in the proposal in order to strengthen the scientific validity of how the global benefits will be achieved and the compliance with GEF requirements.
 - 3- On risks, the proposal does not include the risks that farmers may not adopt organic fertilizers (perhaps because they are not readily available, or too expensive, or other reasons), and/or other land management practices in which it may not be appropriate for farmers to invest (e.g. the interventions may be too labor intensive). The proposal does not specify how it intends to address the risks of non-adoption. Also, measuring carbon can be a methodological challenge. How does the project intend to overcome these barriers, as well as challenges related to increasing soil carbon in degraded areas.

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
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>