

# 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: 6 February 2008

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Michael Stocking

### I. PIF Information

**GEFSEC PROJECT ID:** 3382

**GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:** P107841

**COUNTRY(IES):** NIGER

**PROJECT TITLE:** SIP: Community Driven SLM for Environmental and Food Security

**GEF AGENCY(IES):** World Bank

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:**

**GEF FOCAL AREAS:** Land Degradation,

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S):** LD-SP1

**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 believes the proposal requires strengthening in a number of scientific and technical aspects that are important to the GEF. First, the current outputs lack specificity and are little different to Outcomes. For example, in the key Component 3 for the GEF (poverty and environmental monitoring) neither the number of surveys or the regional coverage of communities is specified. The generic nature of the linkage between poverty and environmental degradation is controversial in the scientific literature, and STAP therefore believes that the Outcomes and Outputs especially for this Component need to be informed by carefully-chosen indicators that will track the linkages and provide evidence that investments in SLM do bring about gains in human wellbeing as well as benefits for the environment. Second, the project could be strengthened by explicit cross-referencing to the results framework and the expected global environmental benefits of the SIP, especially those that are relevant to extremely degraded dryland environments. For example, it is known that it is difficult and costly to increase carbon and below-ground biodiversity in soils that have been 'mined' for their nutrients over many decades and are now extremely degraded. With regards to the global benefit of "an increase in carbon sequestration through SLM practices", the SIP results framework provides a performance indicator to measure soil quality, including carbon, against baseline data. Similarly, increases in biodiversity and water storage require accessible and measurable indicators. How are the global benefits to be measured and monitored, and who will do it? How sustainable will the M&E system for global benefits be after the end of the project? Third, the project claims to promote community-driven SLM using a multi-stakeholder approach. Past experience of such attempts, especially with very poor communities, is that well-intentioned efforts of including the community voice have failed and that the measures of SLM that resulted favored the wealthier and the technical bias of professionals. indeed, one of the key barriers not mentioned in the PIF is the fact that many techniques and methods promoted were inappropriate and/or inaccessible to the resource-poor. How will the project overcome these major obstacles? Finally, climate risks are especially large for dryland environments such as in Niger. The proposal should be strengthened by reference to how far the SLM techniques will enable adaptation and coping mechanisms by the rural poor to be implemented and how far such risks can be mitigated for the global benefits, especially of increasing carbon stocks. No cost-effectiveness estimates of CO<sub>2</sub> abatement are given, nor of information on the steps to obtain such estimates during project preparation.

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

<i>response</i>	
<b>1. Consent</b>	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.
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	<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"> <li>(i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues</li> <li>(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</li> </ul> <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>
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	<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>