

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: 18 March 2008

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Michael Stocking

I. PIF Information

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3393

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: PIMS 3227

COUNTRY: Uganda

PROJECT TITLE: SIP: **Mainstreaming SLM processes at district and central levels to overcome land degradation in the cattle corridor of Uganda.**

GEF AGENCY: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: **GoU (MINISTRY AGRICULTURE AND DISTRICTS)**

GEF FOCAL AREAS: Land Degradation

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): LD SP 2 in TerrAfrica 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 welcomes this proposal on mainstreaming sustainable land management to overcome land degradation in the Cattle Corridor of Uganda. The project commendably sets achievable targets for delivering change. Uganda has received substantial bilateral and multi-lateral funding for agricultural and rural development, including the Cattle Corridor zone where substantial changes in land use are now occurring including the conversion of rangeland to cultivation of bananas and other crops. STAP believes that an approach that addresses co-benefits for human development alongside delivery of global environmental benefits is an urgent priority before environmental degradation gets any worse. There are a number of issues in the PIF that STAP believes should strengthen the proposal in the context of GEF funding and the requirement to deliver global environmental benefits. These are as follows -
 - 1) Define explicitly the global environment benefits (GEBs). Section II does not include explicit definition of GEBs, yet manifestly the SLM approach to be adopted should bring synergetic benefits for climate change and biodiversity, as well as hopefully for global aspects of land degradation control. It also does not state how achieving these benefits will be measured and monitored, yet GEF and its agencies need not only to track the impacts but also show longer term how SLM will bring sustainable benefits.
 - 2) The proposal seeks to address adoption of sustainable land management through incentives. The role of incentives in agriculture and land projects is fraught with problems, not least in whether they are sustainable and might create a 'dependency culture'. Greater detail on what are the proposed incentives "...to encourage local communities to adopt sustainable livelihood options." could be specified further, as well as what analysis, approaches, will be used to define these incentives (for example - specific policy analyses).
 - 3). The proposal could elaborate further on what could be the proposed incentives to curb deforestation effects as a result of increased charcoal use. These are only briefly summarized in the project results framework.
 - 4). In addition, STAP would like to see some analysis on the efficiency of using charcoal improved stoves as a response measure to improving resource use. Refer to -
<http://home.worldcom.ch/redi/charcoal.html>
<http://www.sundayvision.co.ug/detail.php?mainNewsCategoryId=7&newsCategoryId=132&newsId=616828>

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

<i>response</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.	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: <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 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.
3. Major revision required	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. 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.