

# 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: @@@@ @@, @@@@

Screeener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Michael Anthony Stocking  
Consultant(s):

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

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

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4352

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Tajikistan

**PROJECT TITLE:** Second Upland Agricultural Livelihoods and Environmental Management

**GEF AGENCIES:** World Bank

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Republican Center for Farm Privatization Support Project (Project Management Unit)

**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): **Consent**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

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): Consent

Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the proposal "Second Upland Agricultural Livelihoods and Environmental Management" by the World Bank. STAP only has a few comments that could strengthen the project. These are as follows:

1. STAP would welcome dialogue with the implementing agency in the development of the project document.
2. General comment: This project is still too general in its description and has only responded to the "What" question. It needs to go further and respond to the "How" questions and anticipate the type of expected results based on clearly defined verifiable indicators.
3. Description of the baseline: This is well presented but the applicant will benefit from a paragraph summarizing the major achievements in term of quantifiable results from the numerous projects undertaken. It is not, however, clear how the different components: Ia. Farm Productivity, Ib. Land Resource Management, Ic. Small-scale Rural Production Infrastructure and Id. Jamoat-level Rangel and Management are integrated in the landscape and their respective contribution to the general goal of this project.
4. The following questions will help the formulation: What is the current state of knowledge regarding sustainability of upland rural production and natural resource management? What is the state of knowledge regarding alternative production techniques/technologies amongst small-holder farmers in Tajikistan? - At what level of detail, and at what level of consistency across geographies is information available? - What are the forms and processes by which these recommendations have been developed, updated, and disseminated? To what level of local spatial detail are these recommendations now and what could they be in the future? What is the evidence of their influence on behavior, policy, and market development?
5. Results obtained in responding to these questions should be based on clear verifiable indicators of success at landscape level and should lead to a description and analysis of the lessons learned during the implementation of all these baseline projects. Based on these lessons the applicant should be able to design the new proposed project.

6. Incremental of additional activities: The project will raise the profile of the SLM agenda and increase government attention. Incremental financing (and thus economies of scale) would enable project beneficiaries to bring larger and less accessible land parcels, particularly rangelands, under effective management. Improved land management over a larger area would reduce the vulnerability of agroecosystems to soil erosion and pasture deterioration - major factors in degradation of uplands. The above statement is the key for the success of the project. It seems, however, that all SLM problems and solutions are envisaged and it might help to prioritize interventions based on a trade off analysis in order to choose those with a greater impact probability for scaling up. Potentials and limitations of different improved practices and technologies should be established.
  
7. However, there is an absolute absence of the methodology and process by which the specific interventions will be implemented. There is need of designing clear indicators of success and setting priority for the diverse interventions based on the comments and questions given in the above baseline section. The following additional questions could be of help in clarifying the interventions. What is the evidence base for implementation and impact measurement of the different practices? What are the information, technology, or knowledge gaps that constrain the different practices and adoption, how can they be closed, and what is their potential impact? What are the key leverage points for adoption and sustainability? The applicant need to have a consistent evaluation framework to assess the recommendations in terms of the evidence base, prior success or failure, feasibility, scalability, sustainability, all stakeholder's role specified, impact on the poor, cost, and role of others/policy.
  
8. The proposal states that land insecurity is one of the threats farmers face in addressing sustainable agro-ecosystems. The literature documents well that property rights are extremely important for sustainable land management, environmental management, and improved livelihoods - ([http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTARD/Resources/Sustainable\\_Land\\_Management\\_ebook.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTARD/Resources/Sustainable_Land_Management_ebook.pdf)) Nonetheless, farmers' land insecurity appears not to be addressed through the various project interventions. If this is the case, perhaps the World Bank could consider it in its suite of interventions. Alternatively, land insecurity could be raised as a potential risk to the project along with the mitigation measures.
  
9. The expected global environment benefits are not particularly clear. For example, the following global environment benefits qualify more as local/national benefits than global benefits - 1) "improvements in land cover through increased vegetative cover"; and, 2) "improved/increased water availability of project area". STAP encourages the World Bank to reconsider these two benefits as being global environment benefits. For example, "improvements in land cover..." could be characterized as a contributing factor (condition) for "avoided greenhouse gas emissions and carbon sequestration" - also an expected global benefit.
  
10. The proposal raises potential climate change risks. The project intends to address these risks through widespread adoption of sustainable land management practices. However, STAP encourages the World Bank to specify more clearly the adaptive capacity interventions, or how exactly the proposed sustainable land management practices will increase farmers' adaptive capacity, so they can cope with the expected climate variability (floods and droughts).

---

#### STAP advisory response explanations

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:
  - (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.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</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>