

# 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 04, 2013

Screeener: 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:** 5272

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Kenya

**PROJECT TITLE:** Scaling up Sustainable Land Management and Agrobiodiversity Conservation to Reduce Environmental Degradation in Small Scale Agriculture in Western Kenya

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNEP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Ministry of Agriculture in collaboration with Alliance for Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA)

**GEF FOCAL AREA:** Multi Focal Area

### 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): **Minor revision required**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes UNEP's proposal on "Scaling-up sustainable land management and agrobiodiversity conservation to reduce environmental degradation in small scale agriculture in western Kenya". The proposal describes clearly the barriers and threats to sustainable land management and sustainable forest management in the Kakamenga forest ecosystem. The project description also provides valuable data on land degradation and land users' socio-economic conditions in western Kenya. This information assists in contextualizing the conditions land-users face as they, together with the project staff, attempt to improve land management practices and increase agricultural productivity in the target area.

STAP believes the proposal could be strengthened further by addressing the points below during the proposal development.

1. In the project framework, STAP suggests ensuring the indicators that are measurable. For example, the outcome indicators proposed for component 1 include agrobiodiversity and green water. Further details would be useful on how will these be quantified.
2. During the PPG phase, STAP recommends defining further the proposed components. Currently, these appear to be only briefly described on page 8 and 9. Furthermore, STAP recommends strengthening the document by improving its clarity and accuracy of expression. This includes addressing the following details " 1) Structure sequentially the description of land degradation followed by deforestation " or vice versa. Currently, the text goes back and forth between these two issues, and clarity is lost. 2) On page 5, specify that "...per capita income of \$480 is "per annum"..." 3) On page 5, specify "...3 million farming families own less than 2 hectares of land "each"." 4) On page 5 (paragraph 3), please note that loss of agrobiodiversity is not a land degradation process. STAP suggests correcting this phrase. 5) Similarly, on page 5 (paragraph 3), please note that "mitigation of" climate change is an ecosystem service. Thus, please correct this sentence. 6) Paragraph 16 does not appear to link with the rest of the text in this section, or correspond with the section heading. Please strengthen the coherence between the different paragraphs in this section. 7) Please clarify whether the issues listed on page 12 are priority issues of the KAPSLAMP, or of this proposal. Please describe further their relevance to coordination.
3. For component 1, STAP recommends adding a gender component to it. This may strengthen the ability to disaggregate by gender the capacity building, or learning, needs of men and women in the farmer-field schools. In this

regard, the project developers may wish to consider disaggregating data by gender in this component – for example, what are the learning outcomes of men and women and how did their learning, capacity building, contribute to improved agricultural productivity/agrobiodiversity conservation. Doing so will strengthen the project's ability to target one of the defined primary beneficiaries – female smallholder farmers. The project developers may wish to consider the following paper as they develop further component 1, including the gender aspects – 1) Najjar, D. et al., "Learning about sustainability and gender through farmer field schools in the Taita Hills, Kenya". International Journal of Educational Development. 2012 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2012.064> 2) Friis-Hansen, E. and Duveskog, D. "The empowerment route to well-being: an analysis of farmer field schools in East Africa". World Development. Vol.40, No.2 (2012): pp.414-427.

4. Additionally in component 1, STAP recommends describing further the LADA tool to be applied for the participatory monitoring and evaluation system for sustainable land management, and sustainable forest management interventions. STAP believes monitoring and evaluating are important components, especially in estimating and tracking the intended global environmental objectives. As such, STAP would like to see greater detail describing the LADA tool and how it will assist in estimating and monitoring the global environmental benefits associated with component 1.

5. For component 2, STAP feels that the PES component is poorly described, and lacks understanding of the requirements for a successful PES scheme, and the hurdles that need to be overcome. It is unclear what incentive commercial water users would have for buying ES? STAP recommends consideration of its advisory document on "Payment for Ecosystem Services and the Global Environment Facility", 2011. The document identifies potential threats to PES effectiveness, which could be minimized by describing the design choices and specifying indicators. The document can be accessed at – <http://stapgef.org/biodiveristy-and-biosafety>

6. The table in the incremental reasoning section is helpful in readily identifying the additional activities funded by the GEF, along with describing the global environmental benefits. STAP believes this section (and possibly the table) could be strengthened further by defining the methodologies and indicators that will be used to estimate and monitor the global environmental benefits. For example, STAP believes it would be valuable to detail how carbon, agrobiodiversity conservation and soil fertility will be estimated and their changes monitored (will the LADA tool be used for the latter?). Currently, this information appears to be missing in the proposal. For the table, STAP suggests defining specifically the global environmental benefits (e.g. carbon sequestration, improved land cover, agrobiodiversity conservation) along with their proposed impact indicators.

7. STAP would value further details on the World Bank's baseline project "Vi Agroforestry Agricultural Carbon Project". For instance, STAP would appreciate knowing further details about the carbon accounting, including how the small-farmer groups will measure carbon stocks and more generally – how the process will be implemented. For estimating and monitoring carbon stocks, the project developers may wish to suggest using the Carbon Benefits Project methodology (UNEP/GEF).

8. Additionally, STAP recommends for UNEP to contact FAO about its recently submitted proposal on "Development of SFM and support to REDD for dryland forests" (GEF ID 5083). The FAO's project will focus (in part) on assisting Kenya develop its national REDD+ strategy, including development of a national forest carbon accounting system, and participatory forest monitoring system to monitor forest carbon. Therefore, it would be desirable if the activities under the project #5272 (GEF ID) could be used to calibrate the methods being developed under #5083.

9. In the stakeholder section, STAP recommends detailing the actors' roles in relation to the components, and specifying their comparative advantage if applicable.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved.  Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.  Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency: (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to

	STAP's recommended actions.
3. <b>Major revision required</b>	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>Follow-up:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP.</li> <li>(ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</li> </ul>