

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 13, 2016
Screener: 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:	9153
PROJECT DURATION:	4
COUNTRIES:	Uruguay
PROJECT TITLE:	Climate-smart Livestock Production and Land Restoration in the Uruguayan Rangelands
GEF AGENCIES:	FAO
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries (MGAP); National Institute of Agricultural Research (INIA); Uruguayan Federation of Regional Centres of Agricultural Experimentation (FUCREA)
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 issues to be considered during project design

III. Further guidance from STAP

1. STAP welcomes this proposal to develop climate-smart strategies and practices to the livestock production sector in Uruguay. As noted in the PIF, there are considerable barriers to achieving real change in livestock management especially in the context of 'small' (by Uruguayan standards) farms. Therefore, there is a critical need to indicate in the proposal how these barriers will be tackled and how 'climate-smart livestock management (CLSM)' can progress from rhetoric to tangible reality. The current PIF shies away from identifying the action pathways from the current baseline to a technologically-enhanced set of practices that deliver multiple benefits both to the global environment and to human development. This careful linking of actions to outputs, and outputs to outcomes must be the main focus of the proposal as it is further developed.

2. Articulation of CSLM as a goal. STAP is somewhat perplexed "especially in the context of FAO's championing of the approach - that in this proposal there is no clear definition of what is actually meant by climate-smart livestock management and what broad goals it is intended to achieve. CSLM could be broadly defined as "livestock management that sustainably increases productivity, resilience (adaptation), reduces/removes greenhouse gases (mitigation), and enhances achievement of national food security and development goals." [Adapted from FAO sources].

3. To support point 2 above, STAP suggests that even at this PIF/PPG stage, the CSLM strategy is given some substance in order to guide the design of the project and to prevent the project reverting to a top-down technology introduction proposal. STAP would like to see:

a. A focus on improving livelihoods and income so that there is incentive for smallholder farmers to invest in climate-smart livestock management. It is imperative that any improved technologies for CSLM have a

solid evidence-base to show that they bring positive returns to small farmers under real-life farming conditions. STAP notes with some concern that the PIF assumes there will be no increase in production consequent on CSLM – see Table 1 with/without project scenarios. If this is true then the CSLM approach must reduce production costs for it to be viable for small farmers. These issues should be prominent in the proposal.

b. Combining practices that deliver short-term benefits with those that give longer-term benefits may help reduce opportunity costs and provide greater incentives to invest in better management practices. Time horizon issues need to be explicit, especially as most climate-smart agricultural practices incur establishment and maintenance costs. It can take considerable time before farmers benefit from them.

c. Access to markets and capital are key constraints for resource-poor farmers, and limit their ability to innovate and raise their income. This requires development plans with appropriate institutions at national to local levels, provision of infrastructure, access to information and training and stakeholder participation as well as security of tenure arrangements.

d. Resilience issues need to be included as part of the CSLM strategy. In comparable projects in other countries, a focus on the value-chain to ensure profitable outlets for livestock sales has been one way of promoting resilience. Resilience needs to be explicitly addressed as part of the CSLM Strategy. It should be noted that introduction of improved technologies can lead to loss of resilience, making farmers more vulnerable to external shocks and the risks listed in the PIF.

4. CSLM Practices. STAP appreciates that at the PIF stage, CSLM practices can only be broadly identified. However, the proponents do need to develop a thorough check-list of technologies, both old and new, that have potential and that could be tested against criteria for delivery of global environmental and development benefits. Climate-smart livestock management practices will certainly include: • Improved feeding strategies (e.g. cut 'n carry) • Rotational grazing • Fodder crops • Grassland restoration and conservation • Manure treatment • Improved livestock health • Animal husbandry improvements. These should be translated into practices suitable for the local ecologies and societies, and be subject to livelihood support and cost-benefit analysis.

In conclusion, STAP looks forward to this project going ahead. Linking CC mitigation with land restoration in the important livestock sector of Uruguay does indeed have many potential co-benefits both for the environment and human development. However, the proposal as it stands is paved with good intentions but largely devoid of how they will be delivered. Without a very clear articulation of both the CSLM Strategy and CSLM practices, along with the actions needed by stakeholders at all levels, this project is dangerously susceptible to reverting to standard top-down technology implementation with mere hand-waving at livelihood, gender, equity, resilience and sustainability issues. STAP urges that, after the PPG phase, the full project brief be scrutinised to ensure that these issues are addressed so that "the mind-set of stakeholders" will indeed be changed and CSLM becomes a reality.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Concur	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple “Concur” response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to: (i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised. (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to 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.

<p>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP's concerns.</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>
--	---