

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: March 17, 2016
Screener: 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:	9330
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Madagascar
PROJECT TITLE:	Sustainable Agriculture Landscape Project
GEF AGENCIES:	World Bank
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Environment, Ecology, Sea and Forests
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

STAP acknowledges the World Bank's proposal on "Sustainable Agriculture Landscape Project" in Madagascar. STAP notes the project was conceptualized based on lessons learned from previous World Bank projects in Madagascar on irrigation and watershed management. This should help inform the project based on learning, which STAP supports. STAP highly encourages the World Bank, therefore, to equally draw from its projects in Madagascar on biodiversity and forestry for the project design.

Below, STAP recommends additional points to be addressed in the design of the project.

1. Based on the project funding sources (biodiversity portfolio, sustainable forest management programme, and land degradation portfolio), the project aims "to improve agricultural productivity and management of associated natural resources in selected landscapes" by linking biodiversity conservation, sustainable forest management (SFM) and sustainable land management (SLM). As currently written, the project focuses predominantly on SFM and SLM measures. STAP recommends justifying the selection of only SFM and SLM measures (as opposed to landscape management that integrates SFM and SLM into biodiversity conservation) to address the objective.

2. STAP concurs with the project developers that a landscape approach is suitable to address the drivers of environmental degradation the project aims to tackle. The document begins to define the landscape approach, but further details would be useful to strengthen its rationale. STAP recommends, therefore, for the project developers to detail the approach further in relation to the drivers.

3. STAP suggests describing the social and economic context of the stakeholders. This information will assist in understanding the key relationships between the social, economic and biophysical variables. This will contribute towards applying a social-ecological systems-based approach, which STAP recommends applying given the cross-cutting nature of the project. STAP recommends using the Resilience, Adaptation Pathways and Transformation Assessment (RAPTA) Framework to analyze the common drivers of

environmental degradation, identify interventions and build adaptive pathways into the project development through a resilience, adaptation and transformation lens. STAP encourages building adaptive pathways given the parent program is expected to last 20 years.

Information about the RAPTA can be found at www.stapgef.org or by contacting the STAP Secretary, Thomas.Hammond@unep.org

4. STAP recommends specifying the scale of the project, spatially. It is unclear whether a watershed is the main scale. STAP also recommends analysis of the long term effects of increased irrigation on groundwater levels, and the risk of salinization.

Furthermore, it would be valuable to connect the scale of the project to higher and lower scales. This will inform cross-scale interaction, connections and feedbacks, important in addressing the drivers or achieving the objective. Analyzing scales also would help with linking this project to its parent program.

5. It would be valuable to detail how the risks in Annex 1 were assessed, and what are the responses to these risks. This information is important for this type of project that links environment, social and economic factors. It is also unclear whether future activities would require integration to successfully address potential future shocks “and if so, how the project proposes to deal with these shocks through integrated approaches. Annex 2 provides some information on climate shocks that STAP recommends to expand in the main section.

6. It is unclear whether stakeholders have been involved, or how they will be involved, to develop the project activities. STAP recommends detailing how the project plans to involve the range of stakeholders that are important to designing and implementing the project (e.g. communities/individuals representing forestry, biodiversity, and agriculture interests). It is also important for the project to include information on potential conflicts between the stakeholders, and how the project plans to resolve them, given the multiple areas of intervention.

7. STAP encourages for the project to include a knowledge management and learning component, especially given the scale of the project (e.g. 4 watersheds across the country with varied agro-ecologies). At the moment, the knowledge base monitoring systems are focused on data generation, and intra-project use instead of learning and wider knowledge dissemination.

<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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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. <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>
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal</p>

<p>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>
---	---