

# 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: October 08, 2011

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Ravindranath

Panel member validation by: Michael Anthony Stocking; Nijavalli H.

Consultant(s):

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT    GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4642

**PROJECT DURATION :** 3

**COUNTRIES :** Uzbekistan

**PROJECT TITLE:** Sustainable Agriculture and Climate Change Mitigation Project

**GEF AGENCIES:** World Bank

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Ministry of Agriculture

**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 believes the World Bank proposal "Sustainable Agriculture and Climate Change Mitigation Project" in Uzbekistan is scientifically and technically viable. The problem and baseline are well defined, and the project components are clear. STAP believes, however, the proposal could be strengthened in several ways. Its recommendations are listed below.

1. The linkage between the project Components, especially 1 and 2, is obscure and may have adverse socio-economic impacts at the local level. It is unclear, for example, whether the enhancement of financial service provision will be primarily taken up for the rehabilitation of I&D. What will be the distributive effects of this better financial access; will only local elites be able to take advantage; will this increase gender differentiation? In MFA projects in general because of their complexity and difficulty to manage, STAP would prefer to see a tighter focus on a core problem, bringing multiple global environmental benefits through a variety of routes such as reduced GHG emissions, C-sequestration and protected ecosystem service benefits. So, the project proponents are urged to re-examine the basket of activities, identify the complementarities and linkages, and more clearly specify the multiple GEBs with targets.
2. STAP appreciates that agri-business and the market access more generally is a driver for rural development and improved livelihoods. However, the link between such rural enterprises and GHG emissions needs to be made
3. Make the outputs more explicit. For example, it would be good to specify further how pilot demonstrations of renewable energy technologies the project will develop (component 1), or how many information dissemination workshops the project will organize (component 3).
4. STAP has a number of concerns over broad approaches/targets of the project as well as choice of technologies. There appears to be no intended financial cost-benefit analysis, which will be crucial in understanding the rationality for local people of taking up the elements of the project. For example,
  - a. The drivers of degradation of irrigated crop lands. Identification of drivers of degradation would assist in identifying the interventions.
  - b. Ecosystem services to be targeted under the LD FA need specifying
  - c. Scientific rationale for selecting RETs for intervention (such as Biogas, Solar and Biomass)
  - d. Why only off-grid technologies are considered and why not grid connected RETs.
  - e. How is climate resilience built into the project?

5. STAP acknowledges the World Bank's intentions to provide more accurate estimates of the expected CO<sub>2</sub> emission reduction for each renewable energy technology selected by the project beneficiaries. STAP would further recommend for the World Bank to specify what methodology (ies) will be used to estimate and monitor the CO<sub>2</sub> reduction generated by each technology. This will assist the project detail explicitly the global environmental benefits generated through renewable energy interventions. The information could be provided at the time of CEO endorsement.

6. Currently, the expected global environmental benefits generated through sustainable land management are described broadly – for example: "mitigation of irrigated land degradation" and "promoting water conservation in agriculture". STAP encourages a more explicit definition of the expected global environmental benefits generated through sustainable land management interventions.

7. One underlining assumption in the proposal is that the project will be able to reverse land degradation caused by irrigation. However, the proposal also should include the difficulties, associated with reversing salinity due to biophysical factors, and the potential risks of not restoring soil matter.

8. On knowledge management and uptake, STAP recommends for the World Bank to specify how its experience on irrigation-induced salinity in the region is expected to contribute/strengthen the project's effectiveness.

9. In the incremental reasoning, the proposal raises "pumping for groundwater extraction" as a potential measure for controlling and reversing irrigated land degradation. It is not clear to what extent the project intends to use groundwater extraction measures, and whether they will couple with groundwater recharge interventions. Perhaps the World Bank could clarify these issues further.

10. The proposal raises the climate change risks that will likely affect Uzbekistan – mainly intense warming across the country. It also states that the proposed activities will contribute to mitigating and adapting for water scarcity. However, the proposal does not appear to build- in water conservation measures, or adaptive capacity to deal with water scarcity. Given the projected climate variability in the region (1 to 2.50 Celsius as projected by ADAPT) along with the current trend in rising temperatures noted in the proposal (average annual temperatures increasing by 0.290 Celsius since 1951), STAP recommends for the World Bank to specify more clearly in the project framework, incremental reasoning, and climate change risks what water conservation technologies and adaptive capacity measures (including institutional capacity needs and information needs for addressing climate risks and resilience enhancement measures) the project will seek to address in its efforts to mitigate and adapt to climate change.

<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>	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"> <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> 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.
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	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.