# 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, 2015 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**: 9050
**PROJECT DURATION** : 5
**COUNTRIES** : Chad
**PROJECT TITLE**: Building Resilience For Food Security and Nutrition in Chad's Rural Communities
**GEF AGENCIES**: AfDB
**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS**: MinistÃ¨re de l'Environnement et de l'Agriculture du Tchad
**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 African Development Bank's (AfDB) proposal "Building resilience for food security and nutrition in Chad's rural communities". The project aims to improve food security and nutrition by strengthening the resilience of agro and sylvo-pastoral systems in the Sahelian regions of Chad. STAP believes this objective illustrates well the important relationships between global environmental benefits and sustainable development â€“ two reinforcing topics the AfDB is well-placed to address given its work on environmental sustainability and poverty reduction.

To strengthen the project, STAP recommends for the AfDB to address the following points as it develops the proposal.

1. STAP appreciates the maps in the project justification (section II) used to illustrate land use and land cover, the eco-regions of the country and the relevant ecosystems for biodiversity conservation. This information is valuable for contextualizing the project. To further strengthen this section, STAP recommends describing in more detail the land degradation issues and other threats to food security and nutrition.

2. Currently, the proposal suggests the GEF grant will be used to implement an integrated approach that addresses the multiple drivers of environmental degradation, food insecurity and poverty by applying sustainable land management, sustainable forest management and biodiversity conservation approaches and techniques. STAP recommends that the project defines this integrated approach, specifying what are the global environmental benefits and socio-economic benefits, and how the approach will contribute to achieving these benefits.

When considering an integrated approach for resilience, the AfDB may wish to consider the Resilience Adaptation Transformation Assessment (RATA) Framework developed by STAP and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO). The resilience framework will assist the proponent to characterize the system, identify key controlling variables influencing food security in the Sahelian region of Chad, and develop a coordinated suite of activities that targets the most vulnerable aspects. The RATA is an iterative and participatory multi-stakeholder assessment that aims to maintain and improve the resilience of social-ecological systems. The framework is applicable across scales (e.g. field level, sub-national level), and agro-ecosystems (e.g. agriculture, livestock, mixed crop and livestock systems). It will be applied in the integrated approach program "Fostering sustainability and resilience for food security in sub-Saharan Africa" â€“ an initiative that shares common traits with this project. STAP and CSIRO will be happy to advise the

AfDB on the application of the resilience framework. The technical report on the resilience framework can be downloaded at: http://www.stapgef.org/the-resilience-adaptation-and-transformation-assessment-framework/

3. As aforementioned, STAP believes a conceptual framework, such as the RATA, is needed to strengthen the logic of the proposal. For example, the RATA approach could be particularly useful in revising the activities planned in Component 2. Currently, the activities on ecosystem management appear to be primarily focused on biodiversity conservation, and it is not clear how these actions will contribute to the objective on "enhancing food security and nutrition through sustainable resilient agro-sylvo-pastoral systems". The RATA will be helpful in strengthening the reasoning between defining the driving variables and identifying responses targeting food security and the resilience of mixed agriculture and pastoral systems.

Additionally, STAP has argued that biodiversity conservation needs to be mainstreamed into policies and programs on development. It would be desirable to frame the proposed biodiversity activities as such, proposing links between biodiversity enhancement and food security. For further information on mainstreaming biodiversity, the AfDB could consult B. Huntley and K. Redford "Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Practice: A STAP advisory document". (2014)The Global Environment Facility.

4. To further strengthen the incremental reasoning, STAP recommends defining the indicators for each global environmental benefit. For example, how will carbon stocks be estimated and monitored that result from sustainable forest management, how will improvements to biodiversity conservation be measured, and what measurements will be used to assess sustainable land management and pastoral management?

5. The project developers also may wish to consult M. van Ginkel et al. (2012) in defining an integrated systems approach. The paper outlines the steps needed for a community participatory approach for managing crop and pastoral systems in drylands. (van Ginkel, M. et al. "An integrated agro-ecosystem and livelihood systems approach for the poor and vulnerable in dry areas" Food Security 5(6): 751-767.).

6. Furthermore, STAP suggests describing how the project will strengthen cross-sector planning between different government ministries, community-based organizations and stakeholders groups that are integral to the application of an integrated approach. Additionally, it will be important to specify the different roles of the stakeholders, and how their combined roles will contribute to reporting on multiple global environmental outcomes, and knowledge management.

7. In component 1 and 2, STAP recommends detailing land users' knowledge and approaches on agro-sylvo-pastoral systems, and ecosystem management. The proposed activities in these components can be understood and reasoned further by describing the characteristics, the strengths, and limitations of local approaches and technologies, and how the interventions seek to complement this local knowledge. This information also will be useful for identifying scaling-up opportunities based on local capacity.

Further recommendations on scaling up include: 1) identifying indicators that measure scaling-up activities; and, defining opportunities for learning across sectors in order to encourage a systematized process for scaling-up. The AfDB may wish to refer to the following source on scaling-up: Gundel, S. et al. "Scaling-up strategies for research in natural resource management: A comparative review". (2003). UK Department for International Development (DFID).

| *STAP advisory response* | *Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed* |
|---|---|
| **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:<br><br>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised.<br>(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. |
| **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:<br><br>(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.<br><br>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP's concerns.<br><br>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. |