

# 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: April 15, 2014

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:** 5754

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Regional (Latin America and Caribbean)

**PROJECT TITLE:** IDB-GEF Climate-Smart Agriculture Fund for the Americas (PROGRAM)

**GEF AGENCIES:** IADB

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** private sector

**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 acknowledges the Inter-American Development Bank's (IDB) programmatic approach "Climate-Smart Agriculture Fund for the Americas". The initiative intends to catalyze sustainable land management practices in the agricultural, forestry and rangeland sectors through private investments. In particular, the program aims to enhance the resilience of agro-ecosystems amidst increasing population pressure and potential adverse effects of climate change on ecosystems. By applying climate smart agriculture practices, the program intends to address this objective, while generating multiple global environmental benefits.

STAP recommends for the program framework to be strengthened in the following ways:

1. STAP recommends detailing further the results framework, given the importance the GEF assigns to the prospects of achieving and reporting on measurable and larger scale results on the global environment and sustainable development through program approaches. Therefore, STAP recommends adding a program objective that is consistent with the expected global benefits (Currently, a program objective is missing from the framework.), and ensuring the outputs and outcomes are defined at a higher order so the project level information cascades logically from the program framework.

Additionally, the project proponents may wish to redefine the goal so it specifically addresses global environmental and development goals in Latin America and the Caribbean related to climate-smart agriculture. This could include issues related to mitigating climate change through sequestering carbon, and contributing to food security.

The IDB may wish to consult the GEF publication "Adding Value and Promoting Higher Impact Through the GEF's Programmatic Approach" for guidance on structuring a program, including defining comprehensively the results-based framework:

[https://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/publication/Programmatic\\_Approach.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/publication/Programmatic_Approach.pdf)

2. STAP recommends strengthening section C by describing the program rationale, defining explicitly the program objective(s), and detailing further the barriers. For example, STAP recommends detailing how the program intends to maximize global environmental benefits through cross-cutting activities (climate-smart agriculture), given this is one of the fundamental traits of a programmatic approach. Describing further the problem (e.g. the challenge of delivering food security without increasing biodiversity loss, land degradation and increasing greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture and deforestation), and linking it to the program

objective also will strengthen further the design and logic of the program. Detailing the principles of climate-smart agriculture applied through a landscape approach also can further strengthen this section. In this regard, IDB should consider the following sources when detailing the challenges of agricultural livestock and forestry sectors amidst climate change and increased pressure on agro-ecosystems: 1) Lal, R. 2013. Food Security in a changing climate. *Ecohydrology and Hydrobiology*: 13: 8-21. 2) Smith, P. 2013. Delivering food security without increasing pressure on land. *Global Food Security*: 2: 18-23.

Furthermore, STAP recommends defining how the fund will prioritize activities, and detail further how the fund will manage risks for activities that may not be economically sustainable.

3. The proposal states it will promote "climate resilient value chains". However, it will be useful to detail further this activity. In particular, STAP recommends for the program to include value chain analyses for the land management practices to be addressed by component 1 and 2. The value chains should rely on a framework that considers the economic, environmental and social dimensions of agricultural value chains, including accounting for consumption and disposal patterns of waste and its effects on ecosystems and climate change (amounts of greenhouse-gas emissions, the potential to sequester carbon and reduce greenhouse gases through the value chain). Focusing on the economic, environmental and social aspects of value chains reinforces the principles of climate-smart agriculture: increasing productivity and incomes while protecting the environment. Thus, addressing the complementarities between climate smart agriculture and these three pillars of value chains can contribute to delivering the expected global environmental benefits outlined in section F.

The following FAO sourcebook on climate-smart agriculture provides information on a potential value chain framework that IDB could rely on for the value chain analysis:  
<http://www.fao.org/docrep/018/i3347e/i3347e.pdf>

4. STAP recommends defining the methodology for estimating carbon stock changes from silvo-pastoral production systems. The detailed calculations also should be included in the final program document.

5. Similarly, STAP recommends detailing further the expected global environmental benefits in addition to carbon sequestration – for example, benefits associated with soil and water management (component 2). Additionally, defining development benefits also is recommended as the GEF seeks larger scale impacts from programmatic approaches on environmentally sustainable development.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>3. 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:            (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.            (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</p>