

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: September 24, 2014

Screener: Veronique Morin

Panel member validation by: Anand Patwardhan
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT SPECIAL CLIMATE CHANGE FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 6927

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Egypt

PROJECT TITLE: Integrated Management and Innovation in Rural Settlements

GEF AGENCIES: IFAD

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation

Ministry of Environmental Affairs

GEF FOCAL AREA: Climate Change

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 welcomes IFAD's proposal on integrated management and innovation in Egypt, focusing on rural communities. STAP believes the proposal could be strengthened further by addressing the following recommendations during its development:

1. Please provide evidence of positive outcomes from previous projects focused on resettling populations for the purpose improving agricultural activities as an adaptation strategy. Additionally, specify how this evidence will be applied in the design of this project.
2. STAP recommends defining further the adaptation benefits (including the indicators to be used to measure and monitor adaptation benefits) and the additional cost reasoning (The latter is referred to incremental cost reasoning in the proposal, page 7.). Currently, this information is not described clearly in the project overview section.
3. While important, poverty is not the only dimension of vulnerability. STAP recommends more careful consideration of villages to be targeted for intervention. Further, this selection should also consider issues of replication and scaling up – establishing the viability of the interventions would be important for ensuring their wider adoption.
4. Some elements of the PIF would benefit from further clarification during the course of project development. For example, on page 9 there is reference to "investment in adaptive equipment" – it is not clear what this refers to. Regional climate modeling is useful; however, the project needs to better reflect the already existing base of information on regional climate projections (see, for example, Terink et al, 2013) – and the way in which it is being used currently for agricultural planning and decision-making.
- 5) The PIF refers to the climate proofing of value chains. However, the rationale for how this would work is not clear. What is the relative proportion of subsistence to commercial agriculture? Is the focus primarily on post-harvest operations or further processing? Reducing losses and improving efficiency of these operations would seem to be a baseline activity; regardless of climate change. Further, given the range of climate change projections, to what extent are diversification options feasible?

Some recent sources of relevant scientific/ technical information:

McCarl, B. A., Musumba, M., Smith, J. B., Kirshen, P., Jones, R., El-Ganzori, A., ... & Hynninen, R. (2013). Climate change vulnerability and adaptation strategies in Egypt's agricultural sector. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*, 1-13.

Fahim, M. A., Hassanein, M. K., Khalil, A. A., & Abou Hadid, A. F. (2013). Climate Change Adaptation Needs for Food Security in Egypt. *Nature and Science*, 11(12), 68-74.

Terink, W., Immerzeel, W. W., & Droogers, P. (2013). Climate change projections of precipitation and reference evapotranspiration for the Middle East and Northern Africa until 2050. *International Journal of Climatology*, 33(14), 3055-3072.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Concur	STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. 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.
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	<p>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:</p> <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	<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> <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 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>