

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 7, 2008

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

I. PIF Information

GEFSEC Project ID: 3736

GEF agency Project ID: 2913

Country: Ethiopia:

PROJECT TITLE: Mainstreaming agro-biodiversity conservation into the farming systems of Ethiopia.

GEF Agency: UNDP

Other Executing partners: Government of Ethiopia

GEF FOCAL AREA (s): Biodiversity BD SO2 Mainstreaming BD **GEF-4 Strategic Program(S):** BD SP 4 and SP 5

Name of Parent Program/ Umbrella Project: Not Applicable

Full size project **GEF Trust Fund**

II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

1. Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):
Consent

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. The proposal provides a thorough description of the main problems facing agro-biodiversity conservation in farming systems in Ethiopia, as well as a set of comprehensive project components that will attempt to address the problems. STAP provides its consent to this proposal, but would like to raise the following points to help strengthen the full project brief prior CEO endorsement.
3. The PIF indicates that the extension package in Component 1 and the market incentives under component 2 (designed to increase trading in agro-biodiversity friendly products) will be "tested." The full project proposal should clarify how this test will be conducted. In a brief review of the literature, STAP's impression is that donor-funded marketing schemes to generate new product niches or expand demand for existing "eco-friendly" products are rarely successful and thus a careful test of the project's hypotheses is important. Given the field interventions of these components will be done on a pilot basis, STAP encourages the UNDP to consider a careful experimental design that includes baselines and control groups to measure the impact of these field interventions. STAP is willing to advise in the design of such a test should the UNDP request it.
4. Under the assumption that the pilot projects are successful, the full project proposal should provide some evidence that the initiatives could scaled up – is there evidence of a large demand for certified local Ethiopian cultivars or an example of a successful program elsewhere that is similar to the one proposed here that was scaled up? Perhaps just a few communities protecting their agrobiodiversity is sufficient for global environmental benefits, and thus no scaling up is needed. The full project brief should address this issue.
5. Component 3 focuses on the following action: "Wild areas will...be set aside for the economic crops for which Ethiopia is the centre of genetic origin (coffee, enset, teff, durum wheat, sesame and noug seed) and managed to continue nurturing wild relatives" As this sentence is written in the passive voice, one cannot determine who will set aside and manage these lands and what incentives will be offered for them to do so. Set asides almost always require public funds: either to pay performance incentives to farmers or to fund enforcement of government-mandated and managed set asides.
6. A well known problem with land management in Ethiopia are the management incentives generated by the land tenure system. Without secure tenure, it's possible that in-situ agrobiodiversity conservation will be difficult. The full project brief should address whether the land tenure system is supportive of the proposed actions and, if it is not, describe how the project will address this issue.
7. Component 1 states that climate change and gender will "...receive special attention." in the pilot areas. The "whys" and "hows" will need to be addressed in the full project brief.
8. The additional initiative based around "mechanisms for compensating farmers for the services delivered by an improved forest will be investigated and a PES scheme established for the coffee forest" is the

entire project focus in other GEF-related projects because such initiatives are difficult to implement. STAP believes that this action needs further clarification before being approved as part of the final project. Efforts to create payment systems for hydrological services have been difficult in other parts of the world and the evidence base for their effectiveness in changing the status quo land use patterns is slim. Thus unless a substantial portion of this budget will go to this initiative and unless the project is carefully designed so that its effectiveness can be quantitatively measured (likely will need to include control groups and baseline measures), STAP believes that this initiative may not be a cost-effective use of GEF funds. Moreover, the full project document should provide some evidence with regard to the connection between forest cover and hydrological services: in many parts of the world, this relationship is controversial and not clear enough to establish a payment system.

| <i>STAP advisory response</i> | <i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i> |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Consent | 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. |
| 2. Minor revision required. | 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"> (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (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 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 revision required | 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. |