



## Summary Review Proposal Groups: 1, 3, and 5

Asia-Pacific Network for Global Change Research

25–26 October 2012, Siem Reap, Kingdom of Cambodia



# Review

## GROUP 1

### STRENGTHS

- ❖ Capacity building in agricultural sector is crucial and well addressed

### WEAKNESS

- ❖ Scope of the research is too wide (aquaculture, farming, crops); for three countries it needs more than three years
- ❖ Objectives is too complex and what is the focus point of Obj.1.
- ❖ Target groups are not elaborated (farmers? fishermen? )
- ❖ Methods: (more on environmental factors) Cobb-Douglas=Capital + Labor  
[include in the number of labor (fishermen, farmers); must be in different model]
- ❖ More details on adaptive assessment (e.g. Measurement parameters of gained knowledge, understanding...)

### RATINGS

**FAIR**

# Review

## GROUP 3

<b>STRENGTHS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>❖ Has a convincing title, however it will be better if exploring the balance between adaptation and mitigation</li></ul>
<b>WEAKNESS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>❖ Less clear what is expected and how things are to be done</li><li>❖ Reasoning or importance of the study is less elaborated</li><li>❖ It is difficult to identify link between outcome, output and method</li><li>❖ Methodology needs to be improve (Assessment of GHG (appropriate methods, equipment bec. you cannot collect it from the household)</li><li>❖ Bibliographical list and general writing accuracy need to be improved</li><li>❖ Puts little emphasis on Adaptation (more on mitigation measures)</li><li>❖ Incomplete information (leading countries, collaborating countries)</li><li>❖ No clear direction of the research</li></ul>
<b>RATINGS</b>	<b>FAIR</b>

# Review

## GROUP 5

<b>STRENGTHS</b>	The study represents and handles specific issue in the region; important issue addressed
<b>WEAKNESS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input type="checkbox"/> In a way, it seems to be too ambitious to expect reliable climate projection model for the outcome (potential uncertainties from single RCM Projection)</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> The embedding of output and policy making shall be precisely described</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> The areas of the study are too broad (catchment areas, agriculture areas, etc...); study scope is not defined</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Methods are not well elaborated (e.g. Are you using the same methods in different areas: agri., catchment?)</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> the link between adaptation and the water resources are not clear</li></ul>
<b>RATING</b>	<b>GOOD</b>

# General Suggestions

- The flow of the research; the linkages between the main issue and adaptation should be more clear.
- All the three proposal should be more focused to address their problem statement.
- Proposal No. 1 should be on the proper format to make evaluation easier
- Proposal No. 3 is not clear whether an adaptation or mitigation related project (look like addressing mitigation only); should have complete information
- The study should consider feasibility and workability given the time frame and limited resources

# Best Proposal

- Group 5

*“Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment of Water Resources in Lowland Rural Areas in the Southeast Asia”*

Reason:

Considerably has a better focus/research

Crucial need of study among others