

# 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: 10 March 2008

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Michael Stocking

### I. PIF Information

**GEFSEC PROJECT ID:** 3276

**GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:** PIMS No. 3821

**COUNTRY:** Peru

**PROJECT TITLE:** Promoting Sustainable Land Management in Las Bambas

**GEF AGENCY(IES):** UNDP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S):** XStrata Trust Fund, Provincial Governments

**GEF FOCAL AREA (S):** Land Degradation,

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S):** SO1, SP1

**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. STAP welcomes this initiative to build capacity in both the institutions for SLM in the Las Bambas area and the local people, while harnessing private investment through the Las Bambas Trust Fund. While fully supportive of the concept for the project, STAP wishes to see (either in a revised PIF, if requested by GEFSec, or the documentation for CEO endorsement) further information that will make the project compliant with GEF requirements:
  - (1) What agreements do the project and local institutions have with Xstrata; how is the Trust Fund financed; what relation will the project participants have with Xstrata's own initiatives in Peru such as its Community Relations team - [http://www.lasbambas.com/english/xstrata/index.php?pSubPag=36&pIDPlantilla=3&pSubSeccion=1&id\\_menu=1&pSeccion=1&pPag=33](http://www.lasbambas.com/english/xstrata/index.php?pSubPag=36&pIDPlantilla=3&pSubSeccion=1&id_menu=1&pSeccion=1&pPag=33) ?
  - (2) The Expected Outcomes and Outputs are all with respect to take up of activities which may be supportive of SLM (e.g. 100% of government extension programmes applying participatory methodologies. Other than in quantification of Outcomes, there is little basic difference between Outputs and Outcomes. STAP would prefer to see some Outputs in the form of delivery of GEBs, including cross-focal area aspects such as biodiversity and water conservation. Currently, the project appears primarily to be about generating activities, irrespective of whether they deliver impact for the environment.
  - (3) Related to (2), there is no mention of establishing a baseline, from which progress in delivery of GEBs can be monitored. Who will monitor and evaluate the success of Trust Fund projects, and what indicators will be used? STAP recommends the use of community-based indicators, such as farmer assessments of land degradation.
  - (4) STAP notes the 'low' rating given to the risk of limited private sector commitment to incorporating SLM considerations. The record elsewhere is not so positive in private sector-community engagements, especially where the business (in this case Xstrata) is far more powerful than any community and, indeed, more powerful than government agencies and NGOs e.g. the PROINVERSION initiative).
  - (5) The proposal has little on methodologies, and STAP would like information on how the SLM guidance document (Component 1), the participatory methodologies (Component 2) and the Best Practice code (Component 3) will be developed, Will these draw on other similar initiatives, or be new?
  - (6) Under incremental reasoning, the argument appears to be that the project will divert Trust Fund resources away from non-SLM activities and to SLM investments (or at least investments that

are consistent with SLM practices). So what is the opportunity cost of this? If this argument is understood correctly, there is no additional investment, just a re-prioritisation. Other activities, say in human development, may suffer. How will this be managed?

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	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.
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	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: (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.
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	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.