

# 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 04, 2011

Screeener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Michael Anthony Stocking  
Consultant(s):

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT    GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4550

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Samoa

**PROJECT TITLE:** Strengthening Multi-sectoral Management of Critical Landscapes

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNDP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE), Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAF), Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development (MWCSD)

**GEF FOCAL AREA:** Land Degradation

### 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): **Consent**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the UNDP proposal on "Strengthening multi-sectoral management of critical landscapes" in Samoa. STAP notes that the project is for 5 years, a span of time only just long enough to implement a "paradigm shift" in planning the management of Samoa's natural resources on an integrated basis.

The project aims to dismantle institutional and sectoral boundaries, which is a major challenge that needs to be demonstrated as feasible in Samoa if it is to be tried in other larger countries. The ambition of breaking down sectoral boundaries in ministries and other agencies should not be underestimated. This will require considerable commitment by all partners, not just occasional inter-agency meetings. STAP recommends that as the project is implemented, the executing agencies take on board some of the literature dealing with the challenge and which may inform appropriate ways of achieving integration. The paper by Googins and Rochlin (2000) entitled "Creating the Partnership Society: the rhetoric and reality of cross-sectoral partnerships", published in *Business and Society Review* Volume 105, pages 127-144, might be a good starting point.

The project objective and the project framework are compelling and clear. STAP also is very supportive of Samoa's decision to allocate all of its STAR allocations to sustainable land management "an area that can generate multiple global environmental benefits. To strengthen the proposal further, STAP wishes to make the following observations " recommendations:

1. Make the outputs more explicit. For example, it would be good to specify further how many farm households will achieve "Improved SLM and SFM..." in 2.1.2.
2. The introduction of a "learning' output at 2.1.5 is desirable in an innovatory project such as this, where the conditions and ingredients for achieving integrated landscape management of land and forests are analyzed. Not only is it necessary to demonstrate successful implementation (2.1.4) but also it is essential to know why and how success was achieved (a new 2.1.5, preferably " or added into the Expected Outcome for 2.1.4). A stronger emphasis on internal knowledge management is a good strategy for making organizations more efficient, more open, flexible and connected. UNDP should itself be involved in this to inform similar proposals for other SIDS.
3. UNDP should be aware of the GEF "Carbon Benefits Project (CBP), implemented by UNEP, which will be completed shortly and which will inform the GEF on the tracking of total system carbon. In particular, UNDP may wish to investigate further when the carbon measuring tools will be available, so they can potentially be used to strengthen Samoa's capacity building to measure carbon and greenhouse gas emissions " Component 1. Additionally,

further details are needed on how the expected global environmental benefits, including increased carbon sequestration, will be measured and tracked – see incremental reasoning section. Further knowledge and reference to the CBP, or other tools, could fill this gap.

4. The table on page 8 is useful to illustrate the different efforts the project seeks to address on land management and conservation. There are two comments/questions that arise from this table:

a.) The statement on "Strong market links to products from sustainably managed lands to provide incentives to farmers to adopt and promote SLM" implies that market links are the main driver of farmers' incentives to adopt and promote SLM. Perhaps this statement also could link to the outcomes of Component 1, given that enabling policy environments are critical to farmers' motivation for SLM adoption/investments.

b.) It is unclear how the selection of crops with bioenergy potential was made – that is, whether the crops are being proposed by the project, or by the Samoa entities. It also would be good to clarify whether the crops will be native species or not. Further details on this would be useful in order to better determine what potential impacts the crops could have on the ecosystems.

5. STAP recommends including the potential risks of biochar. For example, it would be good to specify the mitigation strategy that would address the potential risk that crops used to making biochar could become more profitable than food crops; thereby, posing a threat to food security.

6. STAP also suggests revising the mitigation strategy for the "sudden global rise in prices of exported agricultural commodities" because it does not propose a specific mitigation strategy.

<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.