

# 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 01, 2013

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Annette Cowie  
Consultant(s):

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT**    **GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 5353

**PROJECT DURATION :** 4

**COUNTRIES :** Armenia

**PROJECT TITLE:** Mainstreaming Sustainable Land and Forest Management in Dry Mountain Landscapes

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNDP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Ministry of Nature Protection, Ministry of Agriculture

**GEF FOCAL AREA:** Multi Focal Area

### 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 UNDP's proposal "Mainstreaming Sustainable Land and Forest Management in Dry Mountain Landscapes of Northeastern Armenia". The project objective is defined clearly and supported by the proposed components. The STAP also appreciates the overall description of the project, and identifying clearly the threats in the targeted area that undermine integrated sustainable land and forest management. The proposal demonstrates a strong understanding of the challenges that need to be overcome.

To strengthen further the proposal, STAP recommends addressing the following points during the development of the concept “

1. In the project framework, STAP recommends specifying the outcome and output indicators. Doing so, will assist UNDP to measure and monitor the intended activity. This will include assigning indicators on what will be measured (example “ number of multi-sectoral stakeholder committees created to oversee the integrated forest and land use plans).
2. In the project description, it would be helpful to further describe the ecological characteristics of the two marzes that will be targeted by the project “ Lori and Tavush. This information can be used to further inform the design and implementation of the project. Wherever possible, STAP also encourages the project developers to reference literature sources in the project description.
3. Furthermore, STAP recommends providing socio-economic indicators disaggregated by gender wherever possible. This data can be used to further inform the design and implementation of the project. Additionally, it would be useful to describe the general climate in the targeted areas, and provide some data on trends or projections on climate change. This information could be obtained at the World Bank's Climate Change Knowledge Portal “ [http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportal/index.cfm?page=climate\\_data](http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportal/index.cfm?page=climate_data) ; which includes (for example) UNDP's climate change country profiles “ <http://www.geog.ox.ac.uk/research/climate/projects/undp-cp/> among other tools. Together, the data will strengthen the proposal description and the barriers it intends to address, and buttress further the rationale of the proposed interventions.
4. STAP also recommends defining a framework to help assess the value and trade-offs of the multiple ecosystem services the project intends to focus upon. This information also will help identify the various landscape functions, and what potential trade-offs may exist between them. The project developers may find the following source useful for valuing the multi-functional benefits of ecosystems, and identifying potential trade-offs between land uses “ de

Groot, R. Functional-analysis and valuation as a tool to assess land use conflicts in planning for sustainable, multi-functional landscapes. *Landscape and Urban Planning*. 75. 175-186. 2006.

5. Additionally, STAP encourages for the project developers to include the trade-offs between the various land use options in the risk section (A.3). Doing so, may help strengthen the mitigating response on stakeholders' competing uses for land and forestry resources.
6. In component 1, STAP encourages UNDP to define further the intended interventions described in the document. For example, the component indicates that community participatory forestry will be integrated into the into the forest and land use plans. However, this activity is only briefly described in the proposal.
7. It would be useful to have further clarification on whether land use plans are enforceable. STAP believes further details about this aspect will help strengthen the interventions and project rationale given it has a strong reliance on land use planning.
8. In component 2, UNDP may wish to consider the methodology developed by the UNEP/GEF project on estimating and monitoring carbon stock changes – in particular, the detailed assessment since the project seeks to set up sites to obtain measurement data.
9. STAP also recommends reassessing the method used to estimate greenhouse gas savings since it appears overly simplistic – for example, it does not take account of forest growth dynamics. STAP suggests recalculating the estimates during the proposal development.
10. The table on page 9 defines a series of ecosystem services that will be generated through sustainable forest management, land management and biodiversity. STAP recommends assigning indicators to each intended benefit to monitor the intended global environmental outcomes. Currently, the climate change benefits and the sustainable land management benefits (carbon sequestration) appear to be further specified (supported by estimates) than benefits derived from biodiversity conservation, and other benefits provided by sustainable land management (example – decrease in grazing pressure in forestland).
11. It would be useful to clarify the point about "non-harvested wood products" under the climate change benefits derived from sustainable forest management. Currently, it is not clear what is meant.
12. Furthermore, STAP recommends specifying the stakeholders' roles (identified in section A.2) in relation to the project's components – specifying the stakeholders' comparative advantages. It also is not clear whether the community groups, private sector and NGO's have been involved in the development of the proposal at this stage. If they have not been involved, STAP recommends they are brought into the process as soon as possible.
13. Under component 2, STAP recommends defining further the livelihood alternatives. At the moment, these are only briefly touched upon in the proposal. If UNDP wishes to consider further PES schemes, STAP recommends for the project developers to consider the STAP advisory document on "Payment for Ecosystem Services and the Global Environment Facility", March 2010. The publication is available on the STAP website – [www.stapgef.org](http://www.stapgef.org)
14. Additionally, component 2 raises measurement of carbon flux and another measurement of carbon stock. STAP believes the former may be too ambitious and potentially unnecessary. Further clarification would be useful about the project's intention to measure carbon flux.
15. STAP believes that regulation and enforcement are valuable measures to reduce fuelwood harvest, but these measures will not be effective in reducing net greenhouse gas emissions unless an alternative energy source, and alternative income sources, is available. It would be useful for the proposal to acknowledge these factors influencing the reduction in fuelwood harvest.
16. The proposal is not clear with respect to alternative energy source for cooking. Its purpose is not clear in the proposal.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved.  Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the

	project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency:</p> <p>(i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions.</p> <p>(ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.</p>
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>Follow-up:</p> <p>(i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP.</p> <p>(ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</p>