

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: April 25, 2012

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: 4761

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Kyrgyz Republic

PROJECT TITLE: Sustainable Management of Mountainous Forest and Land Resources under Climate Change Conditions

GEF AGENCIES: FAO

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: -Kyrgyz Republic State Agency on Environment Protection and Forestry
- Kyrgyz Republic 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 the FAO's proposal "Sustainable management of mountainous forest and land resources under climate change conditions" in the Kyrgyz Republic. The proposal's scientific basis is articulated very clearly and comprehensively. This is evident by a good project framework (some minor revisions are needed – more on this below), a well-defined problem statement, baseline narrative, and incremental reasoning for each intervention. Above all, STAP highly appreciates, and commends, the explicit definition of the global environmental benefits, their proposed indicators and defining specifically a methodology (FAO's EX-ACT) to measure and monitor carbon sequestration.

To strengthen the proposal further, STAP recommends addressing the following points -

1. The outputs in the project framework could be more explicit. For example, it would be useful to detail how many GoKR staff will be trained on LULUCF and REDD+ and carbon monitoring (component 1.2.4). STAP also recommends reviewing carefully the project framework for inconsistencies between outcomes and outputs. For instance, component 3.1.2 is framed more as an outcome than an output.
2. In component 2, the proposal needs to specify further what tree types will be used in the tree plantations. Component 2.2.2 provides further details on tree types, but this information is missing from the incremental reasoning description of component 2. Furthermore, the proposal should define explicitly whether only indigenous trees will be used. If other non-indigenous trees will be planted, the proposal should consider a risk assessment of invasive species.

Also, FAO may wish to draw upon the following citation to indicate some of the possible constraints in measuring carbon from drylands – (Stringer, L.C. et al. (2012): Challenges and opportunities in linking carbon sequestration, livelihoods and ecosystem service provision in drylands. *Environmental Science & Policy* 19-20 121-135.).

3. In component 3, STAP recommends specifying further the criteria for selecting the innovative agricultural practices described in the proposal (conservation agriculture, among others). Furthermore, the scientific underpinning of this component could be strengthened by referencing published material that demonstrates how conservation agriculture (and other proposed practices) may contribute to carbon sequestration, and sustainable land management. It also would be useful to exemplify evidence (through published or rigorous unpublished documents) of sustainable adoption of the proposed practices in the targeted region, or regions with similar biophysical characteristics and socio-economic composition of land users.

4. STAP is pleased to see reference made to the GEF-financed CACILM products in the PIF and to using the database and KM support offered by WOCAT. These should go some way to identifying best practices in SLM. It is further suggested that the current FAO project liaise closely with another GEF-financed initiative – PALM [<http://www.ehs.unu.edu/palm/>]. This trans-boundary initiative (with Tajikistan) has some similar aims to the current proposal, namely to address the interlinked problems of land degradation and poverty. There is no mention in the PIF of this project, despite its relevance to the scientific underpinnings of building sustainable land management practices. Indeed, FAO may well wish to consider building a more explicit aim of poverty reduction in the current proposal, since this is the major barrier to the take-up of sustainable land and forest practices – as recognized in the problem statement of the project.

5. The proposal mentions briefly that payment for ecosystem services (PES) schemes will be piloted. Hence, STAP recommends defining specifically the PES arrangements in the full proposal. Also, the project developers may wish to consult STAP's advisory document on "Payment for Environmental Services and the Global Environmental Facility". The document highlights a number of potential barriers to PES effectiveness that would be useful to consider in the project development. Furthermore, the document outlines how GEF projects can help build the evidence base for PES effectiveness in case the project developers wish to consider this further. The document can be downloaded at – www.unep.org/stap

6. On climate risks, STAP strongly encourages to develop more comprehensively the "disaster risk reduction strategies" the project intends to support and mainstream in the national forestry program. Building in these strategies and other adaptive capacity measures can help underpin the sustainability of the proposed interventions. To assist with this task, the project developers may wish to consult the World Bank Climate Change Knowledge Portal, adaptation profiles for Kyrgyz Republic - http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportalb/home.cfm?page=country_profile&CCCode=KGZ