

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: November 03, 2017
Screener: Sarah Lebel
Panel member validation by: Annette Cowie
Consultant(s):

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

FULL-SIZED PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9796
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Belize
PROJECT TITLE:	Integrated Management of Production Landscapes to Deliver Multiple Global Environmental Benefits
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR); Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, Forestry, the Environment and Sustainable Development (MAFFESD)
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):
Minor issues to be considered during project design

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the UNDP proposal "Integrated management of production landscapes to deliver multiple global environmental benefits". The project's stated objective is to "mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable land/water management into production landscapes in Belize". STAP believes the PIF is scientifically and technically well-developed, yet has some minor concerns which should be addressed as the project moves forward.

1. STAP notes some bold expectations under Component 1 with regards to proposed changes in governance structures, government agency mandates, programming, policies, and legislation. This part of the project relies heavily on the collaboration and continued engagement of multiple government agencies, and the project proponents should be ready to mitigate the risks associated with a failure to achieve these deliverables.
2. It will be important to substantiate various targets presented in the PIF without any justification (e.g. Outcome 2(e) and paragraph 31: how was the 20% erosion reduction value from a participatory program for sustainable soil management derived, and how will it be monitored? Similarly, Outcome 2(d) and paragraph 31: how was the target to rehabilitate at least 50% of key recharge areas determined, and is it feasible?).
3. More detail is required on the strategy to identify and promote suitable SLM practices to manage erosion and enhance productivity of agricultural land. The World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies WOCAT is a useful resource: WOCAT manages a global database on SLM approaches and technologies, which is recommended by the UNCCD. Further information about the database can be found at: <https://qcat.wocat.net/en/wocat/>
4. STAP welcomes a formal component on knowledge management and learning. However, at this stage, the component appears particularly weak and significantly more thought should be given in developing it. STAP encourages the project developers to consult its ongoing advice on Knowledge Management to the

GEF at <http://www.stapgef.org/knowledge-management-gef> as well as some of the knowledge management tools that are currently recommended – see, for example <http://www.knowledge-management-tools.net/knowledge-management-systems.html>.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Concur	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple “Concur” response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised. (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</p> <p>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.</p>
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP’s concerns.</p> <p>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.</p>