

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: @@@@ @@, @@@@

Screeener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Thomas Lovejoy
Consultant(s): Paul Grigoriev

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT **GEF TRUST FUND**

GEF PROJECT ID: 4834

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Brazil

PROJECT TITLE: Recovery and Protection of Climate and Biodiversity Services in the Paraiba do Sul Basin of the Atlantic Forest of Brazil

GEF AGENCIES: IADB

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation (MCTI)

Secretariat for Environment, State of Sao Paulo

Secretariat for Environment of the State of Rio de Janeiro

Secretariat for Science, Technology and Higher Education of the State of Minas Gerais

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 this important and integrated proposal aiming to enlarge the territory of Conservation Units, certify production in buffer zones around PAs, conserve and enhance carbon stocks and institute PES schemes to support and enhance the connectivity of habitats adjacent to PAs, adopting a landscape approach. Undoubtedly this will be a challenge, but one that must be met to help conserve the global environmental and biodiversity values of Brazil's Atlantic Forest region. While STAP is of the opinion that the PIF is well thought through and articulated, the following is provided for consideration during the project development phase.

The title and objective of the project appear to differ in terms of their emphasis. The title stresses the recovery and protection of climate (note: how does one recover climate?) and biodiversity services in the Paraiba do Sul basin whereas the objective is to the recover and preserve the Paraiba do Sul basin so as to ensure the generation of carbon sequestration and biodiversity benefits. Both are somewhat misleading considering the scope of the proposal as outlined in the PIF and it is proposed that this be reconciled (along with greater clarity in the use of the terms protection and preservation).

In Section A of the PIF - Strategic Framework, at present there is a lack of specificity, clarity and also coherence between the expected outcomes and the necessary outputs to deliver them. Without this, it is difficult to undertake a technical assessment and/or estimate global benefits. For example, the Output under CCM "5 Outcome 5.1 is exactly identical to the Outcome. Under SFM/REDD-1 Outcome 1.3 "Good management practices adopted by relevant economic actors" is not informative in terms of the specific outcome that may be anticipated. Similarly, the outcome under CCM-5 Outcome 5.2 "Forest and non-forested lands under good management" is also not clear or informative. Additional examples include the SFM/REDD-1 Outcome "Good management practices adopted by relevant economic sectors" and the corresponding Output "Payment for ecosystem services established", as well as the CCM-5 5.2 output "Forest and non-forest lands under good management practices". Additional specificity and clarity is required to assess this fully.

The global environmental benefits are well presented and clear. The description of threats is well done as well. What is presented as root causes, however, for the most part are the barriers that the project will attempt to address, and should be recast that way. In addition, an assessment of root causes would be useful during full project development.

The adoption of a landscape based management approach is very welcome but STAP questions the proposed use of exotic (i.e.non-native) species (page 14). The rationale for this should be provided.

Payment for ecosystem service schemes represents a significant component of this project. Most of the discussion around PES revolves around increasing the carbon stock. It is suggested that during further development of the project more attention should be paid to additional services beyond carbon sequestration and its direct economic benefits (such as the ones mentioned including reduction of mudflows and floods, river siltation, water recharge, water flow etc.). Care should be taken to put in place monitoring frameworks in order to measure both economic and GEB gains realized from these approaches. The need to further develop PES schemes is recognized and these should be elaborated further during the PPG stage. The baseline concerning ongoing investments is presented, however during the PPG stage it is proposed that quantifiable indicators and baseline be developed for the expected outcomes. The provision of realistic opportunities and mechanisms for local populations to derive economic benefits, while at the same time maintaining biodiversity values, is central to the realization of the project's objective outside of PAs and overall.

The risks are realistically presented although a 3C rise in temperature (assuming mean annual) is very significant while it is not explicitly considered as such in the PIF. The implications of this predicted rise in temperature should be examined more explicitly during the project's further development.

Finally, please note the following typographic error:

On page 6, "defying emission targets" should be changed to defining emission targets

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	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.
2. Minor revision required.	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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.
3. Major revision required	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.