

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: January 25, 2012

Screener: 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: 4772

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Colombia

PROJECT TITLE: Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Dry Ecosystems to Guarantee the Flow of Ecosystem Services and to Mitigate the Processes of Deforestation and Desertification

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Development (MADS); Institute of Hydrology, Meteorology, and Environmental Studies (IDEAM); Alexander von Humboldt Research Institute of Biological Resources (IAvH); United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); Regional Autonomous Corporation of Tolima (Cortolima); Regional Autonomous Corporation of Alto Magdalena (CAM); Regional Autonomous Corporation of Atlántico (CRA); Regional Autonomous Corporation of Sur de Bolívar (CSB); Regional Autonomous Corporation of Valle del Sinú (CVS); Regional Autonomous Corporation of La Guajira (CORPOGUAJIRA)

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 on "Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in dry ecosystems to guarantee the flow of ecosystem services and to mitigate the process of deforestation and desertification". The proposal is well-structured with activities clearly leading to Expected Outputs, and outputs to Expected Outcomes. The problem statement and threats are clear, supported by data and references. The global environmental benefits also are explicit, and their specificity (proposed indicators and methodologies) are very much welcomed by STAP. The proposal also seems to be well-anchored to national scientific centers (IDEAM and IAvH) and national initiatives, such as the National REDD+ Strategy. The proposal could be strengthened in various ways outlined below by STAP.

1. The baseline analysis for Land Degradation is, by comparison with those for biodiversity and SFM/REDD, somewhat thin and incomplete. Colombia has a modest record of research into soil erosion and land degradation but this does include some estimates of productivity decline consequent upon erosion – see <http://www.tucson.ars.ag.gov/isco/isco12/VolumeII/ErosionandSoilProductivityRelationships.pdf>. STAP urges the proponents to include some quantitative data so that the changes consequent on the project may be tracked. Even the use of simple soil loss and productivity change model estimates would provide valuable information.
2. On component 1, UNDP may wish to consider adapting the Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands (LADA) methodology, or contacting FAO, for the development of methodologies to estimate soil erosion in the targeted areas (Output 1.2.1). http://www.fao.org/nr/lada/index.php?option=com_content&view=frontpage&Itemid=75&lang=en
3. Given the wealth of information the project intends to generate on SLM and biodiversity in dry ecosystems, UNDP also could consider contributing to, or learning from, Colombia's experience with piloting UNCCD's impact indicators (land management and biodiversity are among UNCCD's impact indicators). Colombia is one of eleven countries asked to pilot UNCCD's impact indicators as a way to generate knowledge to better prepare countries for UNCCD's reporting requirements in 2013. A report of Colombia's experience with piloting UNCCD indicators can be obtained at - http://impact-pilot.unccd.int/en/static_pages/about
4. A minor comment – It is not clear what entity is CIPAV (Component 2).

5. Ecological monitoring in one form or another is commendably included in both components – Outputs 1.2.2; 1.2.3; 2.1.2; 2.2.3. The GEF attaches considerable importance to the monitoring of the impact of projects, especially those such as this which claim multiple environmental benefits. It is unclear from the Key Stakeholder listing who will undertake which monitoring and, more importantly, how the overall beneficial impact of the project from the several sources of information (e.g. carbon storage, water flow, MRV protocols etc) will be brought together on a common platform both for reporting and for learning.

6. It is encouraging the project intends to hire a gender specialist during the PPG phase. STAP, therefore, would expect for the project interventions to be disaggregated by gender in the full proposal. Gender targeted interventions are more likely to generate the expected socioeconomic benefits for women -which the proposal indicates briefly - as well as strengthen more effectively women's capacities as natural resource managers.

7. STAP encourages UNDP to rely on its climate change profile for Colombia to specify further how the project components will reinforce climate resilience. Colombia's climate change profile can be downloaded at - <http://country-profiles.geog.ox.ac.uk/>

<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.