

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: 5547

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Congo DR

PROJECT TITLE: Community-Based Miombo Forest Management in South East Katanga

GEF AGENCIES: FAO

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Environment, Nature Conservation and Tourism

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 FAO's proposal on "Community based miombo forest management in SE Katanga" in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The project objective is well-defined and supported by the three components. The proposal also identifies clearly the barriers to sustainable land management and sustainable forest management, and the causes and drivers of land and forest degradation appear specific to the target area " Lubumbashi. There are a number of suggestions STAP wishes to make to further strengthen the design of the proposal. These are outlined below "

1. The proposal identifies carbon sequestration as the global environmental benefit the project will seek to deliver. However, this activity is not described clearly in the component section, or in the project framework. STAP suggests defining further the activities on carbon sequestration through sustainable forest management/sustainable land management. This information could be included under component 1, and its expected outputs/outcomes detailed in the project framework.
2. As mentioned above, STAP appreciates the details in the project overview (section A " barriers, causes, drivers of land/forest degradation). However, STAP encourages the project developers to enhance this section further by citing published, or rigorous un-published literature to support this section. For example, the proposal states that overall deforestation rates for the DRC remain relatively low; and, that the causes contribute to "...degraded forests, reduced forest ecosystem services and large net emissions to the atmosphere." It would be useful to provide figures, or references, to support further this section.
3. Similarly, STAP suggests including climate change data on trends or projections in the project overview. This information will further strengthen the section on direct causes of land/forest degradation. This information could be obtained at the World Bank's Climate Change Knowledge Portal " "
http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportal/index.cfm?page=climate_data ; which includes (for example) climate change country profiles " "
<http://www.geog.ox.ac.uk/research/climate/projects/undp-cp/> among other tools.
4. STAP appreciates FAO's note that precise calculations on carbon stock changes will be done during the development of the proposal. In addition to these figures, STAP recommends specifying in the full proposal the methodology that will be used to estimate and monitor the carbon stock changes. Two potential methodologies are UNEP/GEF's Carbon Benefits Project and FAO's EX-ACT:
http://www.unep.org/ClimateChange/carbon-benefits/cbp_pim/
<http://www.fao.org/tc/exact/en/>

5. In this regard, STAP recommends strengthening the baseline by defining the impact indicators, providing data, and describing the methodology that will be used to estimate and monitor the global environmental benefits. This information is important for establishing the incremental reasoning, and ultimately measuring/monitoring global environmental benefits.

6. Additionally, FAO may wish to use the following study conducted in miombo forests in Zambia to further inform its activities on sustainable forest management and carbon stock changes. The paper's reference list also may prove useful to the project developers in informing further the design of the proposal: Chidumayo, E.N. "Forest degradation and recovery in a miombo woodland landscape in Zambia: 22 years of observations on permanent sample plots". *Forest ecology and Management* 291, 154-161. 2013.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
2. Minor revision required.	<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: (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.</p>
3. Major revision required	<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: (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. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</p>