

# 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 07, 2011

Screeener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Michael Anthony Stocking  
Consultant(s):

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT MULTI TRUST FUNDS**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4616

**PROJECT DURATION :** 3

**COUNTRIES :** El Salvador

**PROJECT TITLE:** Climate Change Adaptation to Reduce Land Degradation in Fragile Micro-Watersheds Located in the Municipalities of Texistepeque and Candelaria de la Frontera

**GEF AGENCIES:** FAO

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG)

**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 "Climate Change Adaptation to Reduce Land Degradation in Fragile Micro-Watersheds located in the municipalities of Texistepeque and Candelaria de la Frontera" in El Salvador. Combining funding sources from the SCCF and the GEF demonstrates clearly El Salvador's commitment to mainstreaming climate change adaptation through integrated natural resource management. STAP supports this initiative and perceives there will be similar efforts whereby countries combine funding sources to address simultaneously global environmental benefits, and adaptation priorities identified by SCCF, or LDCF, recipient countries. In this regard, El Salvador's learning and experience could be used in similar efforts led by other countries.

At this time, STAP will restrict its comments to the project component funded by the GEF. When the STAP member on Adaptation joins STAP, STAP will begin to assess carefully the scientific and technical qualities of SCCF projects.

In view of the innovatory nature of this project, combining CCA and LD strategic objectives, and postulating how there is strong mutual benefit between the two as well as potential for supporting human livelihoods, STAP would like to be invited to be more involved with this project. STAP looks forward to reading the full proposal.

Below are STAP's specific comments on the proposal.

1. The proposal provides a thorough overview of the drivers of unsustainable land management, deforestation, and depletion of water resources in El Salvador. It also provides useful data references on the state of natural resources (% of land cover, % of suitable land for agriculture, soil characteristics), some of which dates back to 1960. However, the proposal is less specific about the land management practices used by farmers in the targeted areas. It only provides general information of the unsustainable practices (e.g. burning), and very little, or no information, on the soil and water conservation practices farmers have been using to address the resiliency of the natural resource base throughout the last decades. It would be useful to detail further farmers' traditional knowledge of sustainable land management practices, as well as how the project intends to apply farmers' knowledge in the design and implementation of integrated natural resource management approaches in the selected micro-watersheds.

2. Similarly, the proposal needs to detail what trees, grass, and bushes the project will use to increase vegetative cover for soil and water conservation. Furthermore, it would be useful to detail whether the species will be native species, or non-native species. If the latter, the project may want to consider a risk assessment for invasive species.

3. On global environmental benefits, more information is needed on how the project will measure and monitor the increase in vegetative cover, and the effects of integrated natural resource management. At the moment, the proposal does not include this information. Further, for both CCA and LD, the tracking and monitoring of carbon stocks and GHG emissions would be desirable. On this, STAP draws FAO's attention to the recently-completed GEF-financed "Carbon Benefits Project" which offers a comprehensive toolkit for tracking total system carbon. STAP also refers to the new national reporting requirements under the UNCCD which have two obligatory indicators, land cover and status of rural poverty, as well as nine other voluntary indicators. It would be desirable for this project to harmonise with national reporting, a process which the GEF is itself undertaking at portfolio level.

4. It also would be useful to detail how the soil and water conservation technologies will be differentiated by gender, specifically as the project intends to target 30% of female led households.

5. ECLAC published a report on the "Economics of Climate Change in Central America: Summary 2010" (<http://www.eclac.cl/publicaciones/xml/9/41809/ECCA-SUMMARY-102911peq.pdf>), which describes sustainable adaptive strategies based on economic conditions and climate change risks. FAO may wish to take notice of this report, if it has not done so already. FAO also may wish to consider ECLAC's under-going studies on forests and drought in collaboration with the Global Mechanism of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification and Degradation. The study may reveal adaptation strategies suitable for the targeted micro-watersheds.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	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.
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	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"> <li>(i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues</li> <li>(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</li> </ul> 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.
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	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.