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 Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Michael Anthony Stocking; Nijavalli H.

Ravindranath

Consultant(s):

I. PIF Information (Copied from the PIF)
FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 4479 PROJECT DURATION: 5 COUNTRIES: Guatemala

PROJECT TITLE: Sustainable Forest Management and Multiple Global Environmental Benefits

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources of Guatemala (MARN); Protected

Areas National Council (CONAP); Fundación para el Ecodesarrollo y la Conservación (FUNDAECO)

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 revision required

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the UNDP proposal on "Sustainable Forest Management and Multiple Global Environmental Benefits. In particular, STAP appreciates the detailed carbon sequestration calculations noted throughout the proposal as it clearly demonstrates how the project intends to measure and monitor the carbon benefits generated through sustainable forest management (SFM) practices. However, there are some areas that STAP believes could be further strengthened in the proposal. These are detailed below.

- 1. The project framework is comprehensive and the two components are well explained. However, it appears that there is some confusion and lack of differentiation between expected outcomes and outputs. In general, they appear to have been transposed in the framework table. Outcomes are the downstream impact or major beneficial change that it is expected the project will contribute to; outputs are the tangible products generated by the project. STAP suggests addressing this minor change before the proposal is submitted for CEO endorsement.
- 2. Furthermore, STAP suggests strengthening the baseline. For example, there is a need for a systematic assessment of drivers of deforestation, land degradation, habitat loss and biodiversity loss. Similarly, there is a need for quantitative estimates of drivers of deforestation, degradation and loss of biodiversity. Identifying and ranking the drivers is critical for developing interventions that address the causes.
- 3. It appears that the sustainable land management (SLM) activities are not detailed, or detailed very little, in the project framework and incremental reasoning for example, the description of the SFM/SLM activities for watershed management is very brief in the proposal. It appears that the proposers are, for example, using SLM simply as a counterpart term to SFM but for non-forest areas. A fuller description would enable a better understanding of the scientific viability of the proposed watershed interventions.
- 4. STAP also acknowledges the project will address unsustainable agricultural practices through the reduced use of agro-chemicals, such as soil enrichment with crop residues and animal manure. STAP would appreciate further details on the agricultural sites to assess the feasibility of the proposed interventions. For example, will farmers' access to animal manure be on-site, or off-site and if so will farmers need to pay for it? If the latter is true, UNDP may wish to assess the constraints farmers may face in using animal manure as a sustainable agricultural practice. The mitigation measures also should be defined.

- 5. On Methodology for REDD+, what is the source of the 14 step methodology? There are nearly 15 methodologies approved under the VCS. STAP suggests to study these methodologies and select the one most appropriate for the location.
- 6. The project title claims the project will generate multiple global environmental benefits. However, the proposal appears only explicitly to define global environmental benefits generated by biodiversity conservation and sustainable forest management practices. So, for example, on p.10 the PIF identifies sustainable management of forests as a †global benefit'. In actuality, SLM and SFM are routes/ways of achieving global environmental benefits. The actual benefit needs to be defined, especially in a project such as this promising multiple benefits. Since sustainable land management is a driver of SFM and REDD+ and because the proposal is tied to the GEF land degradation focal area, STAP highly recommends specifying the global environmental benefits expected to be generated through SLM, such as carbon sequestration through soil management and soil enrichment practices, as well as climate change mitigation through sustainable agriculture via the use of organic inputs and reduced use of agro-chemicals.
- 7. In the light of the above point, STAP recommends that the project pay explicit attention to the tracking tools and methods for global environmental benefits. Not only should GEBs be a promised output of the project requiring a one-off verification, but also they should be tracked and monitored by the project. Appropriate tools exist especially for carbon and GHG emissions â6" see for example, the GEF-financed Carbon Benefits Project. The UNCCD national reporting indicators for land cover and changes in rural poverty might be considered for benefits of SLM. The whole area of tracking and monitoring of GEBs needs to be addressed in the PPG phase and made a central part of project implementation. Inclusion in Component 1 might be appropriate.
- 8. The risks due to climate change and the potential adverse impact on forests droughts and expansion of semi arid zones have been adequately recognized. Guatemala also is highly vulnerable to current climate variability, especially due to the occurrence of hurricanes, tropical storms, torrential rains and this issue has been adequately recognized. The source of information on climate change impact seems to be based on National Communication Report submitted in 2001. There are large scientific and modelling advances to assess the climate change, as well as impacts of climate change. Thus, STAP recommends adopting the latest models and scientific methods to assist the impacts. Also, STAP suggests identifying technologies and practices to enhance the resilience of forest ecosystems and forest dependent communities.

STAP advisory response		Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
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: (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.