

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: March 19, 2016
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:	9059
PROJECT DURATION:	7
COUNTRIES:	Guatemala
PROJECT TITLE:	Promoting Sustainable and Resilient Landscapes in the Central Volcanic Chain
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	
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):
Concur

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes UNDP's proposal "Promoting sustainable and resilient landscapes in the central volcanic chain of Guatemala". The project aims to mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable land management into production landscapes to generate global environmental benefits and improve livelihoods. The PIF defines well the drivers of environmental degradation, and how a landscape approach is needed. STAP is pleased, therefore, with the PIF and its integrated activities between biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management and forest management. It also welcomes the incremental reasoning and the detailed environment benefits the project expects to achieve. It is also clear that the project will build on lessons learned from other UNDP-GEF projects on biodiversity, certified (and non-certified) agricultural commodities, carbon sequestration initiatives, and others. STAP welcomes these efforts as they are important for the uptake, and scaling up of knowledge.

To strengthen further the design of the project, STAP recommends addressing the following points:

1. The PIF provides a clear justification for the selection of the target regions, based on four factors (page 10), which are linked to people's dependence on ecosystem services. In order to have a complete picture of the interactions between social, economic and biophysical features, STAP recommends detailing further the social and economic aspects in each site. This information seems absent in the PIF.
2. STAP suggests conducting a stakeholder analysis, to identify the appropriate individuals to include, and how, at the appropriate times during the project design and implementation. Defining a multi-stakeholder engagement plan, that also details the governance arrangement in each site will be important, given the diverse needs and governance type (e.g. communal forest versus government forest) present in the project sites. The project should also specify how the different roles of the stakeholders will combine to achieve the project objective.

3. STAP is pleased to see a description of the climate change predictions for Guatemala, and how the country might be affected by changes in temperature. In the project document, STAP recommends detailing further the climate information by defining a baseline year for the climate changes (2050 is given as the projection year). Furthermore, it will be important to describe in greater detail how households, or communities, have dealt with previous, or present, shocks and stresses due to climate (or other factors) that might affect the viability of the project. In particular, STAP suggests detailing how climate change might affect ecosystems and its services, as well as agriculture and land management approaches. It also would be useful to detail how integration between biodiversity conservation, sustainable forest and land management would be required.

4. In component 1, STAP suggests detailing the type of governance arrangement (e.g. communal forest) that is being considered for the carbon sequestration market. Forest governance is important to consider in carbon markets, as trade-offs might exist between generating social-ecological benefits that further strengthen communal forest management and those benefits that primarily strengthen market efficiency. UNPD could refer to the following paper for further information on the impact of carbon markets on forest governance: Osbourne, T. "Tradeoffs in carbon commodification: A political ecology of common property forest governance". 2015. *Geoforum*. Volume 67, pages 64-77.

5. STAP suggests that the project developers give careful consideration to the viability in the carbon market (and to other payment for ecosystem services they opt to use) by considering the scale of the intervention, the market stability and transaction costs to ensure there will be sufficient demand at the price necessary to create an effective incentive.

6. STAP suggests that the project developers undertake a similar analysis of the market for certified produce scale of the market, prices as supply increases, transaction costs and requirements to access the market. Additionally, STAP recommends that UNDP considers its key messages on developing sustainable certification projects detailed in "Environmental Certification and the Global Environment Facility": <http://www.stapgef.org/environmental-certification-and-the-global-environment-facility/>

7. The Resilience, Adaptation Pathways and Transformation Assessment (RAPTA) Framework (to which UNDP contributed) would be useful in identifying adaptive management strategies that contribute to the sustainability and resilience of the central volcanic chain in Guatemala. RAPTA can be used for project design, helping to establish baselines (social, economic and biophysical) and to identify impact indicators that assess the resilience and sustainability of the proposed integrated activities with diverse stakeholders. The RAPTA guidelines can be found at: www.stapgef.org or by contacting the STAP Secretary, Thomas Hammond: Thomas.Hammond@unep.org

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Concur	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple "Concur" response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised. (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review. <p>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.</p>
3. Major issues to be considered during	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:

<p>project design</p>	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP's concerns.</p> <p>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.</p>
------------------------------	---