

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 25, 2017
Screener: Sarah Lebel
Panel member validation by: Michael Anthony Stocking
Consultant(s):

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

| FULL-SIZED PROJECT | GEF TRUST FUND |
|---------------------------|---|
| GEF PROJECT ID: | 9783 |
| PROJECT DURATION: | 6 |
| COUNTRIES: | Guinea |
| PROJECT TITLE: | Integrated Management of Natural Resources in Middle and Upper Guinea |
| GEF AGENCIES: | UNDP |
| OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: | Ministry of Environment, Water Resources and Forestry / OGUIPAR |
| 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):
Major issues to be considered during project design

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the UNDP proposal "Integrated management of natural resources in Middle and Upper Guinea". The project's stated objective is to "promote an integrated and sustainable management of natural resources by introducing landscape approach and establishment and operationalisation of a core PA, corridors and buffer zones along the Bafing and Falémé rivers and establishing eco-villages around the PA". STAP believes that the PIF includes the main relevant scientific and technical challenges to meet the overall objective. However, STAP has major concerns that will need to be addressed in order both to clarify the intended activities of the project, and to help strengthen the sustainability of the project.

1. Integrated Landscape Management is a laudable aim for this part of Guinea, being a long-term collaborative process by land managers and local stakeholders that is capable of addressing the multiple challenges of looking after a mosaic of complex land uses. The development of a landscape plan is a necessary starting point. But what is missing is an understanding of the ecological, social, and economic interactions among different parts of the landscape that will need to be managed, in order to realize positive synergies among interests and actors and to mitigate negative trade-offs. Trade-off analysis is mentioned but is not set in context with the institutions and agencies that will need to coordinate their activities. The primary activity in Component 1 appears to be the establishment of the long-promised Protected Area. As it stands, this component is unconvincing in its present formulation to achieve the stated aim of 'integrated landscape management'. STAP suggests that some of the recent literature on the landscape approach be consulted and referenced, and then used to build a component that is truly integrated. See, for example, "the five elements of integrated landscape management" put forward by Ecoagriculture Partners that include collaborative, community-engaged processes for dialogue, planning, negotiating and monitoring: all issues that seem to be missing in the current proposal (Defining Integrated Landscape Management for Policy Makers. Ecoagriculture Policy Focus No. 10, October 2013).
2. The PIF explicitly states under Component 2 that it will integrate climate change dimensions in the management plan of protected areas and classified forests. In order to ensure this is done adequately, it will

be necessary to revise the sources of climate information as presented on p.7 of this PIF, information which is itself erroneous. Specifically, it is not possible to express a projected change in temperature as a percentage. It should rather be presented as a change in degrees Celsius. In addition, the expressed historical changes in precipitation seem extreme. It should be noted that the baseline time period used to determine the changes in precipitation may be the cause. In fact, Guinea saw some extreme high precipitation in the 1960s (see UNDP Climate Change Country Profile available here:

http://www.vub.ac.be/klimostoolkit/sites/default/files/documents/cccp_guinea.hires_report.pdf). Hence, if that decade was used as the baseline it may bias the interpretation of historical trends in precipitation. STAP recommends looking at the IPCC's Fifth Assessment Report published in 2013 and 2014 for more accurate and relevant climate information, rather than relying on the 2007 NAPA for Guinea.

3. On p.11, under Component 3, there is a mention of biogas as an alternative energy source. The CO₂e mitigation potential associated with the production and use of biogas should be assessed, as is done for the case of the proposed improved cookstoves at the end of the document.

4. Would it be possible to add a reference for the following statement on p.14: "It is estimated that the time spent for wood collection varies between 2 to 3 hours per woman per day in the country. With adequate management of firewood and improved cookstoves, this can be reduced to only 2 or 3 hours per week"?

5. Component 4 promises 'gender mainstreaming' and 'knowledge management'. Both issues are crucial in the long-term effectiveness and sustainability of this project. However, the proposed activities are somewhat simplistic being framed in their intention rather than their process. Knowledge management, for example, will require more than simply a communication strategy; it will need a KM strategy that includes tools, users and responsible agencies. STAP's on-going advice to the GEF at <http://www.stapgef.org/knowledge-management-gef> might be a useful starting point in building a KM system.

| <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 | <p>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:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised.</p> <p>(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> <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 project design | <p>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> <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> |