

# 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: February 28, 2014

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Anand Patwardhan; Annette Cowie  
Consultant(s):

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT MULTI TRUST FUNDS**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 5531

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Haiti

**PROJECT TITLE:** Ecosystem Approach to Haiti Cote Sud

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNEP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Ministry of Environment

Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources

Organisation pour la R  habilitation de l'Environnement

Soci  t   Audubon SAMANAH

**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 UNEP's multi-trust initiative on "Ecosystem Approach to Haiti's Cote Sud" between the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund (GEF). The project's objective is to increase the resilience to climate change risks and reduce the risk of disaster caused by climate change. The objective is supported by the three components on ecosystem sustainability and resilience, disaster risk reduction through ecosystem management, and sustainable land management approaches (including climate change mitigation). The importance of healthy ecosystems is firmly embedded throughout the components.

The STAP also is pleased to see inter-linkages between the LDCF and GEF, as well as integration between several focal areas of the GEF (biodiversity, climate change mitigation, land degradation + sustainable forest management programme). In the full proposal, STAP recommends analyzing the baselines and defining indicators for each benefit (adaptation benefits and global environmental benefits) in order to monitor and track the intended outcomes. This will assist in strengthening the project's additional cost reasoning and incremental reasoning.

A number of suggestions to strengthen the proposal during project formulation are provided below:

1. During the proposal development, STAP recommends for UNEP to strengthen the proposal's focus on the socio-economic, institutional and biophysical factors and determinants of (e.g. soil type may influence a farmers' ability to adapt) influencing communities' adaptive capacities to climate change. This will help understand further what factors influence vulnerability reduction and disaster risk reduction in the targeted communities. It also will be useful to include issues of scale (temporal and spatial) for each factor. This will help assess, and understand further, the influence of each factor on vulnerability reduction (and adaptive capacity) at different scales.

2. The proposal describes the ecosystem management measures (terrestrial and coastal) that aim to address disaster risk reduction and climate risk management in component 1 and 2. The STAP recommends detailing further who is most vulnerable to climate risks, and how the interactions between humans and

ecosystems affect adaptation to climate change. This includes defining the following aspects: 1) identifying the population who is vulnerable; 2) defining what types of ecosystems the vulnerable populations are dependent on; and 3) how these ecosystems would help decrease their vulnerability, and how much the target population depends directly on the ecosystem.

3. In establishing a monitoring system, UNEP may wish to consider indicators that measure the ecosystem's health, and indicators that measure and track how ecosystem restoration/conservation has assisted in providing ecosystem services that help reduce the communities' vulnerability to climate change. The project proponents may wish to consider the GEF's "Operational Guidelines for Ecosystem-Based Adaptation", October 2012 (GEF/LDCF.SCCF.13/Inf.06) for developing the monitoring system and component 1 and 2.

Within the context of coastal ecosystems (component 1), it also will be important to quantify the ecosystem services they provide within the adaptation planning process. The following source provides an overview of the steps that could be considered for adaptation strategies on coastal ecosystems: Spalding, M.D. et al., "The role of ecosystems in coastal protection: Adapting to climate change and coastal hazards". *Ocean & Coastal Management* (2013). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2013.097>

4. In component 1, the STAP recommends defining the methodology used to estimate carbon stock changes through forest management, reforestation and improved management of vetiver production. This information appears absent from the proposal, and the quoted rates of sequestration seem quite ambitious.

Additionally, it would be useful to detail what type of extension services and information will be provided to farmers on agroforestry measures, such as planting and managing (fruit) trees and vetiver grass.

5. STAP welcomes the attention to improved charcoal manufacture. Detail of the production processes that will be promoted, and the mechanism to foster uptake, should be provided. Measures to address unsustainable coral mining should also be detailed. While alternatives are theoretically available, it will be important to identify affordable solutions, and measures to encourage adoption. The production of biochar (eg in biochar cookstoves) could address several issues simultaneously: more efficient use of fuelwood, and production of a soil amendment with liming properties.

6. In component 3, STAP recommends describing further farmers' land management practices, including land-users' socioeconomic and institutional characteristics that may influence their land management approaches. This information will put into context the potential barriers small-holders may face in adopting sustainable land management, and ways vetiver grass (and vetiver oil production) can contribute to addressing these constraints while reducing vulnerability to climate change and delivering global environmental benefits. The information also will be useful in understanding further the factors influencing farmers' decisions to engage in activities that bring about multiple benefits (example " using vetiver grass for soil health improvements and for income generation resulting from the vetiver oil production). The project proponents may wish to rely on the following document for detailing further farmers' land management practices, and " Bargout, R., and Raizada M. "Soil nutrient management in Haiti, pre-Columbus to the present day: lessons for future agricultural lessons". *Agriculture & Food Security* 2013, 2:11 <http://www.agricultureandfoodsecurity.com/content/2/1/11>

Additionally, STAP suggests detailing further the public-private partnership for vetiver oil production and whether it intends to conduct a market analysis for the commodity, and what extension services will the cooperatives receive to assist individual farmers with marketing purposes.

7. The STAP appreciates the project will build on UNEP's baseline efforts through its role in the Cote Sud Initiative, as well as compliment other GEF initiatives in the country. Thus, it will be useful to provide a more thorough description on how this project intends to tap into the knowledge and learning generated by the Cote Sud Initiative on vulnerability reduction.

8. During the project implementation, STAP suggests collecting disaggregated gender data as possible. Gender disaggregated data can assist the project target its interventions more appropriately by addressing the multiple needs and roles of women and men in enhancing adaptive capacity. The project proponents may wish to refer to the following publication on gender and adaptation to climate change " [http://www.unep.org/pdf/rra\\_gender\\_screen.pdf](http://www.unep.org/pdf/rra_gender_screen.pdf)

STAP advisory	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
---------------	--

<i>response</i>	
<b>1. Consent</b>	<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>
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	<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>
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	<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>