

# 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: November 08, 2017  
Screener: Guadalupe Duron  
Panel member validation by: Michael Anthony Stocking  
Consultant(s):

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

<b>FULL-SIZED PROJECT</b>	<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>
<b>GEF PROJECT ID:</b>	9777
<b>PROJECT DURATION:</b>	7
<b>COUNTRIES:</b>	Haiti
<b>PROJECT TITLE:</b>	Sustainable Management of Wooded Production Landscapes for Biodiversity Conservation
<b>GEF AGENCIES:</b>	UNDP and FAO
<b>OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:</b>	Ministry of Environment
<b>GEF FOCAL AREA:</b>	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 and FAO's project in Haiti on "Sustainable management of wooded production landscapes for biodiversity conservation". The project aims to provide an integrated vision for managing and strengthening biodiversity conservation, and natural resource management. STAP believes there is a solid rationale for the project's incremental reasoning, and for the expected multiple benefits. STAP encourages UNDP and FAO to monitor and assess closely the project's impact through the selection of appropriate metrics, and indicators. STAP also is pleased with the project's intention to develop a knowledge management strategy, and recommends that it includes adaptive management. Further advice on these issues, and other project design elements, are detailed below.

1. Component 1 is focused on spatial planning for enabling the generation of multiple benefits through biodiversity conservation, and sustainable agricultural production of coffee and cocoa through green value chains. STAP encourages UNDP and FAO to detail the spatial planning, or landscape framework, in the project document. This includes describing the theory underpinning the landscape approach, the proposed actions and how they support the approach, and the assumptions that may influence its implementation. Furthermore, STAP recommends identifying trade-offs between improving biodiversity conservation, and achieving sustained, or compatible, socio-economic development through cocoa-coffee production. Managing multiple stakeholders' interests in landscape management often implies there will be trade-offs in meeting these needs. Understanding these trade-offs and opportunities for complementarities is important when operating at the landscape scale.

2. Also in Component 1, STAP notes the intention to develop an ecosystem health index during the PPG phase as part of the whole process of building an enabling environment for biodiversity conservation. Ecosystem health indicators are mentioned twice in the PIF text but no information is supplied on the approach towards an index. STAP encourages this project to use experience elsewhere on developing a purpose-built index for Haiti's ecosystems. A useful starting point is a recent review paper by Allyson

O'Brien, Kallie Townsend, Robin Hale, David Sharley and Vincent Pettigrove (2016). How is ecosystem health defined and measured? A critical review of freshwater and estuarine studies. *Ecological Indicators* Volume 69, pages 722-729. Although focused on estuarine and freshwater ecosystems, the paper reviews a number of indices and their effectiveness. The issues of 'ecosystem integrity' as well as 'ecosystem services' will have to be balanced, given that the Haiti ecosystems will essentially be in production landscapes.

3. For monitoring and assessment, knowledge management and learning purposes, STAP recommends identifying indicators that are relevant at the landscape level – and not relevant to a single sector. This action will contribute to the evidence-base of landscape approaches, or spatial planning, as indicators appropriate at scale will be selected to track landscape level progress and outcomes. This information will be useful for learning and the adaptive management required for the project to meet its objective. Dedicated sub-activities on learning are encouraged for component 3. The following papers may be useful to the project proponents: Reed, J., et al. (2016). Integrated landscape approaches to managing social and environmental issues in the tropics: learning from the past to guide the future". *Global Change Biology* (2016) 22, 2540–2554, doi: 10.1111/gcb.13284

4. STAP recommends building measures to monitor the effects of sustainability standards and certification of coffee and cocoa on biodiversity conservation, and socio-economic development. Evidence indicates that: "Studies have been rarely designed to evaluate whether certification is more a cause of an existing conservation measure; a result of a pre-existing conservation effort; or, other causes that are not related to conservation (e.g. increased incomes)." (Tscharnke, T. et al. "Conserving Biodiversity Through Certification of Tropical Agroforestry Crops at Local and Landscape Scales" <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/conl.12110/abstract>) (Blackman, et al. "Environmental Certification and the Global Environment Facility" <http://www.stapgef.org/stap/wpcontent/uploads/2013/05/Environmental-Certification-and-the-GEF.pdf>)

5. STAP notes UNDP's recently published paper "Options and Opportunities to Make Food Value Chains More Environmentally Sustainable and Resilient in Sub-Saharan Africa": [http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Partnerships/Private%20Sector/UNDP-GEF\\_VC\\_Study\\_Engl.pdf](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Partnerships/Private%20Sector/UNDP-GEF_VC_Study_Engl.pdf) STAP believes it is valuable for UNDP and FAO to draw upon this paper for designing the project. For example, the paper describes challenges to implementing value chains that possibly are applicable to Haiti, and that should be considered when assessing project risks. The paper also proposes an integrated framework that may be useful to the project proponents.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Concur</b>	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.
<b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	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"> <li>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised.</li> <li>(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.</li> </ul> <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>
<b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b>	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;</li> <li>(ii) Set a review</li> </ul>

	<p>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>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------