

# 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: May 10, 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:	9262
PROJECT DURATION:	7
COUNTRIES:	Honduras
PROJECT TITLE:	Agroforestry Landscapes and Sustainable Forest Management that Generate Environmental and Economic Benefits Globally and Locally
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):  
**Minor issues to be considered during project design**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes UNDP's proposal "Agroforestry landscapes and sustainable forest management that generate environmental and economic benefits globally and locally". The PIF articulates the drivers of environmental degradation taking place in the dry-humid biological corridor of Honduras. The objective is well defined and supported by integrating biodiversity conservation, sustainable land and forest management. STAP is pleased UNDP will consider gender in more detail in the project design, and that it will apply its gender marker to determine how the project can achieve global benefits while addressing the different needs of men and women. In the project design, STAP encourages UNDP and Honduras to develop a thorough description of how the activities, outputs, outcomes and the objective are linked. Developing an impact pathway, and identifying the assumptions that should be tested, will help achieve the project's objective and multiple benefits.

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

1. The barriers as described are severe. Considering in particular the deficiencies in governance and capacity, the scope and scale of activities seems ambitious. STAP suggests that the project may be more effective if the scale is reduced, and that it would be prudent to commence with a pilot or prototype of each of the elements, so that the design can be tested and refined, and then scaled up, once proven.
2. Detail further how the different ministries (SAG, SINAPH, ICF, DiBio) will work jointly to overcome the identified deficiencies in planning and implementation, in order to achieve the project objective. These entities have complementary roles and there are a number of opportunities for collaboration on mainstreaming biodiversity in the agricultural/forestry sectors, strengthening forest management plans, and improving livelihood strategies.

3. STAP would like to see supporting evidence for the interventions proposed. For example, it would be appropriate to provide examples or references on the effectiveness of micro-corridors and live fences in enhancing biodiversity and increasing the resilience of protected areas. Additionally, further information should be provided on how the interventions will address the following identified problems: 1) overcoming the impacts of regular dry periods; 2) reducing forest fires; and, 3) managing the pests and diseases causing deforestation. On the proposed tax incentive, STAP recommends analysing: 1) whether it will deliver sufficient encouragement to change behaviour, and, 2) will the tax incentive be affordable to the government. STAP suggests that articulating the basis for the proposed interventions, with respect to the problems identified, will assist in developing effective interventions.

4. STAP also recommends detailing the approach used to engage the multiple stakeholders, and to identify governance arrangements. Developing and implementing an effective stakeholder engagement and governance will be important, given the complexities involved in strengthening governance, supporting biodiversity conservation and landscape management, and supporting value chain activities on coffee and cacao production. STAP's guidelines on applying the Resilience, Adaptation Pathways, and Transformation Assessment (RAPTA) Framework includes components on multi-stakeholder engagement and governance, and theory of change (e.g. an explicit description of how planned interventions will achieve, or contribute to the objective, underpinned by a set of assumptions) that will be useful in designing the project. Additionally, RAPTA is useful in assessing the resilience of protected areas and production landscapes, and the need for adapting or transforming the social-ecological system in order to achieve sustainability. The guidelines can be downloaded at: <http://www.stapgef.org/the-resilience-adaptation-and-transformation-assessment-framework/>

5. Define further the indicators that will be used to monitor biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management, and sustainable forest management. For the latter, please also provide the methodology that is used to estimate carbon sequestration.

6. To strengthen knowledge and learning on sustainability certification, STAP recommends applying its advice on certification detailed in its publication "Environmental Certification and the Global Environment Facility" (2010): <http://www.stapgef.org/stap/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Environmental-Certification-and-the-GEF.pdf>

In addition, STAP also recommends review of the following STAP Advisory Documents: The Evidence Base for Community Forest Management as a Mechanism for Supplying Global Environmental Benefits and Improving Local Welfare (<http://www.stapgef.org/the-evidence-base-for-community-forest-management-as-a-mechanism-for-supplying-global-environmental-benefits-and-improving-local-welfare/>); and Payments for Environmental Services and the Global Environment Facility (<http://www.stapgef.org/payments-for-environmental-services-and-the-global-environment-facility/>)

7. For component 2, further details would be useful on the improved cooking stoves. This includes providing details on: 1) what type of design are they? 2) will there be an industry to manufacture the stoves in Honduras or how are they being supplied?; 3) a description of how the stoves are (a) fuelwood efficient (e.g. how will contribute to forest biomass); (b)affordable to the stakeholders; and, (c) contribute to human health by reducing pollutants. Additionally, UNDP may wish to consider alternative bioenergy technologies, such as those evaluated in the following paper that assesses cookstoves and other options for biomass use in Honduras: "Assessment of biomass energy sources and technologies: Cutz, L. et al. "The case of Central America". Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, Volume 58, May 2016, Pages 1411-143.

8. Additionally, the following paper on the impact of social networks in the adoption of improved cook stoves in western Honduras, which includes some of the target sites, can be used in the project design to further support component 2: " Ramirez, S. et al. "Diffusion of non-traditional cookstoves across western Honduras: A social network analysis." Energy Policy, Volume 66, March 2014, Pages 379-389.

9. Climate data from the CGIAR climate portal can be used to describe climate trends/projections in the target area, and how the project will address climate risks. The CGIAR portal can be accessed at: [http://ccafs-climate.org/data\\_bias\\_corrected/](http://ccafs-climate.org/data_bias_corrected/)

<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>	<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.  (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>
<b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b>	<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>