

# 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 31, 2017  
Screener: Sarah Lebel  
Panel member validation by: Annette Cowie  
Consultant(s):

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

<b>FULL-SIZED PROJECT</b>	<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>
<b>GEF PROJECT ID:</b>	9862
<b>PROJECT DURATION:</b>	6
<b>COUNTRIES:</b>	Jamaica
<b>PROJECT TITLE:</b>	Conserving Biodiversity and Reducing Land Degradation Using an Integrated Landscape Approach
<b>GEF AGENCIES:</b>	UNDP
<b>OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:</b>	Natural Environmental and Planning Agency. Responsible Party: Forestry Department
<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):  
**Minor issues to be considered during project design**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the UNDP proposal "Conserving biodiversity and reducing land degradation using an integrated landscape approach". The project's stated objective is to "enhance conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services through mainstreaming of biodiversity into planning policies and practices into Jamaica's productive landscapes and key sectors". STAP believes the PIF has some good scientific and technical components which will enable the project to succeed, but there are some issues which should be addressed in order to ensure the sustainability of the project.

1. Some key concepts seem to be used incorrectly in the PIF. These include: (1) the concept of alternative livelihoods (see p.11, Barrier 3); and (2) the concept of watershed versus ecosystem (see p. 11 Barrier 2, and p.17 under incremental approach). In the case of alternative livelihoods, while some examples listed such as ecotourism would qualify, others such as climate-smart agriculture do not quite fit the criteria. STAP would encourage the project developers to consult literature assessing the limitations of alternative livelihood projects, such as Wright, et al., 2016. Reframing the concept of alternative livelihoods. *Conservation Biology*, 30(1), pp.7-13 (available here: [http://www.cifor.org/publications/pdf\\_files/articles/ADay1501.pdf](http://www.cifor.org/publications/pdf_files/articles/ADay1501.pdf)). And it is important to understand that while a watershed may be considered to form the physical boundaries of an ecosystem, it does not make any watershed a key ecosystem, as is suggested in this PIF. Further care needs to be put into identifying ecosystems of key value, whether defined geographically by a watershed, or not.
2. Several very specific interventions seem to have already been identified for this project. However, it is unclear how those interventions were selected, and whether sufficient stakeholder engagement has taken place. Moreover, while key communities such as the Maroons of Jamaica are explicitly mentioned in this PIF, little mention is made of other community members. To ensure that the selected interventions adequately address the barriers identified, meet local needs, and address the key drivers of environmental degradation, STAP would encourage the project developers to use an approach akin to that presented in

STAP's "Guidelines for embedding resilience, adaptation and transformation into sustainable development projects" (available here: <http://www.stapgef.org/rapta-guidelines>). The project's developers are encouraged to consult the recent STAP report, "A Conceptual Framework for Governing and Managing Key Flows in a Source-to-Sea Continuum". This paper presents a conceptual framework that can support the design and implementation of GEF projects addressing interconnected upstream and downstream water systems by identifying several key flows that must be managed across the source-to-sea continuum and geographies.

3. In developing its knowledge management component, the project developers may wish to consult STAP's advice to the GEF at <http://www.stapgef.org/knowledge-management-gef> as well as some of the knowledge management tools that are currently recommended – see, for example <http://www.knowledge-management-tools.net/knowledge-management-systems.html>.

4. The project components addressing land degradation need to be strengthened substantially, in order to reflect the title more adequately, and the funding. The strategy to identify priority sites for interventions, and suitable SLM measures should be described. It is stated in paragraph 40 that the project will contribute to LDN. This linkage should be explained more clearly in the description of the project strategy and activities. STAP recommends application of the "Scientific Conceptual Framework for Land Degradation Neutrality". The framework provides guidance on assessing land degradation, identifying appropriate management actions, and monitoring progress in achieving LDN (Orr, B. et al. 2017). The framework can be accessed at: <http://knowledge.unccd.int/knowledge-products-and-pillars/land-degradation-neutrality-ldn-conceptual-framework/land>. Key features include: the integration of planning for LDN into landscape-scale land use planning; applying the hierarchy of avoid/reduce/reverse land degradation in planning interventions; considering the resilience of the existing and proposed land management; and prioritising those sites with greatest chance of reversing LD cost-effectively and sustainably, while delivering multiple environmental and development benefits.

5. STAP appreciates the intention to work with local landholders and incorporate indigenous knowledge. STAP would like to see more recognition given to the fact that smallholders on the brink of financial viability have limited capacity to adopt SLM practices. To encourage successful adoption of modified farming practices will require considerable effort in designing attractive incentives suited to the local circumstances.

<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</p>

	full project brief for CEO endorsement.
--	---