

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: March 08, 2013

Screeener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Brian Huntley; Annette Cowie
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT **GEF TRUST FUND**

GEF PROJECT ID: 5277

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Nicaragua

PROJECT TITLE: Strengthening the Resilience of Multiple-use Protected Areas to Deliver Multiple Global Environmental Benefits

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MARENA)

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): **Consent**

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes UNDP's proposal in Nicaragua on "Strengthening the resilience of multiple-use protected areas to deliver multiple global environmental benefits". The components proposed are well-supported by a thorough description of the problem statement and baseline initiatives. STAP also is pleased to see an explicit definition of the project objective and how each component will contribute towards it. A clear and consistent link between the components and project objective is important, given the complex interactions that are needed in order to achieve the proposed global environmental outcomes on biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management, and climate change mitigation from land use change.

In order to further strengthen the proposal, STAP recommends addressing the points below during the proposal development stage.

1. STAP appreciates the description of the incremental reasoning provided in section B.2, including specifying a timeline when data will be collected (component 1). STAP believes there are a number of ways the incremental reasoning could be strengthened further, including the following: a) specify what methods will be used to measure and monitor the defined global environmental benefits on ecosystem connectivity (described in paragraph 23); b) specify the indicators for each benefit in the full proposal; and, c) provide references (published, or rigorous unpublished documents) to support the baseline narrative.
2. STAP is pleased that UNDP will hire a gender and indigenous specialist to ensure the interventions are based thoroughly on their knowledge and properly address development needs while simultaneously targeting biodiversity conservation, sustainable land use and forest management. To this effect, STAP encourages the project developers to comprehensively integrate gender approaches in each component, as well as elements that capture effectively indigenous population's perspectives.
3. STAP wonders whether UNDP could define further how it will achieve the connectivity between the protected areas and their wider landscape in order to achieve the proposed global environmental outcomes. At the moment, this appears to be defined minimally in component 2. By strengthening this aspect further, the proposal's scientific rationale could be reinforced. One approach that UNDP may wish to consider is that of multifunctional landscapes, including protected areas. This approach is detailed in Dewi, S. et al. "Protected areas within multifunctional landscapes: Squeezing out intermediate land use intensities in the tropics?" *Land Use Policy* 30 (2013). The paper discusses the temporal scales of land-use change inside and outside four protected areas in the tropics, and the multifunctionality of the different landscapes.

4. Additionally, the paper presents a useful framework to analyze trade-offs between conservation objectives and development from land-based activities, and ways to promote the multifunctionality of landscapes (Figure 11). Thus, STAP encourages UNDP also to consider an approach that analyzes the various trade-offs between the proposed global environmental outcomes (biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management, and climate change mitigation from land use change).

5. Under component 2, STAP encourages UNDP to consider farmers' knowledge and local experiences for the development of monitoring systems for integrated land management. This includes making accessible monitoring systems that are farmer-friendly and monitor rigorously the impacts of land management on soil quality. Providing land managers these tools can strengthen their ability to identify appropriate land management practices. To this effect, UNDP may wish to rely on the following resource that outlines the use of bioindicators for evaluating the impacts of land management on soil quality – Rousseau, L. et al "Soil microfauna as indicators of soil quality and land use impacts in smallholder agroecosystems of western Nicaragua". Ecological Indicators 27 (2013).

6. The proposal appears to assume that carbon market funding will be sustained at a level that is possible to fund payment for ecosystem services. Nonetheless, this may not be the case. Thus, STAP suggests defining this risk in section B.4, as well as measures to address it.

7. In section B.5, STAP suggests adding a column to the table that indicates the specific role of each stakeholder in relation to the component(s).

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	<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>
2. Minor revision required.	<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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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.
3. Major revision required	<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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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.