

# 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 08, 2012

Screeener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Michael Anthony Stocking  
Consultant(s):

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT**    **GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 5080

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Peru

**PROJECT TITLE:** Transforming Management of Protected Area/Landscape Complexes to Strengthen Ecosystem Resilience

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNDP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** MINAM

**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 this ambitious multi-focal area proposal for "Transforming Management of Protected Area/Landscape Complexes to Strengthen Ecosystem Resilience" in Peru. STAP appreciates that the proposal fosters synergies between baseline programs and existing GEF investments for the protection of biodiversity and the implementation and enforcement of SLM and SFM practices in these vulnerable areas of regional and global significance. Moreover, STAP welcomes that the proposal addresses the environmental and politico-institutional challenges introduced by climate change in the targeted PA and surrounding landscapes. The proposal extensively outlines a viable strategy for the improvement of governance systems, the technical and financial empowerment of existing institutional stakeholders for the implementation of INRM, which should produce significant global and regional benefits.

However, there is one important scientific issue that requires immediate attention (the first below), and a number that will need to be addressed in the development of this concept to a full proposal:

1. MFA projects, in particular, need to pay particular attention to anticipated global environmental benefits (Section B2 in the PIF). For the current project proposal, the PIF tabulates anticipated "environmental benefits" per project component and by focal area (in Table 1), mixing those that are local and domestic with those that could, if properly presented, be included as global environmental benefits (GEB). Paragraph 67 currently has text with some possible candidate GEBs but no systematic choice that includes scientific methods that are appropriate for the resources available and the changes to be anticipated. GEF funding is, of course, conditional on achieving GEBs which need to be specified at the very outset. STAP strongly urges the proponents to identify GEBs in terms of a judicious sample of Expected Outcome indicators chosen from the GEF-5 focal area strategies (not just for BD, but also LD, CCM and SFM), along with the methodologies that will be used to track these. Indicators that serve for more than one focal area would be particularly useful. For example, changes in land cover might be chosen with a reference to remote sensing techniques; or changes in total system carbon using sampling and measurement. Attention to this matter in Section B2 would considerably enhance the proposal and make it convincing for GEF-funding.

2. Overall, STAP wishes to emphasize the importance of fully addressing the critical issues left to the PPG phase in the proposal "i.e. the precise areas in which the project will work; the links with the Forest Carbon Partnership and the strategies to be used to improve forest ecosystems; and, in particular, the mainstreaming of gender issues into the project's implementation at all governance levels. STAP expects more detailed descriptions and explanations of these project aspects in the full proposal.

3. STAP is concerned about the lack of science-based methodologies and criteria for the selection of the target PAs and their surrounding areas. A systematic and well-designed process should be adopted where criteria for conservation are

established prior to choice is strongly advised. On this matter, proponents may refer to Dinerstein, E., D. M. Olson, D. J. Graham, A. L. Webster, S. A. Primm, M. P Bookbinder y G. Ledec. 1995. A Conservation Assessment of the Terrestrial Ecoregions of Latin America and the Caribbean. The World Bank, Washington D.C.. Environment Canada also has useful guidance, which could be modified for Peru, for choice of PA at <http://www.ec.gc.ca/ap-pa/default.asp?lang=En&n=BEB3DB50-1>

4. The proponents should address more extensively the particular socio-political challenges inherent to the implementation of SLM/SFM in each of the different areas. For example, UNDP could describe the relative security of land tenure arrangements in the targeted areas. Land tenure, which is likely to be affected by CC impacts, greatly affects soil conservation practices. UNDP may wish to refer to the following two publications: 1. Agrawal, A. 1999. Greener Pastures. Durham: Duke University Press. And 2. Young, K. R., and J. K. Lipton. 2006. Adaptive governance and climate change in the tropical highlands of western South America. Climatic Change 78: 63-102.

5. The project intends to have an important contribution to land management in PA buffer zones. Production landscapes in buffer zones present with very particular problems such as marginality and opportunity costs of labour that are very different from standard SLM. There is little in the PIF that indicates the approach that will be adopted, other than it is intended to be participatory. STAP urges the proponents to draw on lessons in buffer zone management from both Peru (e.g. Cordillera Azul National Park - [http://www.theredddesk.org/activity/redd\\_project\\_in\\_the\\_cordillera\\_azul\\_national\\_park](http://www.theredddesk.org/activity/redd_project_in_the_cordillera_azul_national_park)) and more widely (e.g. UNESCO/WHC World Heritage Paper No. 25, 2008, which contains a number of instructive case studies and experiences - <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/events/documents/event-473-1.pdf> )

6. STAP suggests that the proponents include more specific information concerning the GEF projects that will support the financial sustainability of the project, as well as the potential long-term sources of funding for the initiative. Proponents could describe, for example, the specific provisions implemented in existing baseline programs that support the financial sustainability of the project; potential mechanisms ensuring the increased cost-effectiveness of the ecosystem governance systems; and the specific tools that will be used to streamline payments from ecosystem services to support the long-term implementation of the project's components.

7. The Risk Assessment in Section B.4 appears limited. In response to the risk of institutional rigidity and barriers to inter-institutional collaboration, the proponents propose to raise awareness of the negative externalities of CC on BD and PAs. Given that the core components of the project depend on inter-jurisdictional cooperation, STAP is concerned that a mere communication strategy may be insufficient to tackle the challenge at hand. UNDP could consider, for example, promoting the integration of critical institutional stakeholders in instances of strategic decision-making, which would help further raise the profile of the initiative as well as create shared stakes among institutional partners. The proposal also suggests that the risk of weak enforcement of land use stipulations in the landscape will be addressed by building on baseline projects and financially strengthening the management systems. STAP is particularly concerned that enforcement capacities will not improve as the magnitude of the threats increases; in fact, a major risk lies in the possibility that enforcement capabilities could fail when most needed. Finally, STAP recommends that UNDP also consider the risk that the exclusion of stakeholders can pose to the success of the project. Since the implementation of SLM/SFM will require significant participation from local-level stakeholders, STAP suggests including the risk of limited stakeholder buy-in.

8. Similarly, while STAP welcomes the detailed description of the multiple stakeholders involved in the project and their roles in relation to the project components, it also desires to see the inclusion of local-level stakeholders in the table presented in Section B.5. Local stakeholders include small farmers, indigenous groups, and private companies. They are significant because, as mentioned above, local-level actors are given an important role in the implementation of the project, as well as remain particularly vulnerable to the impact of CC.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	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.  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.
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.  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.
3. <b>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(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.</li> <li>(ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</li> </ul>