

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 16, 2016
Screener: Guadalupe Duron
Panel member validation by: Annette Cowie; Brian Child
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9092
PROJECT DURATION:	4
COUNTRIES:	Peru
PROJECT TITLE:	Sustainable Management of Agro-Biodiversity and Vulnerable Ecosystems Recuperation in Peruvian Andean Regions Through Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems GIAHS Approach
GEF AGENCIES:	FAO
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Environment 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):
Concur

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes FAO's proposal "Sustainable management of agro-biodiversity and vulnerable ecosystems recuperation in Peruvian Andean regions through Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS) approach. The problem analysis and description of the drivers provide a solid rationale on why agro-biodiversity conservation is dependent on a landscape management approach. The project might be ambitious in its scope although it is clear the project builds from other initiatives. In this regard, STAP is pleased to see a detailed description of how the project is based on lessons learnt from other GEF projects. If there are lessons learned from non-GEF projects that can be useful in the delivery of multiple global environmental benefits, STAP encourages for FAO to uptake these as well during the project design and implementation. The main challenge might be in securing the viability of agro-biodiversity and small-scale diversified farming (versus industrial agriculture). STAP is pleased the project has considered this challenge, and developed options for policies and incentives, such as Payment for Ecosystem Services. STAP is pleased that its guidance on Payment for Ecosystem Services has been useful in the design of this concept, and future project design.

STAP wishes to commend FAO for the quality of this PIF, and encourages them to design the project with the same rigor. The project will provide important global environmental benefits, and vital lessons and strategies on agro-biodiversity for replication.

Below, STAP provides suggestions for strengthening the project design.

1. The PIF mentions a sustainability strategy. It would be useful to define it, and link it to the project objective, activities, outputs, and outcomes.

2. STAP recommends mapping the drivers of agro- biodiversity degradation, the socio-economic context, and the biophysical and agro-ecological characteristics of each target region. The spatial scale of each intervention is also needed to analyze the potential effects (positive or negative) of an intervention on a lower (household), or higher scale (district). This information will help assess the social-ecological interactions which are important to achieving environmental sustainability at local and global scales.

The project developers could refer to the following paper that presents a conceptual framework on agro-biodiversity and ecosystem services based on spatial scales and social-ecological approaches: Zimmerer, K., et al "Sustainable smallholder intensification in global change? Pivotal spatial interactions, gendered livelihoods, and agrobiodiversity", *Environmental Sustainability* 2015, 14:49â€“60.

3. Additionally, STAP suggests defining further the stakeholders that will be involved in the project. The needs of small-holder farmers, forest dwellers, indigenous groups, and other stakeholders will likely differ, and it will be important for their knowledge, roles and responsibilities to be defined at the onset and embedded in the project development. A multi-stakeholder analysis and engagement plan could assist in achieving this task.

The project also should specify how the combined roles of the stakeholders will contribute (and facilitate) reporting on global environmental outcomes.

4. STAP recommends considering the risks to small-scale agro-biodiversity, given the globalization of markets and large-scale farming. For example, how does the project intend to make small-scale agro-biodiversity competitive if incentives are not enough to compete, or address the implications of global and regional economic policies?

5. STAP recommends for the project to build in adaptive management provisions rather than waiting until the mid-term evaluation to make adjustments as it is described in the PIF. Building a theory of change into the project development is one option. The project developers might wish to refer to the following source on developing a theory of change: <http://www.espa.ac.uk/files/espa/ESPA-Theory-of-Change-Manual-FINAL.pdf>

6. STAP suggests strengthening the learning aspect in the monitoring and assessment component. This includes specifying the project needs that learning can fulfill. The theory of change can help identify these needs, so the project can continuously adjust based on learning.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Concur	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.
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	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: (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. 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.
3. Major issues to be considered during project	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:

design	<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>
---------------	---