

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 23, 2017
Screener: Sarah Lebel
Panel member validation by: Michael Anthony Stocking
Consultant(s):

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

FULL-SIZED PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9554
PROJECT DURATION:	4
COUNTRIES:	Philippines
PROJECT TITLE:	Enhancing Biodiversity, Maintaining Ecosystem Flows, Enhancing Carbon Stocks through Sustainable Land Management and the Restoration of Degraded Forestlands
GEF AGENCIES:	FAO
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), Forest Management Bureau (FMB).

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 the FAO proposal "Enhancing biodiversity, maintaining ecosystem flows, enhancing carbon stocks through sustainable land management and the restoration of degraded forestlands". The project's stated objective is to "deliver multiple and integrated environmental, livelihood and development benefits through the promotion of the cost-effective and sustainable restoration of the biological and productive capacities of degraded forest land ecosystems". STAP believes that the PIF is well developed scientifically and technically. The project builds convincingly on existing initiatives, and establishes clearly the scope of this proposal. The logic is clear, and proposed interventions directly address the very specific gaps identified (e.g. the lack of long-term economic incentives for reforestation through the National Greening Programme; and the emphasis on conventional approaches to reforestation). The PIF presents a rationale built on scientific evidence, including numerous references to current literature. Moreover, it explicitly mentions its ambition to integrate scientific evidence in the project development.

STAP supports the stated intention to analyse the importance of tenure security as a condition for local stakeholders to restore and manage ecosystems sustainably (Output 1.4). In particular, the restoration of Philippine native forest by smallholder tree farmers has been an important contribution to countering the tendency to restore using exotic species (see Snelder, J. & Lasco, R.D.(editors) 2017. Smallholder Tree Growing for Rural Development and Environmental Services: Lessons from Asia. Springer, pp.319-346). STAP hopes that the project can not only enlist local smallholders as stakeholders but utilize their indigenous knowledge centrally in planning and upscaling. FAO needs to ensure that local people are not just consulted but retain a high-level of involvement in the project at all stages of the project cycle.

STAP is pleased that Component 3 sets out an explicit intention to develop a dedicated Knowledge Management system and strategy that also helps to support M&E. As the project develops, the project proponents are urged to examine some of STAP's on-going 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>

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