

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: April 23, 2012

Screener: 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: 4750

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Regional (Ecuador, Peru)

PROJECT TITLE: Multiplying Environmental and Carbon Benefits in High Andean Ecosystems

GEF AGENCIES: UNEP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: CONDESAN

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 this ambitious multi-focal area proposal. The enhancement of multiple environmental and social benefits in high Andean ecosystems is a laudable, if challenging, objective in both institutional and scientific terms. The approach of seeking the synergies between biodiversity conservation, land management in the high Andes and climate change mitigation-adaptation strategies is the most appropriate for these very poor, marginal landscapes with important but extremely delicate environmental attributes. STAP appreciates the well-referenced baseline analysis for the project.

STAP wishes to raise a number of scientific and technical issues that will require attention in the further development of this project to a full proposal.

1. There is an apparent overlap in the scientific and technical content in Components 1 (science base and tools development) and 4 (project monitoring). STAP normally recommends that project monitoring and evaluation is structured as an integral part of all project components since it should be based upon carefully-chosen tracking and impact indicators from the outset and should inform the project as it progresses. This will be especially important in this project for Component 3, where there must be in place good tracking of the ecosystem restoration benefits. In this project with a component specifically to develop monitoring tools, STAP appreciates it might be sensible to keep the tools development separate from the use of the tools. Nevertheless, the full proposal should provide assurance that the project will develop suitable impact indicators that will focus on appropriate global environmental benefits appropriate to a multi-focal project across BD-CCM-LD-SFM, and that specific provision is made for these indicators to be tracked through the lifetime of the project and beyond.

2. The expected outputs currently lack quantification and, implicitly, only have a time-frame of the project duration. During the PPG, STAP recommends that substantial attention is directed at establishing a quantified baseline of the key environmental and social variables of the project (such as land cover, carbon stocks in soil and vegetation, biodiversity status and current usage, and poverty/livelihood status of local people). These variables should then be built into the outputs with realistic quantified targets by project completion. STAP welcomes the inclusion of economic valuations and urges that the economic rationality of land use and ecosystem restoration practices be tracked with the view to their sustainability in the longer term, in what is a particularly difficult biophysical environment.

3. STAP was able to discern from the PIF that the project proponents recognize the importance of gender issues only in one sentence at the end of paragraph B3. A gender dimension is indeed essential. However, it must be built through the tools development, training at all levels and implementation. In land management, the distributional aspects of economic benefits between men and women, and rich and poor, have to be recognized at all levels. If the project aim of

multiplying environmental and social benefits is to be achieved even if only as a downstream Outcome, then stakeholder analysis and gender awareness has to be built into project design from the outset. Some of the relevant issues are discussed in the book: Food, gender, and poverty in the Ecuadorian Andes. By Weismantel, M.J. (1989) 234pp. ISBN 0-8122-8115-2.

4. In Component 1, STAP notes the intention to test and validate a number of methods of measuring total system carbon and GHG emissions. The GEF-financed Carbon Benefits Project is specifically mentioned. For information to the proponents, STAP itself with partners including UNEP will shortly be conducting a validation exercise of the tracking tools for carbon. It is suggested that this proposal coordinates closely with other on-going activities of a similar kind and does not attempt to duplicate their analyses.

5. The risk analysis in Section B4 does not include climate change risks. El Niño effects are well known in the Andes already – see, for example, B.S. Orlove, J.C.H. Chiang & M.A. Cane, 2000. Forecasting Andean rainfall and crop yield from the influence of El Niño on Pleiades visibility, Nature 403: 68-71, which incidentally shows that El Niño variability is a useful and simple indicator for seasonal rainfall forecasting. Climate change in high mountain areas is normally acknowledged as a high risk.

| <i>STAP advisory response</i> | <i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i> |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Consent | STAP acknowledges that on scientific/technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasising any issues that could be improved and the proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement. |
| 2. Minor revision required. | STAP has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. One or more options that remain open to STAP include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (ii) Setting a review point during early stage project development and agreeing 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 revision required | STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical omissions in the concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. Normally, a STAP approved review will be mandatory prior to submission of the project brief for CEO endorsement. 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. |