

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

Screener: 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: 5122

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Solomon Islands

PROJECT TITLE: Integrated Forest Management in the Solomon Islands

GEF AGENCIES: FAO

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology;
Ministry of Forests and Research; Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock

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 FAO's proposal "Integrated forest management in the Solomon Islands". The interventions describe attempts to target the challenges defined in section B.1. The proposed components also seem to support the project objective "...to implement integrated management of protected areas and forest landscape management for the generation of multiple global environmental benefits." However, STAP would have preferred for the components to be further defined in the PIF. It looks forward, therefore, to a fuller description of the interventions in the full proposal.

Below, STAP identifies points that could be strengthened during the proposal development.

1. STAP recommends detailing further section B.1. For example, it would be good for the project developers to describe more comprehensively the target regions, their ecosystems, and threats "in essence, the baseline. In this regard, STAP encourages FAO to support the baseline narrative with data and references (published or rigorous unpublished documents). This information will assist in substantiating further the rationale for the proposed interventions, and for monitoring the expected global environmental outcomes. Under threats, STAP also suggests including climate change impacts and how it could affect ecosystems in the target regions. In this regard, it would be useful to include climate change projection data. One source for this information is the World Bank Climate Change Knowledge Portal - <http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportal/index.cfm>
2. Additionally, STAP recommends detailing further baseline activities listed in the table in section B.1, and how GEF resources will build upon each activity to contribute towards global environmental benefits.
3. STAP recommends defining comprehensively each component. Currently, these are only described briefly which presents a challenge in understanding fully their technical rationale. Additionally, it would be valuable if each component defined explicitly what global environmental outcome it seeks to achieve. This information is absent in some of the component descriptions "for example, component 3 appears to focus on how the component will contribute towards UN REDD activities, and less so on how it will contribute towards global environmental benefit(s).
4. STAP appreciates the estimates on the expected global environmental benefits (carbon estimates, percentage of land under increased ecosystem coverage and forest cover). To complete this section on global environmental benefits, STAP suggests detailing the methodologies that will be used to measure and monitor each global environmental benefit. The project proponents also may wish to identify indicators from the respective focal area tracking tools for each global benefit.

5. STAP is supportive of the basic premise of the proposal and its objective. As the proposal is developed, STAP encourages, however, for FAO to think through how the relationships between the components could be strengthened. In this regard, perhaps it would be useful to consider a framework based on multifunctional landscapes integrating protected areas. As a result, the components could be based more fundamentally on an approach that addresses simultaneously conservation (global environmental benefit) and development (local benefit) through a multifunctional landscapes perspective, inclusive of protected areas. Such an approach also should enable the project developers to identify trade-offs between conservation and development. For this purpose, a reference that FAO may wish to use is as follows - "Dewi, S. et al. "Protected areas within multifunctional landscapes: squeezing out intermediate land use intensities in the tropics?" Land Use Policy 30 (2013).

6. STAP is pleased to see the project developers will integrate gender throughout the activities (section B.3). STAP looks forward to reading further details on how gender will be integrated throughout the proposal and linked to the project's intended socioeconomic impacts, and global environmental benefits. Perhaps FAO may wish to consider the NTFP literature in this regard. In some instances, the literature suggests that women are more involved than men throughout the NTFP value chain (Commercialisation of Non-Timber Forest Products: Review and Analysis of Research R. Neumann and E. Hirsch). Thus, STAP encourages FAO to detail explicitly the gender dimensions of NTFP harvesting and commercialization, and how they contribute to socioeconomic and global environmental benefits. A good reference for guidance on gender dimensions is the 40-page publication from IFAD in 2008: Gender and non-timber forest products: Promoting food security and economic empowerment. It highlights the key issues on the role of women in NTFPs and contains a useful bibliography.

7. STAP suggests adding a column to the stakeholders table (section B.5) that specifies the stakeholders' roles 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.