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: 25 June 2008 Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Michael Stocking

I. PIF Information *(Paste here from the PIF)*

Full size project GEF Trust Fund

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3132
GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: HA-X1002
COUNTRY(IES): Haiti
PROJECT TITLE: Sustainable Land Management of the Upper Watersheds of South Western Haiti
GEF AGENCY(IES): IADB,
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): Ministry of Environment (MDE)
GEF FOCAL AREA (S): Land Degradation, Climate Change
GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): LD-SP1; LD-SP2; CC-SP6.

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 project that attempts to embed environmental goals into sustainable land management and rural development. The explicit focus on using this project, in part, to assist Haiti in attaining the MDGs is very positive.

The three substantive components of the project all raise scientific and technical issues that are outside the scope of a PIF to discuss in sufficient detail. Given its recent history, Haiti will be a challenging country in which to develop truly integrated and community-led approaches to land degradation. The project proponents are advised to consider some issues that should be addressed as the project proposal is developed into a full brief.

Component 1 entails the development of watershed management plans. There is a long history of such plans, including traditional land use planning as well as soil and water conservation plans and watershed plans. Generally, a top-down type of planning where technical experts design the layout of infrastructure and the placing of investments does not work. Alternatively, to quote a recent paper, "Participation in IWM becomes high when the direct, visible benefits of the programme are consistent with the interests of the people or community in question." (Tefera and Stroosnijder, 2007). In other words, planning at a watershed scale needs to be undertaken with local people as an integral part of the planning process. It would be advisable for the project proponents to elaborate on what form these plans will take, how the watershed management committees will be formed and will function, and how the needs and aspirations of local communities will be incorporated.

Component 2 is about introduction and adoption of technologies that will raise living standards and incomes, as well as protect forest cover. Again, the record of technology transfer projects is patchy. Technologies that work in one environment do not necessarily work in another environment especially amongst resource-poor communities. The project proponents are urged to take the lessons from the many decades of investment in technology adoption in the land use and water sectors, and see how their approach can better adapt itself to the felt needs of local people and therefore be acceptable and sustainable.

Component 3 will similarly bring about challenges of a scientific and technical nature. Conflict resolution especially over land issues is much discussed in the social science literature. Appropriate approaches need to be designed to use local knowledge, institutions and methods for conflict resolution. Some evidence of these considerations should be inserted into the project brief so that the project managers will be alerted to the need to utilise lessons learned elsewhere.

The Global Environmental Benefits (Part II, Section A, last sub-section) are specified only very loosely and qualitatively in the PIF, through generic statements on the regional and global benefits of preventing deforestation and land degradation. In order to provide a baseline from which the project may measure its impact, it is advisable to identify quantitatively a number of indicators (cf – GEF-4 LD FA Strategy, for example) that could be monitored, from which GEBs can then be claimed. Baseline surveys and/or secondary sources will have some information, and with the targets for activities, it should be possible to make some estimates of some GEBs that could be attained. This is certainly possible for carbon sequestration and CO2 emissions, and simple soil loss models should provide some data for expected benefits directly in keeping vegetation cover.

STAP advisory response	*Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed*
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: (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.