

# 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: 29 August 2009

Screener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: Brian Huntley & Paul Ferraro

### I. PIF Information

**Full size project**      **GEF Trust Fund**

GEF PROJECT ID: 3933      PROJECT DURATION: 60 months

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:

COUNTRY: Peru

PROJECT TITLE: Sustainable management of protected areas and forests of the Northern Highlands of Peru

GEF AGENCY: IFAD

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): PROFONANPE

GEF FOCAL AREA (S): Biodiversity

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): BD-SP1; BD-SP5

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT (if applicable): SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT (SFM)

### II. STAP Advisory Response (see table below for explanation)

1. Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency:  
**Minor revision required**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

#### *Implementation of the CBSP*

2. STAP welcomes this proposal to promote the sustainable management of protected areas and communal forested lands in Peru. While we have no specific concerns based on the PIF, we ask that the full proposal take account of STAP's general advice on three of the planned interventions:
  - a. Component 1.2 includes Community Forest Management, STAP's analysis of the Evidence base for Community Forest Management impacts on global environmental benefits will be available from October 2009<sup>1</sup>.
  - b. Component 2.2 includes forest certification, STAP's Guidance document on whether and how certification can lead to ecosystem use changes correlated with environmental services and biodiversity will be available in late 2009<sup>2</sup>.
  - c. Component 2.3 includes 3 proposed strategy papers on payments for environmental services (PES), STAP requests that the full project proposal take into account its general advice on this topic<sup>3</sup>, in particular how the strategies can address the four main threats to PES effectiveness: (i) non-compliance; (ii) poor administrative selection; (iii) spatial demand spillovers; and (iv) adverse self-selection.
3. The Panel notes the emphasis in the project on non-timber forest products (NTFPs) under Component 2 and cautions that despite more than two decades of experience with attempts to enhance NTFP markets as a conservation and livelihood strategy, the evidence for success is, at best, equivocal. STAP is aware of very few examples of long-term success with donor efforts to induce NTFP market development to achieve conservation and livelihood efforts (almost all are restricted to big game operations in southern Africa). The full project proposal should indicate from where the project will draw guidance to ensure it doesn't suffer the same fate as most of the donor NTFP initiatives of the past. One

<sup>1</sup> See the brief description at <http://stapgef.unep.org/activities/stapmeetings/RomeApril2009/document.2009-04-16.2025104533>.

<sup>2</sup> See STAP work program at [http://stapgef.unep.org/docs/Activities/STAPWPDocs/GEF\\_C.35\\_Inf.11%20STAP%20Work%20Program%20FY10.pdf](http://stapgef.unep.org/docs/Activities/STAPWPDocs/GEF_C.35_Inf.11%20STAP%20Work%20Program%20FY10.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> Available at <http://stapgef.unep.org/resources/sq/PES>.

resource that may be useful in this regard is the review on “Are NTFPs a way out of poverty?” published in May 2009<sup>4</sup> and the case studies it refers to.

4. The return on investment in component 2 - sustainable management of 2000 ha of forest and 1000 ha under certification - seems very low for US\$7.2 million. However, the benefits depend on how sustainable the impacts are, and how critical the affected forests are in biodiversity terms.
5. No indication is given of the composition of the reforestation programs - other than they will comprise both exotic and native species. Further information, and if necessary, an invasiveness risk assessment, of the exotic species proposed for reforestation projects supported by GEF should be required - both of timber species, and of fungi being proposed for commercial production.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. <b>Consent</b>	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. <b>Minor revision required.</b>	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"> <li>(i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues</li> <li>(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</li> </ul> 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. <b>Major revision required</b>	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.

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.id21.org/insights/insights77/index.html>.