I. PIF Information
Full size project GEF Trust Fund
GEF PROJECT ID: 4149 PROJECT DURATION: 60 months
COUNTRY: Mexico
PROJECT TITLE: Mitigating Climate Change through Sustainable Forest Management and Capacity Building in the Southern States of Mexico (States of Campeche, Chiapas and Oaxaca)
GEF AGENCY: IFAD
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER: National Forestry Commission (CONAFOR), Mexico
GEF FOCAL AREA: Climate change
GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM: SP-6
NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: 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
2. STAP notes the emphasis in this proposal on community forest management (CFM). It is not clear from the PIF whether the proponents believe that CFM is more effective at carbon sequestration than other forms of management and thus should be expanded, or whether they believe that CFM is currently less effective for carbon sequestration but improving it by capacity building is possible and represents a better investment that shifting to or maintaining other management systems. The scientific evidence on this question is mixed and the full proposal should clarify the situation in Mexico to improve the project justification. If it remains uncertain this project should be designed so that it can contribute to the evidence base. STAP will provide its own analysis and advisory document on CFM and its impacts on global environmental benefits to IFAD during the proposal development phase in 2010.

3. The full proposal should also detail the choice of species to be used in re-afforestation projects, and the measures taken to avoid environmental risks that might arise from use of species that have invasive tendencies or are known to be invasive elsewhere. The ecosystem service impacts of re-afforestation - in terms of water use - should also be considered in species choice and re-afforestation design. The PIF gives no information on the process of re-afforestation, other than giving the impression that it is relatively simple, based on Mexican experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAP advisory response</th>
<th>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Consent</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Minor revision required</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Major revision required</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>