

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 14, 2014

Screener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Sandra Diaz
Consultant(s): Paul Grigoriev

I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 5755

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Bolivia

PROJECT TITLE: Sustainable Management of Forest Ecosystems in Amazonia by Indigenous and Local Communities to Generate Multiple Environmental and Social Benefits

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Plurinational Authority for Mother Earth

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 the submission of this concept for a project whose intent is to promote the sustainable management of forest ecosystems in northern Bolivian Amazonia by indigenous and local communities so as to generate multiple environmental and social benefits to encourage continued community continued involvement in their protection.

The overall framework of the proposal is logical and generally well presented and the objective is clear, although it could be somewhat simplified. The Components of the proposed project, the expected Outcomes and proposed Outputs are generally consistent with the defined problem and Objective and are logically presented. STAP would propose that additional thought in particular be given to Component 2. This component as presented seems to be focused only on addressing the second barrier presented (local communities are unable to obtain significant and sustainable revenues from standing forests). Although important, this barrier is only one element of this Component as it is presented. Perhaps elements of this Component could be shifted to Component 1. Currently there is a lack of clarity in the Outcomes and Outputs, as some are mixed with indicators and suggested targets. It is understood that indicators will be either developed or further refined during the PPG stage.

The project context is described well and the threats and principal barriers are identified clearly. However, as mentioned above, the relationship between the barriers (especially number 2) and the structure of the Components could be revisited and strengthened.

The baseline activities and investments are well described, and the anticipated GEBs in three focal areas are evident. The incremental cost reasoning, while presented in a rather general manner, makes it clear that the project will build upon the baseline to generate GEBs.

While the project is certainly innovative in its approach, no explicit mention of this is made. Perhaps this is tacitly assumed. The project's scaling-up potential is likewise not addressed at this stage. The reasoning behind the sustainability of the expected results is adequate at this stage but will require further specifics moving ahead.

The key stakeholders are presented in a comprehensive list however there is little indication of potential roles or unique contributions. Likewise, the nature of the coordinating mechanism to be employed should be

articulated. The importance of gender considerations is very strongly recognized and built into the design. The primary risks and mitigation measures are appropriate. Climate change related risks are strongly recognized.

Regarding the project's coordination with other projects and initiatives, only one project is mentioned (GEF/UNDP project on strengthening certification). Community forest management has been a hallmark of the GEF biodiversity and SFM programs for many years, much of which was led by the Agency concerned in this initiative in the Latin American region. It would be useful even at this stage to indicate how the project will be drawing on this knowledge base and lessons learned. Clearly there is a very large body of experience related to the proposed project that should be considered. Furthermore, STAP wishes to emphasize that the project proponents should ensure that this project contributes to the broader knowledge base for successful community-based SFM and how this supports not only the delivery of GEBs but local benefits as well and including contributions to boarder initiatives such as REDD+. STAP wishes to draw the proponents attention to a paper on this subject the Panel presented in 2010: The Evidence Base for Community Forest Management as a Mechanism for Supplying Global Environmental Benefits and Improving Local Welfare (<http://www.stapgef.org/the-evidence-base-for-community-forest-management-as-a-mechanism-for-supplying-global-environmental-benefits-and-improving-local-welfare/>).

<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: (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.</p>
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: (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.</p>