

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: 4 March 2008

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

I. PIF Information

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3637

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 4015

COUNTRY(IES): Mexico

PROJECT TITLE: Transforming management of biodiversity rich community production forests through building national capacities for market based instruments.

GEF AGENCY(IES): UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Comisión Nacional Forestal (CONAFOR), Rainforest Alliance (RA)

GEF FOCAL AREAS: Biodiversity

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): SFM-SO2; BD-SP 5

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: SFM

Full size project GEF Trust Fund

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(ies): **Consent**

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. This is a focused and clearly-written proposal on integrating biodiversity management into sustainable forestry practices on community lands, using market-based instruments. STAP welcomes it and would be happy to be consulted on developing a monitoring system to assess the impact of forest certification schemes on biodiversity conservation, as well as other technical and scientific aspects UNDP may wish to raise. In particular, this project would seem amenable to the use of control ejidos within the context of implementing the pilot activities so that one can test the implicit assumptions of this proposal that increases in the area under certification (or PTAs) and under offsets actually leads to changes in impacts on forests. Likewise one can test the assumption that were ejidos to participate, their incomes would higher than if they did not participate. There is little credible evidence to support any of these assumptions and thus the project should be explicitly testing them. Given FSC is already present in Mexico (in fact the first FSC forest management certificate was in Mexico), it would also be useful to test the intermediate assumptions, held by many in the conservation community, that building ejido capacity and "facilitating market development" through outside technical assistance leads to more certification than there would be in the absence of such assistance. Two other minor suggestions are - define more explicitly the global benefit(s) the project intends to address, and review the intended outcomes and outputs because some outcomes appear to be outputs.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues 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	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical omissions in

required	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.
-----------------	---