

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: October 16, 2012

Screeener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Brian Huntley; Annette Cowie
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT **GEF TRUST FUND**

GEF PROJECT ID: 4968

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Chile

PROJECT TITLE: Integrated National Monitoring and Assessment System on Forest Ecosystems (SIMEF) in Support of Policies, Regulations and SFM Practices Incorporating REDD+ and Biodiversity Conservation in Forest Ecosystems

GEF AGENCIES: FAO

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Centro de Informaci3n de los Recursos Naturales (CIREN)
Corporaci3n Nacional Forestal (CONAF); Instituto Nacional Forestal (INFOR)

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 FAO's proposal for "Integrated national monitoring and assessment system on forest ecosystems (SIMEF) in support of policies, regulations and SFM practices incorporating REDD+ and biodiversity conservation in forest ecosystems". STAP appreciates the clearly expressed proposal that details the activities to be undertaken, as well as the specific benefits to be generated. The multiple benefits, biodiversity and sustainable forest management, are clear, and the efficient approach to addressing these objectives simultaneously is welcomed. The proposal is technically sound, and applies good practice in carbon stock assessment. The proposal also relates directly and in a focused and targeted way to national and globally identified priorities, including the Aichi targets. STAP welcomes this proposal that offers to serve as a strong example of the benefits of well-articulated multi-focal area projects.

To strengthen the proposal further, STAP suggests that the following points are addressed during the development of the full proposal ":

1. The PIF provides clearly defined, well-linked and logical objectives, outcomes and outputs. However, indicators are not given for CC-5 and BD-2 outcomes in section A " although they are mentioned later in the PIF. STAP also encourages the FAO to reword the outputs so that all are expressed as specific products (tangible or conceptual/virtual).
2. STAP welcomes the strong and well-developed scientific and technical base and approach presented. The project builds on strong existing capacities and directs these to their wider application across the forest ecosystems of Chile, especially the biodiversity rich and unique ancient forests in the south. The technical approaches proposed are based on widely tested methodologies and thus offer good opportunity for scaling-up elsewhere, based on further experience through their use in Chile.
3. A strong and convincing case is made for the value to be added through collaboration, coordination, and achieving synergies between the two key agencies involved in forest assessment and management in Chile. Nonetheless, no mention is made of national academic, or research institutions. STAP looks forward to seeing these details in the final project document.
4. The use of the outputs of the SIMEF to guide land-use planning and biodiversity conservation and sustainable forest management strategies at the local level demonstrates the value of the project in real terms to achieve impact on the ground. The addition of socio-economic indicators to better understand the key drivers behind land-use changes and

forest degradation is of vital importance. It is suggested that these highly sensitive indicators might need as much specialized attention to design as do the more direct physical/biological indicators.

5. The targets set are ambitious, but probably realistic given the strong buy-in of government for the mainstreaming approaches described. Nonetheless, STAP wishes further clarity on how the monitoring of the targets will occur beyond the end of the project.

6. Additionally, STAP welcomes the use of pilot projects. During the development of the project document, consideration might be given to introducing some elements of experimental or quasi-experimental design such as that proposed by the STAP Advisory Report ‘Experimental Project Designs in the Global Environment Facility’. (The report can be found on the STAP website ‘www.stapgef.org’). This would assist in the generation of empirical evidence on project outcomes, and inform future investments in this area.

7. STAP recommends providing an explanation for the derivation of the estimates of carbon sequestration and avoided emissions.

8. FAO may also wish to consider the application of the Carbon Benefits Project tools for the estimation of carbon stock change in biomass and soil. The GEF Secretariat can provide further information about the Carbon Benefits Project.

9. Additionally, STAP would appreciate further clarity on the role of the 13 regional implementation committees, and whether they are necessary (in addition to the oversight and advisory committees)?

10. STAP also recommends revising the figure legend as it is not legible and the elements are not readily distinguished. It also would be helpful to thoroughly proof-read the proposal, and eliminate typographic errors.

<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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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.
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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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.