

# 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: May 12, 2010

Screeners: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Nijavalli H. Ravindranath  
Consultant(s):

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT    GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4098

**PROJECT DURATION :** 4

**COUNTRIES :** Panama

**PROJECT TITLE:** Sustainable and climate-friendly development in Veraguas Province -Proyecto Participa

**GEF AGENCIES:** IFAD

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** National Environment Authority (ANAM); Ministry of Agricultural Development (MIDA)

**GEF FOCAL AREA:** Climate Change

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAMS:** CC-6;

### 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 proposal on "Sustainable and climate-friendly development in Veraguas Province-Proyecto Participa". The project goal, objectives, outcomes, and outputs are clearly defined. Above all, STAP notes this project explicitly defines the expected global environment benefits, which is very much welcomed. STAP also notes the project has a broad goal to contribute to national efforts in mitigating climate change through GHG emission reduction and carbon sequestration. However, the project outputs and activities have a very narrow focus of small scale afforestation, Agroforestry and a few related activities. Panama also seems to have a national plan for Forest Development: Sustainable Forest Model 2008.

STAP believes, therefore, that the proposal could be further strengthened by addressing the following recommendations:

1. Specify how the proposed project is different or how it complements the National Plan, which is likely to be a large ongoing programme.
2. Develop the baseline scenario and assess the carbon status of different land categories (forestland and cropland). Further, an understanding of the current rates of deforestation, forest degradation and loss of agricultural soil carbon and the factors driving them would be very useful in devising strategies for reducing CO2 emissions and enhancing carbon sinks.
3. Define what tree species will be used in the reforestation and agroforestry activities. Species for reforestation require careful selection so as not to be invasive, or compete with indigenous flora. It is important to consider the implications of the proposed forestry activities on biodiversity.
4. Elaborate further on the community natural resource management plans. It is not clear from the proposal to what extent these plans can feasibly be implemented, and how the project will contribute to their effective implementation. Will the plans be backed by national legislation/ policy and political will?
5. Much of this project is written from a development perspective. What scientific backing, or support, is available from ANAM, and other relevant institutions on integrated natural resource management and forestry management to effectively carry-out the project and deliver the global environment benefits?

6. Clarify whether the figures given in this proposal, e.g. % GHG, are referring to global conditions, or are they specific for Panama.

7. Define explicitly the methods that will be used to measure and monitor carbon stocks and changes in different land management systems in the project area (agroforestry, conservation agriculture, and forestry).

8. Clarify why remote sensing technique is required for a small project covering only 500 ha of afforestation plus 500 ha of Agroforestry. Remote sensing may be required only for national level assessments.

9. On capacity building, what is the rationale for a small scale project at a regional level to incorporate activities to build capacity at national level on carbon monitoring? The methods required for monitoring carbon for a small project are likely to be different from monitoring a national level forest area inventory or estimation of CO2 emissions and removals. The project could focus on monitoring at the project level than mixing project level monitoring with national level monitoring.

10. Equally, describe the significant gaps, and how the project intends to manage the risks affiliated with these gaps, that may exist in measuring and monitoring terrestrial carbon and greenhouse gas emissions. For example, there appears to be no ground-based methods that are adapted to the capacities of local communities on land management activities. (See Carbon benefits project: modelling, measurement, and monitoring, GEF ID 3449).

11. The potential global environmental benefits such as CO2 emission reduction or CO2 removal from the project activities such as community based eco-enterprises, sustainable use of natural resources and green marketing could be elaborated further.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. 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.
<b>2. 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.
<b>3. 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.