

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: 5 June 2008

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

I. PIF Information

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3549

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: P102403

COUNTRY(IES): The Republic of Kazakhstan and the Kyrgyz Republic

PROJECT TITLE: Tien Shan Ecosystem Development Project

GEF AGENCY(IES): THE WORLD BANK

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S):

(i) State Agency for Environmental Protection and Forestry of the Kyrgyz Republic; and

(ii) Forestry and Hunting Committee under the Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan

GEF FOCAL AREA (S): BIODIVERSITY

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): BD-SP1, BD-SP3, SFM-SP1, SFM-SP2, SFM-SP3, SFM-SP5, SFM-SP7

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT:

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. STAP welcomes this proposal on the "Tien Shan Ecosystem Development Project" in the Republic of Kazakhstan and the Kyrgyz Republic. There are several aspects of the proposal that STAP believes could be improved to strengthen the scientific soundness of the project. First, the connection between the threats listed and the activities proposed are not clear (with the exception of the connection between greater enforcement and reduced threats). Second, in what way will the project support improved management of existing forests? Third, how will GEF funds be able to increase tourism in the region and why would tourism reduce the threats to forest (through changes of behavior, increased in political support, revenues for forestry department?). Fourth, are the efforts across these two nations coordinated in a transboundary initiative or are they only linked by the proximity to the ecosystem (as transboundary coordination is complex and costly, neither approach is necessarily superior, but it should be clarified). Fifth, the biodiversity links/synergies between the reforestation initiative (not funded by GEF) and the forest conservation activities (funded by GEF) are not clear. They appear as simply too separate projects and although the reforestation activities are claimed to have biodiversity benefits in the proposal, these benefits are not clearly spelled out.

| STAP advisory response | Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 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: (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. |
| 3. Major revision required | 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 |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>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.</p> |
|--|--|