

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: 3 February 2010

Screener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: Brian Huntley

I. PIF Information

Full size project **GEF Trust Fund**

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3940 **PROJECT DURATION:** 48 months

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 3642

COUNTRY: Thailand

PROJECT TITLE: Sustainable management of biodiversity in Thailand's production landscape

AGENCY: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Biodiversity-based Economy Development Office (BEDO), and the Thailand Environment Institute (TEI)

GEF FOCAL AREA: BIODIVERSITY

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAMS: Biodiversity SO-2: SP 5

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:
Minor revision required

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP supports this proposal. Thailand meets most of the prerequisites for successful mainstreaming initiatives. These include sound knowledge base, strong institutional and policy frameworks, and a supportive government. As such, this project has the essential enabling environment for mainstreaming biodiversity in production sectors.
3. The strong focus on two products - shrimp and bamboo - is realistic. Thailand has long experience in the production, harvesting and sale of these generic products. What is lacking, however, is the testing of sustainable, environmentally benign production systems for the indigenous species chosen.
4. The project description makes the progress from concept to financial and ecological sustainability seem too easy. Moving from agro/fisheries product research and development normally can take decades, and given market barriers to certified, high value products in rural and low income urban markets, it is not realistic to expect results in the short term of even a full size project.
5. The risk analysis focuses on the market end, not the product development end. It is assumed that no technological problems will be encountered, and that no negative environmental impacts will result from the proposed product developments. A minor revision is called for to elaborate on these aspects in the full proposal document.
6. STAP will provide UNDP with its own study on environmental certification¹, currently in peer review to inform the development of the full proposal.

¹ See STAP work program at

http://stapgef.unep.org/docs/Activities/STAPWPDocs/GEF_C.35_Inf.11%20STAP%20Work%20Program%20FY10.pdf.

<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.	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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 <p>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>
3. Major revision required	<p>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.</p> <p>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>