STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: 20 May 2009
Screener: David Cunningham
Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

I. PIF Information
Full size project: GEF Trust Fund
GEF PROJECT ID: 3954
PROJECT DURATION: 
GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 3936
COUNTRY(IES): Papua New Guinea
PROJECT TITLE: Forest Conservation and Protected Area Management in PNG
GEF AGENCY: UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): Department of Environment and Conservation
GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity
GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): BD-SP3, BD-SP1
NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: GEF-PACIFIC ALLIANCE FOR SUSTAINABILITY

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 acknowledges this project under the Pacific Alliance for Sustainability (GEF-PAS) programmatic approach. The program is led by the World Bank, with participation from the ADB, UNEP and UNDP and consists of 24 proposed projects from various focal areas (BD, CC, IW and POPs). Please note that STAP is written into the advisory structure of the GEF-PAS (pp. 13, 25 of the Program Framework Document) with reference to more specifically identifying the global environmental benefits.

3. This is a complex project bringing together Payments for Environmental Services (PES) (including REDD), sustainable production certification and community-based management of forest, coastal and marine resources.

4. STAP requests that the full project document takes into account STAP’s general advice on PES. We also draw to UNDP’s attention STAP’s analysis of the Evidence base for Community Forest Management impacts on global environmental benefits which will be available from October 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAP advisory response</th>
<th>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Consent</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Minor revision required</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Major revision required</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Available at http://stappf.unep.org/resources/so/PES