

# 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: 1 February 2010

Screener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: Brian Huntley

### I. PIF Information

**Full size project**            **GEF Trust Fund**  
**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4182    **PROJECT DURATION:** 6 years  
**GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:** 4186  
**COUNTRY:** Malaysia  
**PROJECT TITLE:** Biodiversity Conservation in Multiple-Use Forest Landscapes in Sabah, Malaysia  
**GEF AGENCY:** UNDP  
**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER:** Government of Sabah, Malaysia  
**GEF FOCAL AREA:** Biodiversity  
**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAMS:** BD-SP1; BD-SP3; BD-SP4

### 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 welcomes the ambitious goals of this project, which include ensuring "no net loss in estimated value of ecosystem functions, i.e. full maintenance of natural capital, within pilot site area" (p.2). Minor revision is requested by STAP to address the issues detailed below.
3. Paragraph 13 (p.6) correctly identifies a number of barriers to a long-term solution and sustainable financing of biodiversity conservation, including the fact that options for REDD Plus, biodiversity banking, sustainable timber certification and NTFPs have yet to be fully explored in the project area. Each of these potential interventions has scientific and technical challenges and the full proposal should set out how they will be addressed, for example:
  - a. Sustainable timber certification: the scientific literature reveals that the relationship between biodiversity conservation outcomes and forest certification remains poorly understood, even after more than 15 years of implementation<sup>1</sup>. STAP will provide UNDP with its own study on environmental certification<sup>2</sup>, currently in peer review.
  - b. Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFPs): despite more than two decades of experience with attempts to enhance NTFP markets as a conservation and livelihood strategy, the evidence for success is, at best, equivocal. STAP is aware of very few examples of long-term success with donor efforts to induce NTFP market development to achieve conservation and livelihood efforts (almost all are restricted to big game operations in southern Africa). The full project proposal should indicate from where the project will draw guidance to ensure it doesn't suffer the same fate as most of the donor NTFP initiatives of the past. One resource that may be useful in this regard is the review on "Are NTFPs a way out of poverty?"<sup>3</sup> and the case studies referred to in this publication.
  - c. REDD Plus: A number of barriers to REDD Plus and any Payments for Environmental/Ecosystem Services (PES) scheme are described in STAP's general advice on PES projects<sup>4</sup>, including the need to address the most common barriers to PES effectiveness: (i) non-compliance; (ii) poor administrative selection; (iii) spatial demand spillovers; and (iv)

<sup>1</sup> Tropenbos International (2009) Effects of Forest Certification on Biodiversity.

<http://www.tropenbos.org/index.php/news/forestcertificationbiodiversity>

<sup>2</sup> See STAP work program at

[http://stapgef.unep.org/docs/Activities/STAPWPDocs/GEF\\_C.35\\_Inf.11%20STAP%20Work%20Program%20FY10.pdf](http://stapgef.unep.org/docs/Activities/STAPWPDocs/GEF_C.35_Inf.11%20STAP%20Work%20Program%20FY10.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.id21.org/insights/insights77/index.html>.

<sup>4</sup> See <http://stapgef.unep.org/resources/sq/PES> and additional notes provided to Council at

[http://www.thegef.org/uploadedFiles/Documents/Council\\_Documents\\_\(PDF\\_DOC\)/GEF\\_35/C.35.Inf.12\\_STAP\\_Guidance\\_on\\_PES.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/uploadedFiles/Documents/Council_Documents_(PDF_DOC)/GEF_35/C.35.Inf.12_STAP_Guidance_on_PES.pdf)

adverse self-selection. The full proposal should detail how each of these barriers will be addressed and the project design should be capable of assessing whether the pilot interventions were in fact effective. One risk overlooked in Part G is that the project may not identify long-term buyers of the various ES listed.

4. Component 3 deals with bio-prospecting, among other payment schemes. Do the proponents envisage any links to genetic resource access and benefit sharing (ABS) capacity building in Malaysia? If so, the GEF-funded ABS project for the ASEAN region, 3853 “*Building capacity for regionally harmonized national processes for implementing CBD provisions on access to genetic resources and sharing of benefits*”, may be relevant in Part E (p.9).

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