

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: April 10, 2011

Screeners: Douglas Taylor

Panel member validation by: Sandra Diaz; Michael Anthony Stocking
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT **GEF TRUST FUND**

GEF PROJECT ID: 4470

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Iran

PROJECT TITLE: Building a Multiple-Use Forest Management Framework to Conserve Biodiversity in the Caspian Forest Landscape

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Forests, Rangeland and Watershed Organisation FRWO of the Ministry of Agriculture

GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity

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 this project which complements activities dealing with the Caspian forest ecoregion, and which appears to be well grounded with regard to baseline information, albeit within a very complex administrative landscape. STAP offers the following advice aimed at enhancing projected impacts.

Regarding Component 3, involving Community Forest Management (CFM), STAP draws UNDP's attention to the recently published advisory document from STAP [1] which provides well defined peer reviewed guidance on design choices available and precautions to consider while maximizing the opportunity to improve the evidence base for GEF-supported CFM. While the description in the PIF of how Component 3 will be developed is encouraging, STAP supports the observations made by the GEFSec on the PIF regarding the need to demonstrate effective forest management through M&E with credible evidence about what works and under what conditions. For example the proposed Community Forest Management Plan should include a few important outcome indicators to be applied at both CFM and non-CFM sites over the project period. STAP would welcome a dialogue with the project proponents regarding CFM design choices for the full project brief that are also well informed by emerging outcomes in related projects e.g. Conservation of Biodiversity in the Central Zagros Landscape Conservation Zone (GEF ID 1322) which aim to demonstrate biodiversity mainstreaming at the local level in a series of villages across the Zone, and establish mechanisms to facilitate the dissemination and replication of the successful village approaches.

STAP notes a disparity between the narrative in the Project Overview, which cites long term climate change but particularly fires as a major problem, yet in the risk table climate change impacts are rated as low risk and fires are not mentioned. Surely if fires are considered a major risk then investment in community management areas within the selected 30,000 ha is at serious risk from catastrophic events, including fires, and therefore a statement of mitigating measures should be included.

Reference:

[1] The Evidence Base for Community Forest Management as a Mechanism for Supplying Global Environmental Benefits and Improving Local Welfare, Diana Bowler, Lisette Buyung-Ali, John R. Healey, Julia P.G. Jones, Teri Knight and Andrew S. Pullin, Centre for Evidence-Based Conservation, SENRGY, Bangor University, September 2010. <http://www.unep.org/stap/Portals/61/pubs/STAP%20CFM%20document%202010.pdf>

STAP advisory

Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed

<i>response</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>