

# 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: May 02, 2012

Screeener: Douglas Taylor

Panel member validation by: Michael Anthony Stocking; Meryl Williams  
Consultant(s): Guadalupe Duron

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT    GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4650

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Lao PDR

**PROJECT TITLE:** GMS-FBP Strengthening Protection and Management Effectiveness for Wildlife and Protected Areas

**GEF AGENCIES:** World Bank

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Government of Lao PDR

**GEF FOCAL AREA:** Multi Focal Area

### 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): **Minor revision required**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

1. STAP welcomes this proposal, previously outlined within the parent Program Greater Mekong Subregion Forests and Biodiversity Program (GMS-FBP), GEF ID 4649, and finds it to be well aligned with that Program also noting that the project objective is now more consistent with the components outlined in the Program regarding inclusion of REDD+. There are a number of topics in the PIF and also at Program level that could be strengthened as summarized below.
2. The extensive list of expected outputs and outcomes within the Project Framework is welcomed, but in only a few cases are there quantities specified, therefore without clear measures the expected impact of the project will remain vague. It is encouraging that in the Component narrative sections (Sub-Component 1.3) the establishment of a REDD+ carbon baseline and verification of project effectiveness is included, but oddly an indicative target area of 200,000 ha is not shown in this section but is included within the earlier baseline section.
3. The proposal appears to be linked to the focal area objectives LD-3 for both 3.1 and 3.2. However, the interventions are not mentioned in the baseline, defined in the component activities, or is there any claim for impact for these types of interventions.
4. The Risks section at B.4 require additional consideration; the level of risk is not stated and of the six risks identified two contain no mitigation proposals. STAP recommends structuring this section as a table including risk levels and completing the mitigation proposals. STAP also recommends inclusion of additional risks, namely the risk of not being able to reliably estimate carbon stocks or to develop the required standards and guidelines for REDD+ verification. STAP notes the World Bank has been instrumental in developing MRV standards for REDD+, but is also aware that these remain to be tested under actual field conditions.
5. In addition to incentive-based mechanism such as REDD+, the PIF included Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) but does not indicate in the project narrative (or in the risks section) what PES scheme or approach might be applied to and what criteria would be used. STAP recommends that the proponents develop further their proposals for use of PES based upon advice provided to the GEF by STAP (STAP 2010).
6. STAP requests clarification of why there is no explicit mention of involvement of the Department of Land Planning and Development, National Land Management Authority, regarding the Global Tiger Initiative concept of Smart Green Infrastructure, which is being applied to this project? It is argueable that involvement of this government department is as important as the cited Ministry of Energy and Mines, etc., to project success.

7. B.3, on the socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions there is a very brief and rather formulaic paragraph that does not indicate the type of diagnostic work that the project will undertake in order to design and target interventions suited to the conditions of the people living in the affected areas.

8. The continuing lack of a clear framework at Program and Project level for monitoring and evaluation (M&E) remains a significant gap. The Program document stated that at Program level a set of core program indicators would be developed, and STAP expected to see some evidence of this development within the individual PIFs. In a Program of this complexity, the results framework would be expected to be comprehensive and available for building into individual projects. This is presently not the case and STAP urges the proponents to ensure that the large numbers of indicative targets to be quantified outlined within section B. Project Framework, are clearly mapped to expected results in the full project brief for CEO endorsement.

9. STAP understands that the proposed MSP GMS-FBP Greater Mekong Subregion Forests and Biodiversity Regional Support Project is under consideration but at present STAP is unable to correlate the individual projects within the Program to the MSP in order to advise on possible gap filling. The present project should elaborate on how its results will be integrated towards the regional goals, referencing relevant projects within the Program including the proposed MSP (GEF ID 4652).

#### Reference

Payments for Environmental Services and the Global Environment Facility: A STAP advisory document. 2010 revised edition. <http://www.unep.org/stap/Portals/61/Publications/STAP%20PES%20publication%202010%20-%20website.pdf>

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. 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.
<b>2. 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: <ul 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> </ul> 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.
<b>3. 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.