

# 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: January 23, 2012

Screener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Thomas Lovejoy; Nijavalli H. Ravindranath  
Consultant(s): Douglas Taylor

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT    GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4743

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** India

**PROJECT TITLE:** Developing an Effective Multiple Use Management Framework for Conserving Biodiversity in the Mountain Landscapes of the High Ranges, Western Ghats

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNDP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Ministry of Environment and Forests;  
Department of Forests and Wildlife, Kerata

**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): **Minor revision required**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes this project in India, which contains a good description of the baseline situation and of the problem to be overcome and outlines a well-argued strategy for intervention, citing a large range of partners. STAP also commends the proponents for clearly outlining strategies for addressing climate risk and proposing working linkages with relevant GEF projects and related interventions including the Global Tiger Initiative.

The project is generic in many areas such as specifying threats - and actions outlined here and in the "follow up action" field below may assist in ensuring a very robust project implementation strategy. For instance, while adequately dealing with forest conservation and crop issues, the PIF does not however propose either monitoring or specific actions to follow up the mention of the critical role of mountain ecosystems regarding water supply and quality or to follow up regarding assurance of adequate environmental flows to maintain the stated freshwater biodiversity.

STAP requests the proponents to include a water and soils sub-component which tracks baseline flow and quality at suitable locations downstream of project intervention areas and control sites, in order to track the water retention and run-off related change in PA functions, and at sites where pesticide-related runoff in and near production areas may be monitored. The advantage of such a sub-component will be to demonstrate impact of the land use and cover reforms that are the target of the project, and to highlight the catchment management aspects of the framework.

STAP also advises the proponents to extend the Project Framework mention in Component 1 of valuation of ecosystem goods and services from HRML to specifically include water-related issues, and consideration of the potential for payments for ecosystem services. Additionally, consideration should be given to including water authorities within the key stakeholders listing, which is shown in section B5.

Finally, in the full project brief, the proponents are encouraged to set out clear indicators for impact at the process and environmental impact levels, based on the deliverables outlined in the project Framework and Table B2 within the PIF.

<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.
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	<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"> <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> <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>
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	<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>