

Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel



The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility (Version 4)

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

Date of screening: September 12, 2007

Screener: Douglas Taylor, STAP Secretary

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

I. PIF Information (Paste here from the PIF)

Full size project **GEF Trust Fund**

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: TBD

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 38574

COUNTRY(IES): REG: Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand, Vietnam, China

PROJECT TITLE: Greater Mekong Subregion Biodiversity Corridors Conservation Initiative

GEF AGENCY(IES): ADB, FAO

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: National government agencies (environment and forestry) in all GMS countries; NGOs (WWF, CI, FFI, Birdlife, WCS); Academic Institutions (Asian Institute of Technology, Murdoch University, Mae Fah Luang Univ); IUCN; UNEP

GEF FOCAL AREAS: Sustainable Forest Management

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): SFM-1, SFM-2, SFM-4, SFM-5, SFM-7

II. STAP PIF Screening (based on Part I A Project Framework and Part II Questions of the PIF)

Background logical consistency informing STAP's scientific and technical screening:

1. Is the Project Objective consistent with the Problem/Issue? YES NO PARTIAL
- If "No" or "Partial" explain: *The Objective statement appears much more high level and one step removed from the stated purpose of the project, which is to expand and integrate the high biodiversity areas within and linking to PAs and conserve the remaining globally significant forests. For example, how will "equitable development" be measured?*
2. Are the expected outcomes consistent with the Problem/Issue? YES NO PARTIAL
- If "No" or "Partial" explain:
3. Global environmental benefits scientifically valid? YES NO UNKNOWN
- If "No" or "Unknown" explain: *It is difficult to identify the GEBs except in a very general way*

Relevant Scientific and Technical issues contained in proponent responses to Questions A to H

4. Problem definition scientifically valid? YES NO UNKNOWN
- If "No" or "Unknown" explain:
5. Proposed intervention scientifically justified? YES NO UNKNOWN
- If "No" or "Unknown" explain:
6. Methodology proposed:
Is there a scientifically valid baseline? YES NO UNKNOWN
Is a scientific control explicitly included? YES NO UNKNOWN N/A
Is there scientific or technical innovation? YES NO UNKNOWN
Is the methodology replicable? YES NO UNKNOWN
- If any of the above are marked "No" or "Unknown" explain: *Innovative components are not identified*
7. Is the incremental reasoning scientifically valid? YES NO UNKNOWN
- If "No" or "Unknown" explain:
8. Are the risk statements scientifically valid YES NO UNKNOWN
and comprehensive? *If "No" explain: STAP is not sure why the proponent claimed that climate change will not adversely affect the project. There is a risk that climate change could impact catchment and forest management options*

III. STAP Advisory Response (see next page for explanation)

9. Based on this PIF screening, STAP recommends the following action to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency (ies): **No objection, but follow-up action required**

IV. Further guidance from STAP

10. Follow-up action required: the proponent should contact STAP regarding the issues raised in this screening report, and to record the agreement reached. In such a wide ranging and complex project, the scientific aspects of project design are important to better understand and test regarding baselines, assumptions and choice of indicators to use. The project appears to be targeting production forests rather than sustainable forest management within production landscapes. These and other issues need clarification.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. No objection	STAP has no scientific/technical grounds to object to the approval of the concept. However, in Section IV, 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.
2. No objection, but follow-up action required.	STAP has no objection to the approval of the PIF, but has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities, stated in section IV, 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"> (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (ii) Setting an independent expert review point during early stage project development and agreeing terms of reference for this review The proponent should provide the report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.
3. Objection	STAP objects to the approval of the PIF on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical faults in the concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. In the case of the project concept nevertheless being approved by the CEO of the GEF for development of the full project brief, a STAP review should be mandatory prior to submission of the project brief for CEO endorsement.