

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

Screeener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro and Michael Stocking

I. PIF Information

Full size project **GEF Trust Fund**

GEFSEC PROJECT ID¹: TBD

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: TBD

COUNTRY(IES): Asia, Regional (countries to be determined during project preparation)

PROJECT TITLE: Mobilizing Markets for Forest Ecosystem Services in Asia and the Pacific

GEF AGENCY(IES): Asian Development Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: TBD

GEF FOCAL AREAS: Sustainable Forestry Management (SFM)

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): SFM-1, 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:
2. Are the expected outcomes consistent with the Problem/Issue? YES NO PARTIAL
- If "No" or "Partial" explain: *Some outcomes are not outcomes. This also holds true about the outputs.*
3. Global environmental benefits scientifically valid? YES NO UNKNOWN
- If "No" or "Unknown" explain: *A more detailed explanation is needed about how the project will yield global environment benefits.*

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: *The PIF mentions that research is ongoing in several countries, but no further information is provided about their baselines, or scientific control groups. Based on the PIF, it is also difficult to gauge whether the project is scientifically or technically innovative. The PIF does not specify the PES research to be undertaken.*
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: *The PIF does not raise the risks affiliated with the inability to measure an ecosystem service. The inability to quantify the service may yield, therefore, a poor payment. In turn, this will provoke a number of risks for sustained, and sustainable, PES adoption.*

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**

¹ Project ID number will be assigned initially by GEFSEC.

IV. Further guidance from STAP

10. Follow-up action required: The proponent should address the issues raised by STAP in this and previous sections and provide written feedback to STAP on how these issues were addressed. STAP's comments are as follows: 1- Clearly indicate how this effort will complement existing efforts. In doing so, please specify how this project will link-up with the GEF UNDP project mentioned in the PIF, "Institutionalizing Payments for Environment Services", as well as with the other initiatives raised in the PIF - ICRAF-RUPES, IIED, WWF, etc. It is unclear how the project will not duplicate these on-going efforts. 2 - Please provide a more specific explanation about how the project will generate global environment benefits, and why these activities will lead to global environment benefits. 3 - Include verifiable biophysical data on PES.

<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: (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.