

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: 3 February 2010

Screener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: Brian Huntley

I. PIF Information

Full size project **GEF Trust Fund**

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3906 **PROJECT DURATION:** 72 months

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 3967

COUNTRY: Malaysia

PROJECT TITLE: Enhancing effectiveness and financial sustainability of Protected Areas in Malaysia.

GEF AGENCY: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE), Wildlife Department (Perhilitan)

GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAMS: BD1-SP1-PA Financing, BD-SP3-PA Networks

II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

1. Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency:
Consent

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. The global biodiversity richness of Malaysia is clear and STAP supports this proposal. The network of Protected Areas in Malaysia, administered within a fragmented and overlapping, even mutually competing institutional arrangement, is apparently not cost effective. The proposal to restructure the Federal, State and local responsibilities and financing mechanisms is therefore ambitious, but necessary.
3. The PIF does not give convincing indications of how the project will influence stakeholders and decision makers to dramatically change entrenched policies and legal/institutional arrangements. It suggests that by rewarding performance measured by various evaluation instruments, improvements in the national PA system will result, but the system of prioritization, on biodiversity values, is not clearly articulated. PA management performance might bear no relation to the global biodiversity benefits resulting from good management of low biodiversity value sites, or bad management of high value sites. Therefore, the Panel recommends that the full proposal should elaborate further on the "performance indices" to be developed; including the "conservation indices" described briefly at paragraph 10 but not yet translated into outcomes expected in Section A. With the possible exception of component 3.4, all of the outcomes are indirect.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</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.	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"> (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 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.
3. Major revision required	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.