

# 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: 29 January 2010

Screener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: Brian Huntley

### I. PIF Information

**Full size project**      **GEF Trust Fund**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 3957    **PROJECT DURATION:** 48 months

**COUNTRIES:** Indonesia, Cambodia, Philippines, Vietnam

**PROJECT TITLE:** Removing Barriers to Invasive Species Management in Production and Protection Forests in SE Asia

**GEF AGENCY:** UNEP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Indonesia: Forest and Nature Conservation Research & Development Center (Bogor) - Ministry of Forestry, with Ministry of Environment; Cambodia – Ministry of Environment with Forest Administration; Vietnam – Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment – Vietnam Environmental Protection Agency; Philippines – Department of Environment and Natural Resources. ASEAN Center for Biodiversity (Manila) and FAO Regional Office Asia Pacific (Bangkok)

**GEF FOCAL AREA:** Biodiversity

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM:** BD SP 7 Invasive Species

**NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT:** related to but not part of GEF SFM

### 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. STAP supports this project and notes that the Invasive Alien Species problem is a poorly acknowledged global threat to biodiversity and human well being. The project addresses the urgent need for coordinated, regional responses, within existing networks and experience such as that of the Global Invasive Species Program (GISP).
3. The difficulties of mobilising a regional programme with participating countries at differing levels of institutional, legal, policy and technical capacity is recognised in the PIF, but the full proposal will need to indicate how the synergies of collaboration between differentiated needs and capacities, especially in technological/scientific and data management areas, will be accomplished.
4. The PIF includes, as component 1(ii), cost recovery as a key motivating strategy for government support. However, it does not indicate how cost recovery will be approached. IAS control projects can be extremely labour intensive, and the funding of such operations needs to be linked to benefits not only to biodiversity but also to ecosystem services such as water yield, flood abatement, Non-Timber Forest Products, etc. Indications of how such benefits will be achieved in the pilot projects should be given in the full proposal.

<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.
2. <b>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>
3. <b>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>