

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: May 03, 2012

Screeener: Douglas Taylor

Panel member validation by: Michael Anthony Stocking
Consultant(s): Douglas Taylor

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 4945

PROJECT DURATION : 3

COUNTRIES : Cambodia

PROJECT TITLE: GMS-FBP Collaborative Management for Watershed and Ecosystem Service Protection and Rehabilitation in the Cardamom Mountains, Upper Prek Thnot River Basin

GEF AGENCIES: ADB

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF)

GEF FOCAL AREA: Land Degradation

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): **Consent**

III. Further guidance from STAP

1. STAP welcomes this well researched and presented proposal, previously outlined within the parent Program Greater Mekong Subregion Forests and Biodiversity Program (GMS-FBP), GEF ID 4649, and finds it to be well aligned with that Program. There are a number of topics in the PIF and also at Program level that could be strengthened, particularly regarding the imprecise descriptions of interventions as summarized below.
2. STAP particularly commends the proponents for the detailed and helpful summary in section B.6 (coordination with other related initiatives) of the linkage of the project with other projects in the country and at regional level. This should enable a very solid results framework to be constructed for the full project brief
3. The PIF contains some useful quantified outputs and outcomes in the project framework; nevertheless STAP encourages the proponents to be more specific about the outputs but particularly the outcomes, which for Components 2 and 3 are incomplete.
4. The PIF identifies collaborative stakeholder management as a means of stabilizing degrading areas; however, the criteria for selection of incentives for stakeholders are not clear. In particular in Component 1 there is mention of Economic Land Concession (ELC) areas as well as forest and buffer areas and that forest encroachment may be reversed through amongst other means benefit sharing. Whose benefits are these? In Component 2, it is unclear who are the key actors are expected to initiate change and are these actors the same as the expected beneficiaries?
5. The continuing lack of a clear framework at Program and Project level for monitoring and evaluation (M&E) remains a significant gap. The Program document stated that at Program level a set of core program indicators would be developed, and STAP expected to see some evidence of this development within the individual PIFs. In a Program of this complexity, the results framework would be expected to be comprehensive and available for building into individual projects. This is presently not the case and STAP urges the proponents to ensure that the indicative targets, outlined within section B. Project Framework, are clearly mapped to results in the full project brief for CEO endorsement.
6. STAP understands that the proposed MSP GMS-FBP Greater Mekong Subregion Forests and Biodiversity Regional Support Project is under consideration but at present STAP is unable to correlate the individual projects within the Program to the MSP in order to advise on possible gap filling. The present project should elaborate on how its results will be integrated towards the regional goals, referencing relevant projects within the Program including the proposed MSP (GEF ID 4652).

<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: (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.