

# 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: October 03, 2011

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

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

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT    GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4579

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Bhutan

**PROJECT TITLE:** Sustainable Financing for Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resources Management

**GEF AGENCIES:** World Bank

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Bhutan Trust Fund for Environmental Conservation (BTFGEC);  
Ministry of Agriculture and Forests (including Departments of Forestry, Livestock and Agriculture);  
World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF);  
Local Communities

**GEF FOCAL AREA:** Multi Focal Area

### 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

STAP welcomes the World Bank proposal "Sustainable Financing for Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resources Management in Bhutan". The project framework is defined clearly, particularly the expected outputs. STAP also welcomes the estimation of carbon benefits from sustainable land management and sustainable forest management, as well as a description of how the carbon benefits will be estimated using the FAO EXACT tool, or other available tools. In this regard, the World Bank also may wish to consider using the tools from the GEF Carbon Benefits Project, to be completed soon by UNEP, which will provide a comprehensive way of tracking total (i.e. above and below-ground) system carbon.

Below, STAP provides suggestions on how to strengthen further the proposal before submitting it for CEO endorsement.

1. STAP notes the headline objective of the project to improve the effectiveness of the BTFC. This is a laudable aim, especially as it is to be achieved by a mix of BD and LD focussed actions. STAP questions why, if sustainable financing for both conservation and NR management is to be secured, the FA objective, LD-3 was not specified, especially Outcome 3.1: Enhanced enabling environments between sectors in support of SLM. Indicator 3.1 Demonstration results strengthening enabling environment between sectors (incl. agriculture, forestry). This project will, indeed, have to show through its pilot activities how conservation and SLM can be balanced, while achieving security for local people in good agricultural practices.

2. The proposal defines clearly the barriers that exist for the adoption of sustainable land management (SLM), grazing management, and sustainable forest management (SFM) activities that are proposed in Component 2. However, what appears to be missing is an overview, or background, of the existing frameworks (policy and legal) that will drive and support farmers in their adoption/adaption of the proposed natural resource management interventions detailed in Component 2 (e.g. SLM on steep slopes, investing in diversification of agricultural and forestry products, and improved grazing management). The proposal states that outcomes from Component 2 will inform policy development on natural resource management (Component 3), particularly on SFM, alpine meadow management, and protected area management. Nonetheless, a policy foundation is needed in order for land users to adopt successfully the proposed natural resource management interventions. This policy/legal backdrop is what appears to be missing in the proposal. STAP suggests detailing further the existing policy/legal frameworks that will help support land users' adoption of SLM, SFM, and grazing management.

3. It is unclear what agricultural and non-timber forest products will be commercialized and criteria will be used to decide which products to commercialize. For example, will a market analysis be done to evaluate the market feasibility for forest products? Furthermore, if there is a risk of over-exploitation of agricultural or non-timber forest products resources, what measures will be put in place to address this risk?

4. If possible, STAP encourages the World Bank to detail further the proposed SLM practices, specifying how the World Bank's learning from its GEF SLM Bhutan project will contribute to the adoption of the project's SLM interventions.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. 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.
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	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"> <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> 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.
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	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.