

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: March 15, 2016
Screener: Guadalupe Duron
Panel member validation by: Annette Cowie
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9267
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Myanmar
PROJECT TITLE:	Rural Productivity and Ecosystems Services Enhanced in Central Dry Zone Forest Reserves
GEF AGENCIES:	ADB
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Environmental Conservation and Forestry (MOECF)

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):
Concur

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the Asian Development Bank's (ADB) proposal "Rural Productivity and Ecosystem Services Enhanced in Central Dry Zone Forest Reserves" in Myanmar. The project aims to fulfill an important gap in conserving dryland biodiversity, improving forest management and agricultural productivity in the Central Dry Zones (CDZ). The concept is designed well, and provides a good rationale why, and how, integration between biodiversity conservation, forest and land management is needed to enhance ecosystem services in the CDZ in Myanmar. STAP appreciates the attention to all types of response, from review and planning through to practical training, and particularly the focus on policy development, which is fundamental to creating an enabling environment.

STAP is also pleased with the use of references to support the information in the PIF. STAP encourages the project developers to continue with this practice when designing the project as it will demonstrate that knowledge (published and unpublished) was used to develop the interventions. Thus, STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal and encourages the proponent to develop it with same rigor.

To strengthen further the design of the project, STAP recommends addressing the following points:

1. STAP welcomes the project developers' interest in using the Resilience, Adaptation Pathways and Transformation Assessment (RAPTA) Framework (previously called RATA). RAPTA can be used to embed resilience thinking into the design of the project, including how to identify opportunities for adaptation or transformation. Adaptive management provisions will be important to consider given the shocks and stresses identified in the concept (e.g. climate change impact on water availability for crops), which can continue influencing the sustainability of the project. For further information about the RAPTA, visit the STAP website: www.stapgef.org, or contact the STAP Secretary, Thomas Hammond:

Thomas.Hammond@unep.org. Practical guidelines for application of RAPTA in project design will soon be available from the STAP web site.

2. For component 2 and 3, the project developers might find useful the following paper on community forest management of dry forest in the CDZ: Oo, P. et al "Dry forest community types and their predicted distribution based on a habitat model for the central dry zone of Myanmar". Forest Ecology and Management. December 2015. Volume 358. 108-121. The paper discusses what factors influence successful forest management.

3. Component 1 and 2, the project developers might be interested to consult the following groundwater assessment in the CDZ: Pavelic, P. et al "Integrated Assessment of Groundwater Use for Improving Livelihoods in the Dry Zone of Myanmar", International Water Management Institute, 2015. : https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=XoDGCgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=central+dry+zone+myanmar&ots=5a2sbQPdX0&sig=YacyAFGeLxg_SA3x5gtaDI_sTIM#v=onepage&q=central%20dry%20zone%20myanmar&f=false

4. STAP is pleased the project will conduct a social, economic and biophysical analysis of the project area. STAP recommends for the project developers to use participatory methods (in addition to the surveys and databases mentioned in the document) to acquire knowledge first hand from stakeholders about their social and economic context, and their biophysical knowledge. This will help in assessing the interactions between these variables, which is important to describing and assessing the social-ecological system, and for designing effective interventions. Farmers and communities will have extensive knowledge on soil and water conservation technologies, forest management, and biodiversity that will add value when embedded into the design and implementation of the project.

5. When identifying the stakeholders, STAP recommends formulating a stakeholder plan that defines the various responsibilities and specifies how the combined roles will contribute to the project objective. Stakeholders (at the community, district, ministerial and other relevant levels) on agriculture, forestry, and biodiversity should be identified. The potential for conflict between stakeholders should also be assessed, given their diverse and potentially conflicting interests. The project should also consider what mechanisms might be required (e.g. facilitator) to encourage dialogue and understanding between diverse stakeholders.

6. Given the focus of the project on improving ecosystem services, STAP recommends detailing further the ADB's RETA on valuation of ecosystems services in the CDZ. It would be useful to detail the lessons and gaps that this project will address. Lessons from other GEF, and non-GEF projects, on biodiversity, sustainable forest management or land management in Myanmar should also be consulted to inform the design of this project.

7. For component 2, STAP recommends its report on Payment for Ecosystem Services, which summarizes the evidence for PES effectiveness and provides recommendations on how to design PES interventions. The document can be downloaded at: <http://www.stapgef.org/payments-for-environmental-services-and-the-global-environment-facility/>

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Concur	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple "Concur" response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised.</p> <p>(ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</p> <p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the</p>

	full project brief for CEO endorsement.
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP's concerns.</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>