

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 11, 2010

Screeener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: Mary K. Seely
Consultant(s): Brian Huntley

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 3822

PROJECT DURATION :

COUNTRIES : Regional (Central African Republic, Congo, Cameroon, Gabon, Equatorial Guinea, Congo DR)

PROJECT TITLE: CBSP - A Regional Focus on Sustainable Timber Management in the Congo Basin

GEF AGENCIES: UNEP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: World resources institute (wri), Ministry of Tourism and Environment - Congo, Ministry of Water, Forestry, Hunting, Fishery and Environment- Central African Republic, Ministry of Fisheries and the Environment -Equatorial Guinea , Ministry of Environment-Eaux et Forets, Comifac and other partners

GEF FOCAL AREA: Multi Focal Area

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAMS: BD-4;BD-5;CC-6;

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): **Minor revision required**

III. Further guidance from STAP

Screening report, part 1. Integrating this project with the CBSP

1. STAP notes that this is the 11th project concept approved for inclusion in the Strategic Program for sustainable forest management in the Congo Basin (CBSP). The Panel refers UNEP (as well as the World Bank, FAO, UNDP and AfDB) to its previous advice on the program (See PFD screen at [http://www.thegef.org/uploadedFiles/Projects/Work_Programs/November_2008_Work_Program/stap%20review\(33\).pdf](http://www.thegef.org/uploadedFiles/Projects/Work_Programs/November_2008_Work_Program/stap%20review(33).pdf) and the PFD itself at http://www.thegef.org/uploadedFiles/Projects/Work_Programs/November_2008_Work_Program/PFD_3782_MFA_CBSP_Congo_Basin.pdf). This project has elements in common with others the Panel has advised on, including the World Bank GEF projects 3772 on Enforcement of Protected Areas network in DRC (See PIF screen at [http://www.thegef.org/uploadedFiles/Projects/Work_Programs/November_2008_Work_Program/Stap%20review\(31\).pdf](http://www.thegef.org/uploadedFiles/Projects/Work_Programs/November_2008_Work_Program/Stap%20review(31).pdf)) and 3779 on Enhancing Institutional Capacities on REDD issues for Sustainable Forest Management in the Congo Basin (See PIF screen at [http://www.thegef.org/uploadedFiles/Projects/Work_Programs/November_2008_Work_Program/STAP%20review\(36\).pdf](http://www.thegef.org/uploadedFiles/Projects/Work_Programs/November_2008_Work_Program/STAP%20review(36).pdf)).

2. The Panel stresses the importance of coordination amongst agencies as they develop project concepts and full proposals under the CBSP program in order to add value compared to project-by-project programming. For example, this project refers to its parent program only briefly and the full project proposal should expand on this as follows:

2.A. Paragraphs 19 and 24 don't align the project well with the 3-component structure presented in the Program Framework Document (PFD, pp. 7-9), the full proposal should indicate which program component(s) its activities will contribute to and how. Paragraph 26 links the project to two program components but these links seem far weaker than the contributions to non-GEF programs and initiatives listed in the PIF.

2.B. Paragraphs 35 and 36 predict 'multiple benefits and added value' to be gained from the programmatic approach, the full project document should support these claims, including through references to specific projects among the 13 that will comprise the program. For example, there may be links to the 12th project listed in the PFD which also deals with

payments for environmental services (PES) (UNDP/UNEP) and the 13th project which also deals with capacity building for SFM (World Bank).

3. The proposal does not specify what legislation gaps on illegal logging, within and between countries, the project will address in the Congo Basin. It would be useful to detail the gaps in order to fully understand how and to what extent the project will address them. It would also be useful to indicate the associated regulations allowing enforcement across borders.

4. The programmatic framework document also indicates that the program will strengthen COMIFAC's capacity to 'take on the role of the main coordinator for sustainable forest management in the region'. It would be useful if the full proposal for this project could provide further details on COMIFAC's capacity to implement and enforce illegal logging policies, given the focus of component 1.

5. One example of a benefit from the programmatic approach identified in STAP screens of the individual projects to date may be addressing the barrier that non-compliance presents to PES effectiveness in the Congo Basin, as suggested indirectly at paragraph 19. The panel welcomes this project's (3822) intention to reduce illegal logging in this regard and urges UNEP to work with the World Bank on its recently endorsed project proposal to promote community forest management in its GEF project 3772 on Enforcement of Protected Areas network in DRC (See PIF at http://www.thegef.org/uploadedFiles/Projects/Work_Programs/November_2008_Work_Program/BD_3750_Regional_CBSP_PIF.pdf and STAP screen at [http://www.thegef.org/uploadedFiles/Projects/Work_Programs/November_2008_Work_Program/Stap%20review\(31\).pdf](http://www.thegef.org/uploadedFiles/Projects/Work_Programs/November_2008_Work_Program/Stap%20review(31).pdf)).

6. A second example of the programmatic approach potentially working is the collaboration envisaged (paragraph 33) on REDD capacity in the region through the WB GEF project 3779 on Enhancing Institutional Capacities on REDD Issues for Sustainable Forest Management in the Congo Basin. STAP welcomes the intention to collaborate noting the connection to the GEF Carbon Benefits Project (3449) which is also relevant, although outside of the CBSP.

Screening report, part 2. Developing the UNEP proposal for 'A regional Focus on Sustainable Timber Management in the Congo Basin'

7. It is unclear how harmonisation of policies, taxation and other developments will be implemented/ enforced. Is this intended to be a voluntary arrangement or, once signed, are there mechanisms to bind the countries and companies to implementation?

8. The project intends to establish a baseline of illegal logging but then has 20% reduction as an expected outcome. Are these two activities time compatible?

9. From the document it is unclear if the conservation and production areas elaborated in the program document are experiencing the same or unique challenges and how they will be addressed in terms of policy, taxation and other developments from this project.

10. On development of PES schemes (paragraph 14), the Panel welcomes the proposal's intention to apply lessons learnt from UNEP's experimental PES project in Uganda (GEF project 3682). STAP also refers UNEP to its general guidelines on PES projects (<http://stapgef.unep.org/resources/sg/PES>) and in particular the need to address the most common barriers to PES effectiveness: (i) non-compliance; (ii) poor administrative selection; (iii) spatial demand spillovers; and (iv) adverse self-selection. The full proposal should detail how each of these barriers will be addressed and the project design should be capable of assessing whether the pilot interventions were in fact effective.

11. STAP welcomes the project's inclusion of targeted research and recommendations on how to improve certification standards to include global environment benefits. The Panel is also developing an advisory document on certification and global environmental benefits which will be available in 2010.

12. The Panel reiterates the following points from its general advice on implementation of the CBSP program for UNEP to address in developing a full project proposal:

12.A. STAP recommends that the GEBs be specified further, including how the GEBs will be measured and tracked.

12.B. The full proposal should explain how the potential climate change risks could be mitigated through sustainable forest management.

<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. <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>