

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; Meryl Williams
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT **GEF TRUST FUND**

GEF PROJECT ID: 4677

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Thailand

PROJECT TITLE: GMS-FBP Strengthening Capacity and Incentives for Wildlife Conservation in the Western Forest Complex

GEF AGENCIES: World Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Department of National Parks

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

1. STAP welcomes this 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. The strategy proposed of linking revenue from a proposed REDD+ pilot to incentivize local communities to conserve natural resources and to complement existing financial resources for management of protected areas is in principle sound and STAP supports the concept. The fact that basic conservation and management costs are to be paid from this project is implicitly justified given the extremely fragile status of the tiger population in the target area. There are a number of topics in the PIF and also at Program level that could be strengthened as summarized below
2. The PIF adequately summarizes the baseline situation including estimates for tiger density within the target landscapes; however the PIF is silent about the status of tigers in the wider landscape and the contribution towards or connectivity with conservation corridors and the wider region within the regional Program. This concern is directly related to the need regarding GEF BD-1 objective to extend the coverage of threatened species in protected areas and improve coverage of their spatial range. This concern is not intended to detract from the otherwise sound strategy of consolidating existing protected reserves and improving their sustainability.
3. The project calls for, under Component 1.3, the establishment of a Regional Centre for Tiger Conservation and Research which the PIF suggests may develop policy to incentivize staff of parks, but STAP recommends that such a center should also systematically examine incentives on a regional basis not only for staff but also for local communities associated with parks both inside and outside park boundaries. This proposal could be linked to the proposed pilot actions described under Component 2.1 and 2.2, and parallel pilots in the other countries participating within the GMS Forest and Biodiversity Program. Additionally, one of the issues that could be examined is the land rights situation of such communities and their bearing upon the assumption that financial flows from REDD+ or other payments will be sustainable in terms of population stability and their support for conservation. In addition, the PIF is not clear about how prey abundance will be recovered to higher levels, although this is an aim and prey abundance will be monitored. Is hunting of key prey species legally permitted?
4. The list of expected outputs and outcomes within the Project Framework is welcomed, but in only a few cases are there quantities specified, therefore without clear measures the expected impact of the project will remain vague. STAP expects that at the time of CEO endorsement that a comprehensive results framework will be included to address this gap, including clarifying the global environmental benefits at national level and also the contribution to the regional Program.

5. The Risks section at B.4 needs some reworking and structuring; the level of risk is not stated within the five categories mentioned and mitigation proposals are not clearly linked to risks. STAP recommends structuring this section as a table including risk levels and completing the mitigation proposals. STAP also recommends inclusion of additional risks, namely the risk of not being able to reliably estimate carbon stocks or to develop the required standards and guidelines for REDD+ verification, and of not being successful in having local people become less dependent on activities that exploit the forest resources on which C sequestration and tigers (e.g., prey) depend.

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: <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. 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.