

# 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: 29 January 2010

Screeener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: Brian Huntley

### I. PIF Information

**Full size project**

**GEF Trust Fund**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 3445

**PROJECT DURATION:** 48 months

**GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:** PIMS 4033

**COUNTRY:** Thailand

**PROJECT TITLE:** Integrated community-based forest and catchment management through an ecosystem service approach (CBFCM)

**GEF AGENCY:** UNDP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Regional Environment Offices (REOs) and Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning (ONEP) under Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE)

**GEF FOCAL AREAS:** Biodiversity and Climate Change

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAMS:** BD- SP4 & CC-SP6

**NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT:** SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT

### II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

1. Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency:  
**Consent**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP supports this ambitious project, which builds on prior UNDP / Kingdom of Thailand experience and identifies some of the key barriers to increased success in Community-Based Forest and Catchment Management initiatives.
3. The objective of building national capacity to harness innovative financing mechanisms is appropriate, and the lessons learned in this strategy will be of benefit to many other countries seeking self sustaining financial models for forest conservation. The full proposal should provide details on the operational mechanisms for capacity building on this topic.
4. At Part F, the PIF correctly identifies leakage of logging impacts to neighbouring countries as a risk and STAP refers UNDP to its advisory documents on Payments for Environmental Services (PES)<sup>1</sup> and Community Forest Management (CFM)<sup>2</sup> in preparing the full proposal. For example, other threats to the effectiveness of PES schemes should also be addressed.

<sup>1</sup> See <http://stapgef.unep.org/resources/sg/PES> and additional notes provided to Council at [http://www.thegef.org/uploadedFiles/Documents/Council\\_Documents\\_\(PDF\\_DOC\)/GEF\\_35/C.35.Inf.12\\_STAP\\_Guidance\\_on\\_PES.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/uploadedFiles/Documents/Council_Documents_(PDF_DOC)/GEF_35/C.35.Inf.12_STAP_Guidance_on_PES.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> Available in 2010.

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