

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 09, 2010

Screener: Douglas Taylor

Panel member validation by: Meryl Williams
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 4029

PROJECT DURATION :

COUNTRIES : Regional (Mongolia, Russian Federation)

PROJECT TITLE: Integrated Natural Resource Management in the Baikal Basin Transboundary Ecosystem

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: UNDP, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment of Russia, Ministry of Environment of Mongolia

GEF FOCAL AREA: Multi Focal Area

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAMS:

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 which promises to pull together key governance implementation arrangements for the Baikal Basin at a transboundary level and thus help support national and other project efforts for this World Heritage area. It also builds on signification prior investments of GEF agencies, especially the World Bank.
2. This is an ambitious project but UNDP and partners appear to have the requisite knowledge and partnerships in the region to undertake it. STAP supports the 'waterbasin SAP + biodiversity mainstreaming approach' to be adopted because this is not only more cost-effective than 'hotspot remediation combined with protected area designation' but is also more appropriate to the issues at hand where biodiversity and water quality threats apply over large and interrelated areas,
3. STAP questions whether the Expected Outcome under Objective 3 of a 20% reduction in water pollution load in Selenge Delta relative to 2008 levels is achievable for 4 year program, especially when the load may well be significantly higher than the 2008 level by the time the project commences in 2011.

<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: <ol 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.
--	--