

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: October 08, 2011

Screener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: Sandra Diaz

Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT **GEF TRUST FUND**

GEF PROJECT ID: 4562

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Mongolia

PROJECT TITLE: Network of Managed Resource Protected Areas

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of nature, Environment and Tourism (MNET)

GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity

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

STAP welcomes this well prepared proposal from Mongolia aimed at the expansion of PAs through establishment of a new category of PAs in the country, Managed Resource Protected Areas to be managed through the application of community-based natural resource management (CBNRM). This concept is usually considered by conservation community as a successful story, but there is limited evidence to demonstrate in practice where dual goals of CBNRM, sustainable environmental management and community development, are satisfied.

1. Typical barriers/factors that lead to failures are: 1) ecological/biodiversity conservation boundaries are different from boundaries accepted by community-managed areas; 2) while CBNRM uses participatory processes and decentralized decision-making, this may lead to reinforcement of existing local "elite" structures with the interests that might not coincide with conservation objectives and further marginalize disadvantaged groups, 3) to assess CBNRM effectiveness, monitoring and evaluation policy that covers environmental issues, poverty reduction and institutional changes is usually absent, 4) PES schemes aimed at reconciling social-economic and environmental benefits are poorly designed and ineffective; markets for BD products are poorly accessible; 5) limited technical and institutional capacity of communities to conserve biodiversity, which prevents communities from responding to incentives (institutional capacity includes ability to allocate and enforce rights); 6) potential "leakage" effects when pressure on biodiversity is shifted to other areas with less protection; and (7) adverse self-selection, whereby communities already engaged in, or intending to engage in, environmentally-friendly forest management practices disproportionately participate in community-based NRM programs. STAP recommends addressing the above barriers in preparing final project document. Two STAP's advisory products might be useful to develop appropriate remediation actions: The Evidence Base for Community Forest Management as a Mechanism for Supplying Global Environmental Benefits and Improving Local Welfare, September 2010; Payments for Environmental Services, revised March 2010 available at: <http://www.unep.org/stap/Publications/AdvisoryProductsofSTAP/tabid/2912/Default.aspx>

2. The PIF does mention some examples of CBNRM existing in Mongolia. Lessons learned from these experiences would be useful to understand and be systematized/used in this project.

3. Valuation of ecosystem services is a backbone of sustainability of CBNRM. This PIF does not provide sufficient information about how evaluations will be done and mainstreamed into decision-making. Reference to the ongoing GEF/UNDP SPAN project is provided but its results could be insufficient and might be too general for local decision-making in selected pilot areas.

4. Traditional knowledge of local communities is an important element in informing decision-making processes. How will the project address collection and integration of traditional knowledge into planning and implementation of managed resource protected areas?

5. Mongolia's geographic location, fragile ecosystems and socioeconomic conditions make the country highly vulnerable to climate change. There are several ongoing projects aimed at improving the resilience of country's ecosystems and land-use activities (incl. projects supported by Adaptation Fund and SCCF). How will this project will coordinate with these activities and support ecosystem based adaptation in the overall framework of CBNRM?

<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.