

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: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Michael Anthony Stocking
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT MULTI TRUST FUNDS

GEF PROJECT ID: 4625

PROJECT DURATION : 5.6

COUNTRIES : Malawi

PROJECT TITLE: Shire Natural Ecosystems Management Project

GEF AGENCIES: World Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Government of Malawi

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): **Minor revision required**

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the World Bank's proposal "Shire National Ecosystems Management Project" in Malawi. In particular, STAP appreciates the level of coordination the Ministry of Irrigation and Water Development, along with the World Bank, will implement with the various stakeholders involved in projects and programs in the Shire River Basin. Coordinating the various natural resource management and biodiversity conservation activities in the Shire will undoubtedly be challenging. However, organizing these multiple efforts will be critical to the integrated management approach the SRBMP seeks to achieve.

In its current form, STAP is unable fully to assess whether the proposal is scientific or technically viable. The proposal does not specify sufficiently the project components to assess their scientific validity. STAP also provides specific comments below on how the proposal could be strengthened. STAP rates this proposal as "Minor Revision" based on its commentary below, and looks forward to a more thorough and scientifically sound proposal at CEO endorsement.

Below, STAP provides specific comments on the proposal.

1. Even though the proposal is not meant to be fully developed at the PIF stage, STAP believes the components could be more explicitly defined in the incremental reasoning. Doing so would allow for a clearer understanding of the proposed interventions, and the expected results. For example, the proposal is unclear how it intends to address SLWM at the watershed level – specifically, what SLWM practices will be encouraged, how will their selection be made, and how will women's farmers SLWM needs and knowledge be acknowledged and included in the selection of SLWM interventions. On the latter, it also would be useful to indicate the proportion of women farmers in the Shire Basin, or targeted communities, so the proposal is clearer on the level, and type of, initiative(s) needed to gender differentiate the SLWM interventions.

2. Similarly, the proposal provides very little information on the community-based sustainable forest management interventions. It would be useful to provide further details on what is the "proven co-management model" that will be used to establish the two community forest management interventions, what outcomes from the pilot made it a good model for community forest management in these two reserves, and how the project intends to apply the learning, or replicate successful aspects, of the model.

3. Additionally, the proposal states very little on the charcoal production activities. STAP recommends defining further the two expected outputs on charcoal production during the project preparation. In particular, it would be useful to detail what type of technology (type of kiln or stove) will be used to produce the charcoal, as well as detail the potential

negative impacts of charcoal production on the global environment (release of CO₂, CH₄, others). In the socioeconomic benefits section, it also will be important to recognize that emissions from transportation may impact substantially the charcoal fuel cycle; thereby, the impact on the global environment may outweigh in the long-term the socioeconomic benefits generated by charcoal production.

4. The statement on global environmental benefits is good. However, further details are needed on how biodiversity conservation and carbon stocks will be measured and monitored. For carbon stocks, one option could be to use the tools from the UNEP-GEF Carbon Benefits Project.

| <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. |