

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: April 25, 2012

Screeener: Guadalupe Duron

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

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT **GEF TRUST FUND**

GEF PROJECT ID: 4744

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Mongolia

PROJECT TITLE: Securing Forest Ecosystems through Participatory Management and Benefit Sharing

GEF AGENCIES: FAO

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Forestry Agency;
Ministry of nature, Environment and Tourism.

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 proposal "Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation, SFM, and carbon sink enhancement into Mongolia's productive forest landscapes" by FAO. Below, STAP recommends several ways the proposal could be strengthened further.

1. Although the project framework is defined well, it could be strengthened further by indicating explicitly in component 3 how, and to what degree, climate change is likely to affect (or is affecting) forest landscapes in Mongolia. This information also needs to be added to the problem statement section and the incremental reasoning of component 3. Addressing these changes will support better the project objective and its intended effect to enhance ecosystem resilience to climate change.
2. Furthermore, STAP recommends specifying further the resilience enhancement measures the project seeks to achieve through "...a more intensive forest management system." H.Ykhanbai (2010) "Mongolia Forestry Outlook Study", FAO outlines a number of objectives, including measures to address climate change risks that may contribute to the project development. The World Bank Climate Change Knowledge Portal also provides useful information on climate risks and adaptation measures at the country level that could be used to develop the proposal-
<http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportal/index.cfm>
3. Some of the outcomes under components 2 and 3 appear to be outputs (example "avoided emission of 47,500 t C/year through SFM). In addition, some of the outputs appear to be project activities (example - 2.1.4 Development and dissemination of good practice guidelines). Therefore, it would be useful to review these sections during the project development to ensure that outcomes represent the major downstream achievements to which the project will contribute, outputs are the project deliverables by the end of the project period, and activities are the processes leading to outputs.
4. Under Component 4, STAP reminds the project developers explicitly to include the tracking of global environmental benefits, the appropriate choice of indicators to measure impact and the methods that are to be used for impact monitoring. Co-benefits for human development and local livelihoods are also important to track, especially as the sustainability of project investments depend on the viability of the FUGs. The GEF is currently stressing the importance of the quality of arrangements at entry of a project to measure impact.

5. STAP is pleased to note that the carbon sequestration benefits are explicitly defined. However, the proposal appears to indicate the biodiversity benefits are mainly to improve, and stabilize, *Moschus moschiferus* and *Hucho taimen* populations. STAP recommends, therefore, strengthening further this section by making explicit the global benefits for biodiversity. Furthermore, STAP encourages the project developers to define more clearly what species and habitats the project seeks to address through mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into managed landscapes. Currently, the focus on biodiversity conservation appears defined weakly throughout the proposal.

6. STAP recommends adding references to support the problem statement, baseline, and project interventions. These could include published articles, or rigorous unpublished evidence. Citing sources would strengthen the scientific underpinning of the proposal.

<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.