

# 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: February 24, 2014

Screeener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Annette Cowie  
Consultant(s):

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 5660

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Pakistan

**PROJECT TITLE:** Sustainable Forest Management to Secure Multiple Benefits in High Conservation Value Forests

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNDP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Ministry of Climate Change  
Provincial and territorial Forest Departments

**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):  
**Consent**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes UNDP's proposal "Sustainable forest management to secure multiple benefits in Pakistan's high conservation value forests". The objective is supported by three appropriately defined components on biodiversity conservation, carbon sequestration generated by forest landscapes, and landscape spatial planning inclusive of sustainable forest management. The emphasis on capacity building, participatory approaches and up-scaling efforts of sustainable forest management approaches in Pakistan are welcomed by STAP, given these aspects are important to the sustainability of forest landscape management. The STAP also is pleased with the baseline definition and the estimates of the global environmental benefits – particularly, the details provided on the estimates of carbon stock changes.

During the proposal development, STAP recommends for UNDP to address the following comments:

1. In component 1, it will be important to conduct a stakeholder analysis valuing the ecosystem services generated by forests (provisioning, regulating, and supporting). This will contribute to the implementation of the forest management plan and its objective to provide, and contribute towards the sustainability of, ecosystem services across the landscape. In this regard, it will be useful to specify further how the ecological, social and economic elements (and their interactions and trade-offs) of a multi-functional approach will be considered in the valuation of ecosystem services and landscape planning. (For example, placing a value on an ecosystem service may exclude the livelihood dependence of stakeholders on that service (e.g. provision of food); thus, undervaluing the ecosystem service.)

Additionally, it will be helpful to detail how the participatory planning will be adaptive, and inclusive of the objectives of all stakeholders. UNDP can refer to the following two literature source for further guidance on forest ecosystems within a multi-functional approach, and on valuing ecosystems: 1) Nijnik, M. and D. Miller, et al. "Targeting sustainable provision of forest ecosystem services with special focus on carbon sequestration". *Developments in Environmental Science*, Vol.13 (2013), 547-567; and, 2) de Groot R., et al. "Global estimates of the value of ecosystems and their services in monetary units". *Ecosystem Services* 1 (2012), 50-61.

2. The STAP encourages UNDP to define explicitly the methodology that will be used to assess the values of the different ecosystem services to be generated by forest landscape management. It also will be useful

to provide scientific references supporting the methodology, or the conceptual framework used, for the valuation of ecosystems services. With respect to the estimated carbon benefits, STAP encourages UNDP to describe the approach quantification of carbon stock and fluxes, including the proposed validation procedure. STAP suggests that the assumed root to shoot ratio of 0.4 for Riverine forests is likely to be an overestimate.

3. It is clear that implementation of effective policy to support sustainable forest management will be a substantial challenge. Therefore it will be useful to detail further the policy and regulatory environment for sustainable forest management to support the REDD+ initiatives in Pakistan. In particular, it will be important to describe how climate policy measures are linked to agricultural, forestry, and other land-use strategies. This information will assist in describing the enabling environment for the proposed interventions. Detail should be provided on the measures to provide alternative sources of timber and fuelwood, to manage the risk of leakage if the project is successful in controlling forest conversion in the project area. The suggested alternatives of agricultural residues and LPG would entail risk of soil carbon loss and fossil GHG emissions, respectively, thus contributing to leakage.

4. The literature demonstrates the importance of biodiversity as an ecosystem service, as well as its important links to the provision of ecosystem services. Therefore, UNDP may wish to consider integrating landscape connectivity into the valuation of ecosystem services in component 2. The following reference provides an example of a methodology on integrating landscape connectivity into valuation of ecosystem services: Ng, C.N. et al. "Integrating landscape connectivity into the evaluation of ecosystem services for biodiversity conservation and its implications for landscape planning". Applied Geography 42 (2013), 1-12.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	<p>STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved.</p> <p>Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.</p>
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency:            (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions.            (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.</p>
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>Follow-up:            (i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP.            (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</p>