

# 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: 18 September 2009

Screener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: Brian Huntley & Paul Ferraro

### I. PIF Information

**Full size project**      **GEF Trust Fund**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 2881      **PROJECT DURATION:** 48 months

**GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:** CR-X1004

**COUNTRY:** Costa Rica

**PROJECT TITLE:** Integrated Management of Marine and Coastal Resources in Puntarenas

**GEF AGENCY:** IADB

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S):** MarViva; Ministry of Environment, Energy and Telecommunications, Sistema Nacional de Areas de Conservacion (MINAET-SINAC); National Coastguard Service (SNG) and Instituto Costarricense de Pesca y Acuicultura

**GEF FOCAL AREA (S):** Biodiversity

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S):** BD-SP4-Policy, BD-SP5 -Markets

**NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT** (if applicable): n/a

### II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

1. Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency:  
**Minor revision required**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP notes the intention to include 2 pilot schemes on payment for ecosystem services in this project. The PIF includes no details of the services to be paid for or the potential buyers and the full project proposal should include a detailed plan for the pilot projects. For the design of the pilots, STAP refers IADB to its general guidelines on PES projects<sup>1</sup> and in particular the need to address the most common barriers to PES effectiveness: (i) non-compliance; (ii) poor administrative selection; (iii) spatial demand spillovers; and (iv) adverse self-selection. The full proposal should detail how each of these barriers will be addressed and the project design should be capable of assessing whether the pilot interventions were in fact effective.
3. The project also aims to increase the level of sustainability certified marine and coastal tourism activities in Costa Rica. STAP's guidance document on whether and how certification can lead to ecosystem use changes correlated with environmental services and biodiversity will be available in late 2009<sup>2</sup>. The project design should take these guidelines into account if possible.
4. A question that the full proposal should address is why Costa Rica, with such a long history of seemingly successful capacity building and PA development projects funded by GEF and others, still needs to develop institutional and legislative capacity and frameworks in biodiversity conservation - whether in terrestrial or marine systems? This should be considered and addressed in the full project proposal, with reference to the GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation: Costa Rica (1992-2005)<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> See <http://stapgef.unep.org/resources/sg/PES> and additional notes provided to Council at

[http://www.thegef.org/uploadedFiles/Documents/Council\\_Documents\\_\(PDF\\_DOC\)/GEF\\_35/C.35.Inf.12\\_STAP\\_Guidance\\_on\\_PES.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/uploadedFiles/Documents/Council_Documents_(PDF_DOC)/GEF_35/C.35.Inf.12_STAP_Guidance_on_PES.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> See STAP work program at

[http://stapgef.unep.org/docs/Activities/STAPWPDocs/GEF\\_C.35\\_Inf.11%20STAP%20Work%20Program%20FY10.pdf](http://stapgef.unep.org/docs/Activities/STAPWPDocs/GEF_C.35_Inf.11%20STAP%20Work%20Program%20FY10.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> <http://thegef.org/uploadedFiles/costa%20rica.pdf>

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. <b>Consent</b>	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. <b>Minor revision required.</b>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues</li> <li>(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</li> </ul> <p>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.</p>
3. <b>Major revision required</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>