

# 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 14, 2014

Screener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Sandra Diaz  
Consultant(s): Paul Grigoriev

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT    GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 5735

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Global

**PROJECT TITLE:** Effectively Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into Government Policy and Private Sector Practice Piloting Sustainability Models to Take the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) to Scale

**GEF AGENCIES:** CI

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF)

**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 the submission of this important, timely and clearly presented concept for a project that will mainstream biodiversity conservation into government policy and private sector practice in three pilot biodiversity hotspots by strengthening the role of civil society organizations as catalysts for the effective management of biodiversity, and by replicating approaches and innovations in other biodiversity hotspots. The project is designed to contribute to the upcoming CEPF Phase 3 and represents an important bridge to ensuring that civil society becomes a more proactive, effective and capacitated partner. It intends to do this by initiating the development and implementation of models that will increase the role and effectiveness of civil society in mainstreaming biodiversity in government policy and private sector business practices.

The project framework is logical, coherent and clearly presented. The linkages between the general problem, Objective, Outcomes and Outputs are well defined and demonstrate strong consistency in logic. It is noted, however, that indicators at the Outcome level should be reviewed. Component 1, 3 and 4 Outcomes require indicators. What is presented for Outcomes 3 and 4 are targets, as is recognized in the proposal, but the indicators for which these are the targets are not precisely defined. Indicators under Outcome 2 are appropriate but the second and third indicators should refer to a change in funding as opposed to amounts from those sources.

The threats, baseline activities, including investments, and gaps are well documented and clearly presented, as is the baseline scenario. The GEBs to be secured are clearly evident and the incremental cost reasoning is presented very thoroughly and convincingly.

The project is highly innovative in several important areas including financing mechanisms and integrating biodiversity into public policy and private sector practices through new models and partnerships, among others. Mechanisms for ensuring the sustainability of project results are also built into the project's design. The project is also designed so that it will inform the scaling-up of its lessons and results to at least twelve other hotspots through the CEPF Third Phase. Component 4 is essentially targeting the scaling-up of the project's results.

The project stakeholders are indeed numerous. Not all of them are presented in the proposal, but they are clearly defined by categories using an example on the basis of the Brazilian Cerrado, one of the three hotspots involved in the project. In the future project preparation process, their particular roles in the project

should be made more explicit. For a project of this scope, coordination will present its specific challenges. The proposed mechanisms are described extensively and should form a solid basis for effective coordination. In addition, it is noted that gender considerations are contemplated in the project's activities.

The main risks are identified, weighted and the proposed mitigation measures are appropriate and realistic, for the most part. The risk "opportunities for reform of particular policies do not arise during project duration or reforms take a long time" is very realistic. This is a risk confronting any initiative whose limited timeframe affects appreciable and sustainable change. The proposed mitigation strategy for this risk is to give "strong weighting to time-bound opportunities for influencing policies when establishing public policy targets for the project." While targeting low hanging policy fruit is better than nothing, the major policy issues are often not time-bound. Lack of enough political space for civil society to influence public policy is rightly considered a risk. However, a risk specific to the scope and objectives of this project, namely the strongly asymmetry in the capacity of civil society organizations to influence government policy as compared to that of the private sector (particularly large corporations) is not mentioned, and it should be addressed.

STAP notes that long term sustainability in this initiative will depend on innovative financing arrangements to "mainstream" biodiversity into policy and decision making. Indeed, the project will be drawing on direct past experience in this regard. The Panel wishes to draw the proponent's attention to an upcoming STAP guidance document: Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Practice (in press) which will be presented to Council in May 2014. In addition, STAP wishes to stress the importance of ensuring that project investments in this area also ensure that tangible evidence is generated over time which will allow empirical analysis of the effectiveness of these measures in delivering biodiversity-related global environmental benefits.

<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>