

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: 20 May 2009

Screener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

I. PIF Information

Full size project **GEF Trust Fund**

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3936

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 4257

COUNTRY: India

PROJECT TITLE: Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Conservation into Production Sectors in the Godavari River Estuary, Andhra Pradesh, India

GEF AGENCY: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Union Ministry of Environment and Forests (MOEF); Andhra Pradesh Department of Environment, Forests and Pollution Control Board

GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM: BD SP4: Strengthening the Policy and Regulatory Framework for Mainstreaming Biodiversity

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/ UMBRELLA PROJECT: Programme for Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Conservation into India's Production Sectors (India GEF Coastal and Marine Program (IGCMP))

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:
Consent

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP notes this first of two projects anticipated under the India GEF Coastal and Marine Program (IGCMP). We have no comment on the science aspects of this PIF.

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
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: (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.