

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: May 09, 2012

Screener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Thomas Lovejoy
Consultant(s): Paul Grigoriev

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 4867

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Indonesia

PROJECT TITLE: Enhancing the Protected Area System in Sulawesi (E-PASS) for Biodiversity Conservation

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Forestry

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 this proposal to strengthen the management effectiveness and financial sustainability of Sulawesi's network of PAs, thereby securing considerable global environmental benefits. This project is timely indeed considering the nature and rapid intensification of threats to the island's important biodiversity, ecosystems and ecosystem services upon which many depend.

The problem and threats are articulated clearly and the project objective is completely in line with the problem. The global environmental benefits are well presented and related to specific sites, which is always good to see. The project is well thought through and demonstrates consistency in logic at all levels. The barriers are clearly laid out and the proposed outcomes and outputs are demonstrably related to the removal of the barriers.

The baseline activities are well documented and considerable attention has been paid to the presentation of the existing baseline for project outcomes. Some of these could be updated, however, if possible. The still missing baseline values for some of the indicators will be collected during further project preparation.

Under Component 2, there may be an issue concerning the wording that should be clarified. It is stated that "In order to remove the aforementioned financial barriers and to increase the sustainability of the PA system, this component aims to increase the government budget allocation to Sulawesi PA system by at least 50% from the current estimated amount of US\$ 13.8 million per year." Since the thrust of this component is not so much to increase the government's budgetary contribution as it is to supplement it and diversify funding through the development and implementation of innovative and alternative financing mechanisms, this should be reflected in the wording. In this regard, REDD+ features quite prominently. Perhaps there may be somewhat of an over-reliance or emphasis on this mechanism? In this regard, perhaps additional focus could be directed to the other alternative proposed financing mechanisms and what would be required to implement them from a legal and institutional perspective.

The risks are real and well presented, although as usual in projects, the components of the mitigation or management strategy for climate change related risks are rather general and exhibit a certain inherent faith in the long term effectiveness of what is being proposed.

<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 emphasizing 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.	<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"> (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 <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. Major revision required	<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>