

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: March 16, 2013

Screener: Christine Wellington-Moore

Panel member validation by: Brian Huntley
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT **GEF TRUST FUND**

GEF PROJECT ID: 5089

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Mexico

PROJECT TITLE: Strengthening Management of the PA System to Better Conserve Endangered Species and their Habitats

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: National Commission for Protected Natural Areas (CONANP)

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

PIF Information extract: The objective of the project is to increase the effectiveness of PAs in Mexico in contributing to the conservation of endangered species through the consolidation and expansion of effectively managed and financially sustainable protected areas, including key areas of the natural ranges of the selected species. There are two components to the proposed project: Component 1: System level frameworks consolidated to support the conservation of endangered species; and Component 2: PAs are managed effectively for the conservation of endangered species.

Further guidance from STAP:

STAP welcomes this well-formulated proposal which reflects the substantial advances made in conservation science and its application in Mexico over the past two decades, much of this resulting from GEF and associated projects. The identification of the twelve most threatened taxa in a mega-diverse country and the focus on the key drivers of the threats to each of these, plus species specific strategies for each, is a model that offers opportunity for replication elsewhere. Similarly, the high level of spatial information on species and habitat distribution and status and trends makes possible cost effective strategic conservation planning. The development of financial strategies to ensure sustainability of the project is commendable, again building on experience in several approaches to financing conservation through PES, re-investment of PA fees, eco-tourism and raising support from the private sector.

STAP has only minor suggestions to take into account in preparing full project document:

1. The establishment of baselines, targets and indicators of success for each of the twelve species and other biophysical and socio-economic objectives would be essential. This is already described in the PPG.
2. Given the strong science base on which this project is founded, STAP would request that references to information sources be cited in the full project document, as an added strength to the proposal.
3. It would be prudent to examine potential importance of key issues associated with chemicals sources and management within and surrounding the overall area in question. Chemicals can move through aquifers and rivers to the coastal areas, threatening all biota along the way. Given the impact of chemicals on fecundity, and that birds with low clutch size and marine species are involved, one should consider examining monitoring of chemical contaminants in the area, and, if possible identify potential point sources within the managed area. Data of chemical levels in bird eggs and marine species might also be examined. Without such consideration, chemical contamination and ongoing chemical stress due to poor chemicals management within or upstream of the area, has the potential to undermine

integrity of protection efforts and health of species. Note that chemicals can come from ongoing use (urban and agricultural), poorly managed stockpiles, active and abandoned mines and other sources.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	<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>
2. Minor revision required.	<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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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.
3. Major revision required	<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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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.