

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: October 08, 2013

Screeener: Paul Grigoriev

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

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT **GEF TRUST FUND**

GEF PROJECT ID: 5546

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Panama

PROJECT TITLE: Sustainable Production Systems and Conservation of Biodiversity

GEF AGENCIES: World Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Autoridad Nacional del Ambient (National Environmental Authority)

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): **Minor revision required**

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the submission of this project concept intended to help conserve globally significant biodiversity and enhance local livelihoods through improvements in PA management effectiveness (in 10 areas to be selected) and the mainstreaming of biodiversity friendly management/production practices in their buffer zones. To a large degree, this project concept builds upon the groundwork and achievements of the GEF project Rural Productivity and Consolidation of the Atlantic Mesoamerican Biological Corridor (CBMAP II) that ends in July 2014.

1. The overall impression of this concept is that there is undoubtedly merit in it for globally important biodiversity, but the manner in which it is presented and the lack of specificity in several areas makes it difficult to assess systematically and thoroughly. While the general difficulties confronting protected areas and growing stresses on biodiversity are presented, the specific problem that this proposed project tackles remains to be clearly defined. The threats and stresses are presented in a general manner. While biodiversity's significance is described, there is a lack of an explicit identification and description of the discrete GEBs that are to be expected to be generated through this proposed project and the incremental support. They are implicit but more effort is required to properly define them, along with appropriate indicators. Baselines will need to be addressed looking ahead.
2. The Outputs need revisiting because what is presented for the most part are not Outputs (e.g. Number of PAs with a 75% score in GEF METT which is a target for an indicator; Number of producers under biodiversity friendly production systems; Number of subprojects, exchanges, studies etc.) In general, the project structure could be made clearer, more precise and more coherent.
3. It is noted that considerable effort has been devoted to the definition of various risks, although risks associated with climate change driven events do not receive much attention. In the PCN, however, there is some inconsistency whereby under the section on Key Risks and Issues, stakeholder participation is the only risk presented when clearly there are more as evidenced later. Some editing would help improve their presentation. The definition of stakeholders is inclusive of interests but on the basis of past experience, consideration should be given to possible means of enhancing the meaningfulness and effectiveness of participation, especially that of intended beneficiaries. Also, the level of attention devoted to issues related to gender considerations in project implementation is commendable.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may

	<p>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>
<p>2. Minor revision required.</p>	<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>
<p>3. Major revision required</p>	<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>