

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

Screener: 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: 5549

PROJECT DURATION : 3

COUNTRIES : Philippines

PROJECT TITLE: RicePlus-Dynamic Conservation and Sustainable Use of Agro-biodiversity in Rice-based Farming Systems

GEF AGENCIES: FAO

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau (PAWB),

Department of Agriculture - Bureau of Agricultural Research,

Department of Agriculture - Bureau of Soils and Water Management,

Southeast Asia Regional Initiatives for Community Empowerment (SEARICE)

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 concept for a project intended to enhance, expand and help sustain practices and opportunities for supporting globally significant biodiversity in rice-based farming systems.

1. Overall, the problem definition, threats and barriers are appropriately reflected in the proposed project's desired outcomes, outputs and supporting activities. The project structure is logical and coherent. The provision of the figures to illustrate the barriers and strategy for barrier removal, the project structure, is also appreciated.
2. More specifically, the Outcomes, particularly in the text, are rather wordy and could be made tighter. The use of a concise statement of the expected Outcome would be appropriate at the beginning of the text. The table listing Outcomes and Outputs at the beginning is better in this regard but even there some tightening of the wording or focusing could be done.
3. The GEBs of the project are understandable, and attainable, but they should be made more explicit.
4. The definition of stakeholders is appropriate, although there is no indication that gender considerations have been taken into account. This should be addressed in the future stages of project development. The selection of pilot sites will help in this regard.
5. The indication and assessment of risks is realistic, although likely underestimated in some instances, such as consumers' willingness to pay and level of expected effective participation. Some elements of the proposed mitigation strategy sound more like assumptions based on linear cause-effect predictions, or wishful thinking, than realistic and effective proactive measures to be undertaken. Proposed measures may not always lead to expected results for a variety of reasons. More specificity grounded in what is realistic would be desirable moving forward. Is there a Plan B if what is being proposed and is assumed to work does not? Much of the project's success is predicated upon this. Regarding one of the risks, government budgetary constraints, the results of the preliminary discussions on co-financing remain unclear. Co-financing estimates are provided but the specific nature of this support is not particularly clear. This will require pinning down during further project development.

6. The intent behind this project proposal is clear but in general the specifics are not. Since this is a concept that is understandable. As it stands, what is being proposed is still rather general and diffuse and does not provide a strong sense of what is realistically being expected to be achieved. This will require some focusing of the project during the PPG.

| <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: (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> |
| 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: (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> |