

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: 4 March 2008

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

I. PIF Information

GEFSEC PROJECT ID:

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 3530

COUNTRY: Philippines

PROJECT TITLE: Expanding and diversifying the national system of terrestrial protected areas in the Philippines

GEF AGENCY: UNDP

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

GEF FOCAL AREAS: Biodiversity

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM: BD-SO1; SP3

Full size project **GEF Trust Fund**

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(ies):
Consent

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. Because of the size of the protected area expansion proposed and the diversity of ecosystems and protected area type in the Philippines, STAP believes that this project could contribute more to our collective understanding of the effectiveness of different forms of protected areas in achieving environmental and social impacts. STAP encourages the project proponents to consider allocating some of its "capacity building" investments to strengthening the Philippines' ability to draw inferences about the impact PAs have on observable outcomes that can be measured in protected areas AND in unprotected areas with similar characteristics. The latter is generally not done and thus inferences are difficult to draw about the effectiveness (and cost-effectiveness) of investments. Capacity building in this vein relates to the ability to monitor changes on a large-scale, the ability to create some variation in protected area location that is not related to expected outcomes (useful for identifying effect of protection), and the ability to understand how to draw inferences from the observed data. This information would be beneficial to both national and global conservation efforts. STAP has a few other suggestions to strengthen the proposal -
 1. Define a baseline for project management.
 2. Define more clearly the global environment benefits the proposal intends to achieve. This is not clear in this PIF.
 3. Account for a mitigation strategy that addresses policies and market interventions that can undermine sustainable financing of protected areas - for example, subsidies for alternative land use.

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: <ol 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 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	<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>
-----------------------------------	---