

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: April 24, 2012

Screener: Thomas Hammond

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

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 4829

PROJECT DURATION : 2

COUNTRIES : Global (Angola, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Benin, Central African Republic, Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Cook Islands, Cameroon, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Algeria, Grenada, Ghana, Gambia, Guinea, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Kenya, Lao PDR, Sri Lanka, Morocco, Moldova, Mongolia, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Nepal, Nauru, Niue, Philippines, Sao Tome and Principe, Chad, Togo, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, St. Vincent and Grenadines, Vanuatu, Serbia, Congo DR)

PROJECT TITLE: Support to GEF Eligible Parties for Alignment of National Action Programs and Reporting Process under UNCCD

GEF AGENCIES: UNEP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: National Government Ministries UNEP-WCMC,

GEF FOCAL AREA: Land Degradation

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 effort to support alignment of national action plans and national reporting under the UNCCD 10 Year Strategy. The Panel is particularly encouraged that support in this initiative will also be channeled to quantitative baseline assessment and monitoring. STAP has worked closely with the UNCCD Secretariat and relevant bodies such as the Committee on Science and Technology over the past three years to revise, rationalize, and improve the indicator framework for the Convention. Due to the support and capacity building function of this initiative across 53 countries, a science and/or technology based review of project interventions is not required. At this juncture, the only recommendation STAP wishes to make is that the project terminal evaluation specifically review the degree to which implementation of the baseline analysis and indicator framework has succeeded at country level.

<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 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: (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	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. 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.

