

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: May 17, 2010

Screener: Douglas Taylor

Panel member validation by: Meryl Williams
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT **GEF TRUST FUND**

GEF PROJECT ID: 2885

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Regional (Belize, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico)

PROJECT TITLE: Meso-American Barrier Reef System II

GEF AGENCIES: World Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Comision Centroamericana de Ambiente y Desarrollo (CCAD)

GEF FOCAL AREA: Multi Focal Area

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAMS: BD-1;BD-2;BD-4;BD-5;IW-1;IW-2;

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 multi-focal area project to build upon the foundational investment of GEF in the earlier Mesoamerican Barrier Reef System Project that terminated in 2006, and especially the emphasis on more realistically addressing 'alternative livelihoods' and widening the inclusion of tourism and fishery interests.

1. STAP requests that output indicators for stress reduction actions should be developed by the time of CEO endorsement. Currently Component 2 cites many watershed/ecosystem demonstration actions that are planned and while it appears that these may be delegated to various local and regional partners it will be necessary for the full project document to specify standards to be applied to the sub-components dealing with watershed management and coastal-marine zone management. During planning and implementation, the project partners should also be clear as to which agencies have regulatory, monitoring and policy responsibility for different polluting practices affecting the reefs. Such clarity will be essential to refining policy and management once the governance arrangements are established

2. Regarding Component 3 and also considering the cost-effectiveness of the project, the project developers might take advantage of the WRI-WWF and partners study of the value of reef- and mangrove-related fisheries, tourism, and shoreline protection services in Belize which is estimated to be US\$395 to \$559 million per year (ref. 1). Also more generally, the multiple values of coral reefs amongst a wide range of ecosystem services are quantified in the first report of The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB - <http://www.teebweb.org>)

Ref. 1, see: Cooper, E., Burke, L., and Bood, N. 2009. Coastal Capital: Belize. The Economic Contribution of Belize's Coral Reefs and Mangroves. WRI Working Paper. World Resources Institute. <http://www.wri.org/publications>

<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

	<p>(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</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>
<p>3. Major revision required</p>	<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>