

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: 19 March 2009

Screener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

I. PIF Information *(Paste here from the PIF)*

Full size project **GEF Trust Fund**

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3830

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:

COUNTRY(IES): Argentina

PROJECT TITLE: Rural Corridors and Biodiversity Conservation

GEF AGENCY(IES): World Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): NATIONAL PARKS ADMINISTRATION (APN)

GEF FOCAL AREA (S): Biodiversity and Climate Change

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): BD-SP1 Financing; BD-SP2 Marine PA; BD-SP3- PA Networks; CC-SP6-LULUCF

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: Sustainable forest management

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):
Minor revision required

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP believes that an emphasis on corridor development is justified in the case of Argentina and has only a few comments on the PIF. In some cases, the outputs and outcomes are identical (e.g., output 3.2 is the same as the outcome for project component 3). The full project document should make clearer distinctions. The Panel requests that in addition the proponent addresses the following issues and refers to them in the full project brief.
3. Component 1 aims to strengthen SIFAP through a number of interventions. After briefly characterizing the interventions, the PIF then asserts that (p.4) "[b]y mid-term, the system would be incrementally absorbed by the institution members, who would take over the financing and management from the project." But it is not clear why SIFAP is unable to finance and manage the proposed interventions now, but, after GEF financing, it will eventually take over the financing and management. What conditions or capacities would change that would make SIFAP capable of doing this?
4. Component 3 aims to increase the protected area (PA) system by six PAs. Yet the PIF acknowledges that 50% of existing PAs have no management and 30% lack "sufficient funding and staffing." Why is expanding the PA system a priority? The PIF is not clear. Is it because simple gazetting PAs without any management yields substantial global environmental benefits (GEBs), because the GEBs from the existing PAs that lacks management are not as valuable as the GEBs likely to be generated by the new PAs, or because component 1 will somehow address the 80% of the existing PA system that is either completely lacking or partially lacking management?
5. The full project document should explain how the World Bank project will coordinate with the UNDP/UNEP GEF project 3623, *Establishment of Incentives for the Conservation of Ecosystem Services of Global Significance*¹ since the latter is focused on two of the three provinces of focus in the World Bank project.

¹ PIF Approval Date September 16, 2008, <http://gefonline.org/projectDetailsSQL.cfm?projID=3623>.

<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.	<p>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:</p> <ul 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 <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>
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>