

# 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: @@@@ @@, @@@@ Screener: Thomas Hammond

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

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4859

**PROJECT DURATION :** 4

**COUNTRIES :** Brazil

**PROJECT TITLE:** Consolidation of National System of Conservation Units (SNUC) and Enhanced Flora and Fauna Protection

**GEF AGENCIES:** IADB

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Ministry of Environment (MMA), Instituto Chico Mendes de Conservação da Biodiversidade (ICMBio), Jardim Botânico do Rio de Janeiro (JBRJ)

**GEF FOCAL AREA:** Multi Focal Area

### 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 important proposal aiming to improve the conservation of globally significant terrestrial ecosystems and endangered species, restore degraded landscapes and enhance carbon stocks through the expansion and consolidation of the SNUC and more sustainable management of forest and non-forest lands adjacent to protected areas in the Caatinga, Pampa and Pantanal biomes. A number of observations on the project information form which may assist in project elaboration are provided below.

While this is clearly a multi-faceted and multi-focal initiative, with funding proposed from BD, SFM and CC, the title does not reflect that accurately, mentioning only the consolidation of the SNUC and species protection. The objective, while being more indicative of the different elements of this proposal, could nevertheless be more streamlined in its wording.

While the global environmental benefits to be derived are mentioned, this is done only in rather general terms. The GEBs are more implied than presented explicitly. While this is perhaps understandable since much definition of the specific benefits still lies ahead (and they should better be defined through further assessment and project development) the Panel believes that an effort to review existing data would have been useful at this stage to help guide decision making.

Following from the above, the threats are described adequately for this stage in the process but are also presented in general biome terms, and are not location specific. This will also need to be far better defined during future project preparation.

As presented, the baseline for protected areas, species, land use etc. is generally weak and this again is an important component of this undertaking that will need to be addressed during further development of the proposal.

With regard to Component 1, it is mentioned that further assessment of protected area management effectiveness and the conservation status of endangered species will provide a foundation for designing or defining new protected areas. This is to be expected but at the same time, the expected outputs for this are already presented i.e. "At least 24 new protected areas declared covering approximately 1,000,000 hectares". It would be useful to see the assessment which was used to arrive at these figures.

Considering the complexity of the proposed project, concerning scope, extent, and the diversity of stakeholders and the funding levels, the description of the executing mechanism (the success of which would appear to be central to overall project success) is rather light.

The definition of risks is reasonably thorough although not enough consideration is given to the potential impacts of climate change. While the links to drought and fire are made, these are not presented in the assessment of risks. In addition, it would be advisable as well to assess the level of risk individually, along with proposed mitigation measures.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	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.
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues</li> <li>(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</li> </ul> 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.
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	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.