

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: October 18, 2013

Screener: Paul Grigoriev

Panel member validation by: Sandra Diaz
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT **GEF TRUST FUND**

GEF PROJECT ID: 5560

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Colombia

PROJECT TITLE: Forest Conservation and Sustainability in the Heart of the Colombian Amazon

GEF AGENCIES: World Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministerio de Ambiente y

Desarrollo Sostenible (MADS),

IDEAM, Patrimonio Natural-Fondo

para la Biodiversidad y Áreas

Naturales Protegidas, Parques

Nacionales Naturales, Instituto SINCHI

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): **Minor revision required**

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the submission of this concept of a multi-focal area initiative intended to improve governance and promote sustainable land use activities so as to decrease deforestation and conserve biodiversity in the Colombian Amazon forests, with the focus being on the "heart" of this area - the core Chiribiquete National Park. It is noted that the 1.5 million ha. expansion of Chiribiquete National Park mentioned in this proposal was proclaimed on August 21, 2013.

The project objective (project development objective in this case) is consistent with the defined problem and principal threats confronting the forests and biodiversity, however analysis of these threats are presented in a general manner. The proposed four project components are consistent with the problem definition, although it would be helpful if a section dedicated to the specific barriers that this project will try to overcome would have been provided. The barriers are mentioned in various places but presenting them together would lead to a sharper presentation of the logic inherent in the project's structure. This would help improve the overall coherence of the proposal.

It is clear that GEBs will be realized through this project but they should be more specifically described. A section on expected GEBs would help in this regard as well.

It would have been useful and informative if proposed outcome indicators would have been provided. These will be required moving forward.

The definition of stakeholders is comprehensive and it is noted that consideration is to be given to gender specific activities and involvement mechanisms in the further development of the project.

The description of the methodology on page 9 of the PCN is very sketchy and requires additional detail - as at this stage it is very difficult to make an assessment.

Concerning risks, the major ones are well identified (which is welcome) although climate change risks could receive more consideration. In fact, the overall risk for implementation effectiveness is considered to be "substantial".

However, on page 21 of the PCN, the following is stated. "There is little likelihood that risks identified will negatively affect project progress and achievement of PDO, despite uncertainties in stakeholder engagement, in ability of implementing agencies to effectively execute and monitor efforts and sustain them beyond project completion and the presence of armed groups in forest areas" Bank is relatively unfamiliar with local groups and cannot predict precisely how (they) will react in fact to project. Private sector is present in project area and might pose some initial resistance to proposed initiatives" Such a statement, honest and objective as it is in terms of the real risks, seems to run counter to the above noted conclusion. Given the circumstances, how can the conclusion be reached that there is little likelihood that the risks are unlikely to undermine or negatively affect the project? Considerably more attention must be given to realistic mitigating measures. The same applies to ensuring or enhancing the sustainability of the project's outcomes.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	<p>STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved.</p> <p>Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.</p>
2. Minor revision required.	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency: (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.</p>
3. Major revision required	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>Follow-up: (i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</p>