

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 04, 2015

Screener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Bierbaum Rosina M.
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 9044

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Peru

PROJECT TITLE: Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Peru

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: UNOPS

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):
Concur

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes this proposal, and continues to be highly supportive of the small grants program (SGP) overall. The SGP is uniquely placed to test innovative actions which address multi-focal area (MFA) challenges in a local setting, and to combine the delivery of GEBs with actions to reduce poverty and promote local livelihoods.

STAP notes that SGPs tend to be highly innovative, and not 'risk averse'. As such these initiatives often test new approaches to supporting environmentally sustainable development across the traditional focal areas of the GEF and within communities which often have limited experience in the management of complex projects. This approach allows for the development of the necessary experience and capacity to take on larger scale, more costly projects in future. The fact that the SGP has in the past often worked with some of the poorest and most disadvantaged sectors of society that at the same time typically have the greatest reliance on the natural resource base makes SGP initiatives very compelling and worthy of continued support.

STAP wishes to stress that going forward attention to the GEF 6 Strategy, particularly the innovative and cross sectoral initiatives undertaken by the IAPs and other Programs, is highly relevant to the selection of individual small grant projects. In particular, this allows for additional opportunities to further evaluate the effectiveness of multi-focal approaches and test ideas which could become the basis of future large-scale initiatives.

STAP understands that the SGP tends to be treated very much as a stand-alone project within recipient countries, and may often be only weakly integrated with other GEF-funded activities or other national and local-level initiatives. As such, STAP recommends attention be given as to how the SGP will be integrated institutionally in-country so that the SGP's outputs support multiple objectives, influence other activities, and where possible are sustained over the long term.

Finally, STAP would recommend that the contribution of these projects to the development of human capacity and institutional capital, along with improved knowledge management at country level, elaborated wherever possible. The contribution of these initiatives to the delivery of the GEF Knowledge Management Strategy is one such step which could be explored. More importantly, these projects are uniquely placed to improve learning and knowledge management at the national level, and can therefore contribute to our understanding of the delivery of global environmental benefits and environmentally sustainable development objectives.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Concur	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple “Concur” response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised. (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to 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>
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP’s concerns.</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>