

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: November 13, 2017
Screener: Virginia Gorsevski
Panel member validation by: Brian Child
Consultant(s):

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

FULL-SIZED PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9584
PROJECT DURATION:	6
COUNTRIES:	Philippines
PROJECT TITLE:	Integrated Approach in the Management of Major Biodiversity Corridors (IA-Biological Corridors)
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Biodiversity Management Bureau and Forest Management Bureau of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR)
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 project by UNDP entitled "Integrated Approach in the Management of Biodiversity Corridors in the Philippines." This is a large \$12.3 m project aimed at protecting biodiversity in two major remaining corridors on two large islands in the Philippines.

Numerous threats to biodiversity are identified for the Philippines including forest cover loss, poor agricultural practices, unsustainable fishing, excessive fuelwood collection, illegal wildlife trade, invasive alien species, etc., as are the underlying drivers of poverty and weak tenure. The objective is to stem loss in biodiversity and improve local livelihoods through reductions in forest loss and land degradation using an integrated management strategy for corridors in two areas – Central Mindoro and Eastern Mindanao. STAP is pleased to see maps of these areas included in the project proposal, though it must be said that the maps could be further improved if a subset of the entire country were included to indicate where in the country these two regions are located. The underlying premise of this project is that the implementation of an integrated approach will lead to changes in land use and land cover which will ultimate benefits people and biodiversity simultaneously.

Overall, the project is well written and organized with clearly articulated Components. STAP fully endorses this project.

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
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

	<p>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.</p>
<p>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</p>	<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>
<p>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</p>	<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>