

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: 11 March 2008

Screener: Select STAP Sec screener

Panel member validation by: Michael Stocking

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

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 2505

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 4030

COUNTRY (IES): Argentina, Bolivia and Paraguay

PROJECT TITLE: Sustainable Forest Management in the Transboundary Gran Chaco Americano Ecosystem

GEF AGENCY (IES): UNEP, UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Organization of American States (OAS) in collaboration with the Environment and Sustainable Development Secretariat (Chief of the Cabinet of Ministers, Argentina; Vice-Ministry of River Basins and Hydraulic Resources (Ministry of Water, Bolivia); Environment Secretariat (Ministry of Environment, Paraguay).

GEF FOCAL AREAS: Land Degradation, Biodiversity, Climate Change

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): SFM-SO7;SO3

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: SFM

Full size project GEF Trust Fund

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):
Consent

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP welcomes the information provided in this PIF on the monitoring of the impact on SLM and SFM, using the SP2 tracking tools and indicators. This is an example of good practice, which should be shared with GEF agencies, in STAP's view. STAP also welcomes the differentiation of Outcomes and Outputs and the quantification of targets in the outputs. For Component 2, STAP advises establishing a firm baseline in a number of key environmental (e.g. biodiversity and above/below-ground carbon) and developmental (e.g. livelihoods and wealth status of local people) indicators from which the impact of the project can truly be assessed. If this is not done, the impacts will only be assessable by inference from project activities and will be subject to major assumptions.

<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.	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: (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 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.
3. Major revision required	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.