STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: 6 June 2008  
Screener: Guadalupe Duron  
Panel member validation by:  Paul Ferraro

I. PIF Information

- GEFSEC PROJECT ID:  
- GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:  
- COUNTRY(ies): Colombia, Ecuador and Peru  
- PROJECT TITLE: Facilitation of financing for biodiversity-based businesses and support of market development activities in the Andean Region  
- GEF AGENCY(ies): UNEP  
- OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): Andean Development Corporation (CAF), Alexander Von-Humboldt Institute (Colombia); CORPEI/ National Sustainable Biotrade Program -Ecuador (PNBSE); PROMPERU (Peru).  
- Regional: Andean Development Corporation (CAF)  
- GEF FOCAL AREA(S): Biodiversity  
- GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): SO2; SP4;SP5  
- NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: 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 this regional proposal on facilitating financing for biodiversity-based businesses and supporting market development activities in the Andes. The proposal could be strengthened if the proponents could provide some evidence, from within the region, in which the variables claimed to be barriers have been removed and a biodiversity business sector has taken off with environmental gains (e.g., surely there is some biodiversity businesses that have access to competitive credit). If evidence doesn’t exist for the region, does UNEP have evidence of a donor-financed (or government-financed) biotrade initiative somewhere else that has led to environmental and development gains? Finally, the project assumes that if a business adheres to the biotrade principles, there is an additional environmental benefit beyond that which would have existed in the status quo: the project should consider some way of verifying this. At the very least, a baseline measure of adherence to the principles is needed if the goal is to reduce further erosion from the principles over time, rather than greater adherence, then control areas/businesses may be needed to show added-value from the initiative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAP advisory response</th>
<th>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Consent</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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.