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: 12 March 2008        Screener: Douglas Taylor, STAP Secretary
Panel member validation by: Meryl Williams

I. PIF Information

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 2975
GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: P096836
COUNTRY(IES): Philippines
PROJECT TITLE: Mindanao Rural Development Program Phase II: Coastal and Marine Ecosystem Conservation Component
GEF AGENCY(IES): World Bank
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S):
GEF FOCAL AREA(S): Biodiversity, Land Degradation,
GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): BD1, BD2, SLM1, SLM2
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 the integration of upland and coastal activities, and also notes positively the targeting (among others) of women in the community level agricultural and natural resource management initiatives.
3. Most development agencies, including the GEF (see 2007 Philippines country evaluation) find the Philippines difficult to fully achieve the desired impact. The cautions and suggestions in the 2007 country evaluation should be heeded, although clearly this project cannot await a national GEF Philippines strategy. STAP notes that coordination among national agencies is already addressed in the PIF.

<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. |