

# 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: 6 June 2008

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

### I. PIF Information

#### **PART I: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION**

**GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3021**

**GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 3601**

**COUNTRY(IES): Panama**

**PROJECT TITLE:** Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into the operation of the tourism and fisheries sectors in Las Perlas Archipelago

**GEF AGENCY(IES): UNDP**

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Autoridad de los Recursos Acuáticos de Panamá (ARAP)

**GEF FOCAL AREAS:** BD

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S):** SO-2, SP4, SP5

**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 proposal on "Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into the operation of the tourism and fisheries sectors in Las Perlas Archipelago" in Panama. STAP believes that it would be useful if the proponent could also detail if, and in what ways, the project would complement, or take-up some of the emerging results of the on-going project on marine biodiversity in Las Perlas Archipelago, which is led by the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute. <http://darwin.defra.gov.uk/project/12021/> [http://www.stri.org/strategicplan\\_2008-2013.pdf](http://www.stri.org/strategicplan_2008-2013.pdf).

The proposal could be further strengthened in two ways: (1) justification for the conservation value of the project site could be stronger by showing that this site is relatively more important than the other sites in Panama that host marine mammals, sea turtles, and other species (as currently written the motivation for the program sounds more like a program focused on improving the economic returns to an important fishery and tourism site through better management; as an example, manatees are threatened in Panama by hunting and boat traffic, but the actions under this proposal do not seem targeted to such threats);

and (2) supporting evidence that market-oriented donor initiatives like promoting product development and marketing to stimulate eco-friendly product demand, providing fishermen with better scientific information, or offering credit to fishermen leads to improved environmental outcomes. Are there good examples of such investments, particularly by UNDP, leading to sustainable flow of environmental services? Panama has a lot of entrepreneurs, including many in the tourism sector. Why don't they see the opportunities for new products and services? The project proposes to move up the supply chain "to support the development of demand," but why isn't demand working its way down the supply chain? Why is UNDP and its partners the only ones who see the economic gains from this investment, while consumers and intermediaries are unaware of the gains to be made from biodiversity-friendly activities? The proposal would be stronger if it could clearly show that such actions have been demonstrated to work elsewhere or they are designing this program with the intention of explicitly testing these hypotheses.

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
------------------------	--

<p><b>1. Consent</b></p>	<p>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.</p>
<p><b>2. Minor revision required.</b></p>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues</li> <li>(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</li> </ul> <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><b>3. Major revision required</b></p>	<p>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.</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>