

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: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

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

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3626

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:

COUNTRY(IES): Republic of Palau (ROP); Federated States of Micronesia (FSM); Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI)

PROJECT TITLE: The Micronesia Challenge : Sustainable Finance Systems for Island Protected Area Management

GEF AGENCY(IES): UNEP, (select), (select)

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): Relevant in-country Government agencies; TNC, CI, Micronesia Conservation Trust

GEF FOCAL AREA (S): Biodiversity,(select), (select)

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): BD-SP1, CC-SP4

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT:GEF PACIFIC ALLIANCE FOR SUSTAINABILITY (GEF PAS)

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 believes that the Micronesia Challenge is a worthy project. STAP simply encourages the proponents to seek the most up-to-date scientific advice on selecting the protected areas in ways that will mitigate the risk that the investments will be for naught as a result of climate change.

<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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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.