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

Date of screening: 18 September 2009
Screener: David Cunningham
Panel member validation by: Brian Huntley & Paul Ferraro

I. PIF Information

Full size project GEF Trust Fund

GEF PROJECT ID: 3962
PROJECT DURATION: 60 months
GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: P115988
COUNTRY: Guinea
PROJECT TITLE: Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Mining Induced Growth and Employment Project (BioMIGEP)
GEF AGENCY: World Bank
GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity
GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(s): BD-SP4-Policy, BD-SP5-Markets
NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT (if applicable): SPWA- Strategic Program for West Africa

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: Minor revision required

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP welcomes this project to mainstream biodiversity considerations into local development planning around the mining sector in Guinea. The Panel commends the apparent intention to use an ecosystem goods and services approach and apply the principles of sustainable land management.

3. The PIF provides very limited information on the biodiversity values of the project areas. The full project proposal should provide indicators of the expected biodiversity gains, in terms of important species and ecosystems benefiting from the project impacts.

4. The anticipated impacts of climate change, as described in recent regional reviews (Climate and Climate Change in West Africa - FAO, 2008\(^1\); Regional Framework for the Adaptation of West African Agriculture to Climate Change 2009) should be considered in the full project proposal, including the characterisation of climate change risks and how they will be managed in the project.

5. General guidance from STAP on ‘Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes’ (GEF Working Paper 20, November 2005) should be considered in the final proposal\(^2\).

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>response</th>
<th>Details</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. |