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I. PIF Information

PART I: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

GEF PROJECT ID: 4080  PROJECT DURATION: 60 months
GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 4313
COUNTRY(IES): Senegal
PROJECT TITLE: SPWA- Participatory Conservation of Biodiversity and Low Carbon Development of Pilot Ecovillages at the Vicinity of Protected Areas in Senegal
GEF AGENCY(IES): UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): National Ecovillage Agency (ANEV)
GEF FOCAL AREA(S): Biodiversity & Climate Change
GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): under BD, SO1 / SP2 + SP3; and under CC SP4
NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: Strategic Programme for West Africa (SPWA)

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

This proposal is well developed. It provides detailed project interventions, and references to support the proposed activities. STAP has the following observations to help strengthen the proposal –

1. The proposal does not state if a risk assessment will be done for invasive species resulting from *Jatropha curcas*. If a risk assessment had not been planned, STAP recommends the project reconsiders doing an assessment.


3. On testing of Payments for Environmental Services (PES) schemes (component 4), the Panel refers UNDP to its general guidelines on PES projects [Footnote: See http://stapgef.unep.org/resources/sg/PES and additional notes provided to Council at http://www.thegef.org/uploadedFiles/Documents/Council_Documents__PDF_DOC)/GEF_35/C.35.Inf.12_STAP_Guidance_on_PES.pdf] and in particular the need to address the most common barriers to PES effectiveness: (i) non-compliance; (ii) poor administrative selection; (iii) spatial demand spillovers; and (iv) adverse self-selection. The full proposal should detail how each of these barriers will be addressed and the project design should be capable of assessing whether the pilot interventions were in fact effective.

4. STAP suggests that UNDP considers the guidance it provided on the SPWA programmatic frameworks on biodiversity and climate change. Some of STAP’s guidance is valuable to this proposal. STAP’s guidance can be accessed through these links –

- a. SPWA biodiversity component –
b. SPWA climate change component –


5. STAP suggest a baseline in terms of governance framework, biodiversity (e.g. including pressure on key protected area resources), and on energy use for Ecovillages. Such a baseline would help answer several of the basic queries raised in the STAP screens for the programmatic frameworks, which are also applicable for this project. Ideally, comparisons with villages not involved would add great value to the overall results.

<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. |