

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: 9 February 2010

Screener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: Brian Huntley

I. PIF Information

Full size project **GEF Trust Fund**

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 4113

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: CO-X1011

COUNTRY: Colombia

PROJECT TITLE: Mainstreaming biodiversity in palm cropping in Colombia with an ecosystem approach

GEF AGENCY: Inter-American Development Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: National Federation of African Palm Growers (FEDEPALMA) as executing agency. Humboldt Institute on Biological Resources Research (IAvH) and World Wildlife Fund (WWF) as supporting partners

GEF FOCAL AREAS: Biodiversity

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM: BD-SP5

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 supports this proposal to improve the environmental performance of the palm cropping sector in Colombia. A minor revision is called for to ensure the full proposal addresses some scientific and technical issues associated with Payments for Environmental Services (PES) (Component 2) and environmental certification (Component 3).
3. The Panel refers IADB to its advisory document on PES¹ for use in developing Component 2 of the full proposal, in particular to the need to describe design choices to minimize four threats to PES effectiveness and to specify indicators that will permit one to evaluate the importance of these threats in the project:
 - a. non-compliance with contractual conditions
 - b. poor administrative selection (i.e., contracts are offered to areas or individuals who are not in the best position to supply environmental services cost-effectively)
 - c. spatial demand spillovers (a.k.a., general equilibrium effects, or "leakage") whereby protecting a resource in one location pushes pressure onto resources elsewhere
 - d. adverse self-selection, where people would have supplied the contracted PES service or activity even in the absence of a payment.
4. The scientific literature reveals that the relationship between biodiversity conservation outcomes and certification remains poorly understood across a range of sectors including agricultural and forest products. Certified palm oil is relatively new and the evidence base for environmental benefits has not yet been established. STAP will be able to provide its own study on environmental certification, currently in peer review, to inform the development of Component 3 of the full proposal in such a way that the project can contribute to this evidence base.

¹ 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](http://www.thegef.org/uploadedFiles/Documents/Council_Documents_(PDF_DOC)/GEF_35/C.35.Inf.12_STAP_Guidance_on_PES.pdf)

<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.	<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"> (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 <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>
3. Major revision required	<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>