

# 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: @@@@ @@, @@@@ Screener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Thomas Lovejoy  
Consultant(s): Doug Taylor

### I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

**FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4716

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Guatemala

**PROJECT TITLE:** Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Coastal and Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNDP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources of Guatemala (MARN); National Council of Protected Areas (CONAP); The Nature Conservancy (TNC)

**GEF FOCAL AREA:** Biodiversity

### II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies): **Consent**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes this proposal for strengthening the coverage and effectiveness of protected areas in coastal Guatemala, comprising a useful combination of scientific, technical measures and participatory community involvement. Guatemala's area under conservation is already one of the leading examples in Latin America and the Caribbean region as a proportion of its total area.

STAP's offers the following suggestions for consideration during development of the full project brief.

Under Components 1, 2 and 3, the impacts of the various interests that need to be well understood in order to enhance MPA management could be considered within the emerging framework of Marine Spatial Planning (see for example Douvère, F. (2008). Marine Policy 32:762-771.)

Component 3 includes work to determine BD friendly fisheries practices, which would presumably enhance conditions compatible with current shrimp export certification. In order to enable comparison of the proposed biodiversity-friendly fishing practices to those practised elsewhere, STAP recommends that the proponents consider adopting methodology compatible with possible future fisheries certification and which builds in the interests of the artisanal fishing community. Several recent publications are available, e.g. J. Alder, et al. (2010), Marine Policy 34 (2010) 468-476; Sainsbury, K. (2010), FAO Technical Paper 533.

Finally, similar to advice provided for the Honduras MPA project (GEF ID 4708) STAP wishes to underscore the likely synergies in capacity development, data collection and research, and in lessons learned which exist between these two projects.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	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.
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	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

	<p>(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.</p>
<p>3. <b>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.  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>