

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: April 25, 2014

Screener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Sandra Diaz
Consultant(s): Paul Grigoriev

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 5680

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Colombia

PROJECT TITLE: Consolidation of the National System of Protected Areas(SINAP) at National and Regional Levels.

GEF AGENCIES: IADB

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Parques Nacionales Naturales; Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development and Regional Environmental Authorities (CARs)

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):
Minor revision required

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the submission of this concept for a project intending to increase the coverage, representativeness and connectivity of protected areas and strengthen their management effectiveness and participatory instruments.

The project framework is generally clear and coherent. The Objective is clearly stated and consistent with the title, and the project components appear to address the baseline conditions and barriers that are described. The project overview is detailed, although its arguments could be strengthened by referencing previous assessments or reports (i.e. to confirm the presence of the described barriers), or scientific literature (i.e. to confirm that PAs and biological corridors will benefit the relevant threatened species).

ASTAP notes that the proposed indicators at Outcome level, while useful for project level results based management, are not indicators of impact with respect to GEBs (e.g. # hectares of new PAs; implementation of monitoring and surveillance system; changes in ecosystem representativeness indicator). In effect there are no "hard" indicators mentioned (e.g. trends in populations of threatened species). This essentially means that the GEBs mentioned (i.e. "the protection of globally important species") are assumed, rather than proven with evidence. Understandably, changes in quantifiable indicators may only become fully evident post project. However, by establishing a framework for monitoring and measuring these changes, this project could generate knowledge on the effectiveness of different management strategies of PAs, and help to identify opportunities and areas for future interventions.

Relevant stakeholders are well-defined, and it is noted that designing and establishing new PAs will be done in consultation with local communities and indigenous groups. The process could be further strengthened by including baseline social assessments of local populations (e.g. wellbeing indicators; livelihood strategies) to identify synergies between conservation and social development goals. Such assessments could also allow the social impact of the project to be measured at a later stage.

The principal risks are appropriately defined and it is noted that climate change related risk is assessed as being high. The proposed risk mitigation strategies appear appropriate but the one for climate change related risks appears somewhat static and not proactive enough, at least in the way it is presented. Climate change risks should also be considered when initially determining PA locations and management strategies.

This project will complement ongoing initiatives, but a considerable level of coordination with other projects and initiatives will be required to maximize synergies and resource efficiency. Coordination activities have been thoroughly described between the project and a variety of relevant initiatives within Colombia. However, an analysis of the strategies used and lessons learned from projects in other countries with similar environmental and socio-economic contexts (e.g. Mexico – please see GEF Project 4763 - Strengthening Management Effectiveness and Resilience of Protected Areas to Safeguard Biodiversity Threatened by Climate Change) could help to inform the overall project approach.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	<p>STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved.</p> <p>Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.</p>
2. Minor revision required.	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency: (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP’s recommended actions.</p>
3. Major revision required	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>Follow-up: (i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</p>