

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 14, 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: 5749

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : El Salvador

PROJECT TITLE: Conservation, Sustainable Use of Biodiversity, and Maintenance of Ecosystem Services in Protected Wetlands of International Importance

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources (MARN)

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 the submission of this concisely presented concept for a project intending to promote the conservation and sustainable use of globally significant biodiversity values and ecosystem services through the creation of new protected wetlands of national importance and the improved management of existing ones.

Overall, the project framework is coherent and well structured. The links between the problem, barriers and the proposed outcomes and outputs are understood but could be made more clear. STAP would propose that the Objective be reworded to reflect the GEBs of the wetlands. Some items listed as Outputs (such as under 1.1.1 scientific characterization, local consultations, boundary demarcation) are not specifically Outputs in the view of this reviewer, rather activities leading to an Output. In addition, there is also some confusion between outcomes and indicators which should be revisited in the preparation of the final project document. For example, Outcome 2.1 should be related to the improvement in the coordination of efforts among relevant authorities who influence the management of wetlands and the PAs (identified as Barrier 2). What is presented as Outcome 2.1 in the proposal is that numbers of yet to be determined key indicator species remain stable. In this regard, the focus of Component 2 could be adjusted to address the identified barrier – the lack of coordination among relevant authorities. It is acknowledged that further work on the indicators and overall results framework will be undertaken during the PPG.

The overall problem, threats and principal barriers are well defined and described. While the root causes are not presented explicitly, they are integrated for the most part into the table of barriers (par. 7). In addition, the baseline activities are well summarized, as is the baseline scenario. The GEBs are evident although at times these are inferred rather than explicit. The incremental cost reasoning is presented clearly.

The proposed project presents elements which are innovative, at least at the national level. The rationale for expecting sustainability of the project's results is outlined adequately and the project has potential for scaling up at the regional level.

The primary stakeholders are clearly defined as are their roles. No discussion is presented, however, on how gender considerations will be integrated into the project's further design and implementation. This will require consideration during the PPG.

The presented risks are realistically defined and assessed and the proposed mitigation measures are reasonable. Climate change is recognized as one of the risks “ as the likely future effects of climate change in El Salvador are significant to extreme. However, there are undoubtedly other risks than those presented. While lack of consensus in dealing with invasive species is identified as a risk, other previously identified threats and pressures and how they may pose a risk are not identified or addressed. On page 5, par, 4, 8 threats are identified. Some of these will present risks that are different from "lack of consensus". These should be defined and assessed including realistic mitigation measures proposed for managing them.

This project should dovetail well with other relevant initiatives, although the precise nature of coordinating mechanisms or processes will need to be defined during the PPG.

<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>