

Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility



STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: August 22, 2007

Screeners: Douglas Taylor, STAP Secretary

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

I. PIF Information *(Paste here from the PIF)*

Full size project **GEF Trust Fund**

GEFSEC PROJECT ID¹:

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 2496

COUNTRY(IES): Russia

PROJECT TITLE: Strengthening Protected Area System of the Komi Republic to Conserve Virgin Forest Biodiversity in the Pechora River Headwaters Region

GEF AGENCY(IES): UNDP,

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Natural Resources

GEF FOCAL AREAS: Biodiversity,

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): BD – SP 3

II. STAP PIF Screening (based on Part I A Project Framework and Part II Questions of the PIF)

Background logical consistency informing STAP's scientific and technical screening:

1. Is the Project Objective consistent with the Problem/Issue? YES NO
2. Are the expected outcomes consistent with the Problem/Issue? YES NO
3. Global environmental benefits scientifically valid? YES NO UNKNOWN

Relevant Scientific and Technical issues contained in proponent responses to Questions A to H

4. Problem definition scientifically valid? YES NO UNKNOWN
5. Proposed intervention scientifically justified? YES NO UNKNOWN
6. Methodology proposed:
 - Is there a scientifically valid baseline? YES NO UNKNOWN
 - Is a scientific control explicitly included? YES NO UNKNOWN
 - Is there scientific or technical innovation? YES NO UNKNOWN
 - Is the methodology replicable? YES NO UNKNOWN
7. Is the incremental reasoning scientifically valid? YES NO UNKNOWN
8. Are the risk statements scientifically valid and comprehensive? YES NO UNKNOWN

III. STAP Advisory Response

9. Based on this PIF screening, STAP recommends the following action to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency (ies): **No objection (no further STAP action proposed)**

IV. Further guidance from STAP

10. Risks are not well defined, and cannot be scientifically assessed especially the CC risks, which are omitted. Regarding claimed GEBs, which are justified by reference to WWF 200 providing a "high biodiversity" label, this is a complex area of science policy, and so we cannot say whether this is scientifically valid. Otherwise the project seems innovative and scientifically interesting with good potential for replication.

¹ Project ID number will be assigned initially by GEFSEC.

Notes on this screening report.

STAP has merely screened the project concept from a scientific/technical viewpoint and has had no access to the underlying technical documentation that may exist. The main purpose of the STAP screening report to the GEF is to advise whether a STAP review of the project brief is required following approval of a PIF. Following the screening of a PIF by the STAP, one of three possible responses (complementary to the GEF Secretariat assessment) can be provided to the GEF. These are outlined below together with a brief explanation:

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation</i>
1. No objection	STAP has no scientific/technical grounds to object to the approval of the concept. The proponent has the option of approaching STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission
2. Requires a STAP review	STAP has identified specific scientific/technical concerns or opportunities that should be discussed with the proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. If STAP provides this advisory response, the key issues will be listed for follow-up with the proponent.
3. Recommend rejection	STAP has identified major scientific/technical faults in the concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided.