

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: 19 March 2009

Screener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

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

Full size project **GEF Trust Fund**

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3886

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: P091932

COUNTRY(IES): Colombia

PROJECT TITLE: Colombian National Protected Areas Conservation Trust Fund – Additional financing for the Sustainability of the *Macizo* Regional Protected Area System (SIRAPM)

GEF AGENCY(IES): IBRD

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): National Natural Parks Authority (UAESPNN); Ministry of Environment, Housing and Territorial Development (MAVDT); and the National Protected Areas Conservation Trust Fund

GEF FOCAL AREA (S): Biodiversity

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): BD – SP3 + SP1

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: N.A.

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(ies):
Minor revision required

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP believes that continued support for Colombia's protected area system is justified and the way in which this project builds upon previously funded GEF projects is laudable. The Panel, however, has called for 'Minor Revision' to highlight the need for the full project document to make clear what exactly the proponents mean by a "mosaic approach" in Component 1. Although mosaic approaches have been discussed in conservation science literature for well over a decade, practical implementations of the approaches and measured results are rarer. Questions that require answers in the full project proposal include: On what previous experiences in Colombia or elsewhere using this approach is this project building, from where will the scientific expertise needed to implement it come from, and on what basis are the proponents claiming that participation by a variety of civil society members is a critical elements?
3. The full project proposal should also describe the ways that the project will "benefit at least 49 municipalities with their corresponding communities and 13 indigenous reserves" (component 2).

<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.	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 (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.
3. Major revision required	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.
--	--