

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: January 16, 2010

Screener: 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 ID: **PROJECT DURATION: 60months**

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:

COUNTRY(IES): Latin America and the Caribbean

PLATFORM TITLE: Piloting Public-Private Funds for Watershed Protection

GEF AGENCY(IES): IADB, ,

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): The Nature Conservancy

GEF FOCAL AREA (S): Biodiversity

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): SO1, SO2, SP1, SP3, SP5

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT (if applicable): **THE GEF PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP (PPP) RENAMED THE GEF EARTH FUND**

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):
Consent

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP welcomes this proposal to establish additional experimental water funds, especially ones with a long term outlook; this aspect addresses previous criticisms of GEF direct support for Payments for Environmental Services (PES) which were regarded as too short term to be sustainable. STAP also notes that the proposal refers to the PES guidance provided by STAP (GEF/C.35/Inf.12).
3. The Platform is targeting the testing of public-private funding mechanisms, and is therefore not immediately about testing whether payments induce change in land management leading to GEBs. Noting that the Platform will eventually specify land management interventions, STAP offers some observations below for consideration during later stages of the formulation of conservation plans and the associated payments.
4. Table 1 presents linkages between conservation activities and a matrix of relations with water and biodiversity, but does not describe what, if anything, in Table 1 generates land use changes (pressure reduction) that would lead to biodiversity and ecosystem service enhancement. STAP encourages the proponents to use the Water Funds as a way to test experimentally the effectiveness of the elements in Table 1.

| <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 | STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical omissions in |

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| required | 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. |
|-----------------|---|