

# 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 11, 2011

Screener: Douglas Taylor

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

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4494

**PROJECT DURATION :** 3

**COUNTRIES :** Sao Tome and Principe

**PROJECT TITLE:** Integrated Ecosystem Approach to Biodiversity Mainstreaming and Conservation in the Buffer Zones of the Obo National Park

**GEF AGENCIES:** IFAD

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Directorate of Environment, Directorate of Agriculture and Rural Development

**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

1. STAP welcomes this project which targets the buffer zones of the Obo National Park on both islands of Sao Tom & Principe and which is intended to complement IFAD's Participatory Smallholder Agriculture and Artisanal Fisheries Development Programme (acronym PAPAFA), essentially aimed at restarting community-based cocoa production which began its operations in 2003.
2. STAP does not object to this project, but requests via a minor revision that the issues raised below be responded to within the full project brief.
3. While it is clear that the key actors who are expected to mainstream biodiversity within the production landscapes (National Park buffer zones) are organic cocoa farmers and who may be expected to reduce the rate at which forest clearance and loss of biodiversity occurs, it is less clear what measures can be taken to halt biodiversity loss and even reverse the degradation noted in the PIF. The baseline and indicators proposed for the M&E system development will be essential for demonstrating results and should be the priority activity at project inception.
4. Also regarding selection of areas for community management (Component 1), the proponents should consider parallel selection of areas for application of selected outcome indicators (e.g. on forest cover and species richness) in order to gather evidence for impact in the target areas and to demonstrate the absence of displacement or leakage of forest degradation to non-target areas. For more guidance on this topic IFAD should carefully consider the advice recently published by STAP in The Evidence Base for Community Forest Management as a Mechanism for Supplying Global Environmental Benefits and Improving Local Welfare [1]
5. Regarding the existing certified production of organic cocoa in collaboration with private partners, STAP found that this on its own by no means guarantees satisfactory environmental performance of the production sector within a given ecosystem, and STAP recommends that producers use standards stringent enough and monitoring and enforcement strict enough to ensure that poorly performing producers are excluded, in the interests of the majority and of the sustainability of the host ecosystem. For further information and targeted advice please see STAP's recent advice on certification [2].
6. The PIF mentions conservation of marine ecosystems in the buffer zone (project Framework, Component 2), but fails to provide any further information about the intervention proposed in section B.2. Given that IFAD has cited one

of the successes of the PAPFPA as the increased yield of fish through 'fish concentration devices', how will pilot Marine Managed Areas be reconciled with this objective?

References:

[1] The Evidence Base for Community Forest Management as a Mechanism for Supplying Global Environmental Benefits and Improving Local Welfare, Diana Bowler, Lisette Buyung-Ali, John R. Healey, Julia P.G. Jones, Teri Knight and Andrew S. Pullin, Centre for Evidence-Based Conservation, SENRGY, Bangor University, September 2010. <http://www.unep.org/stap/Portals/61/pubs/STAP%20CFM%20document%202010.pdf>

[2] Environmental certification and the Global Environment Facility: A STAP advisory document. Prepared on behalf of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) by Allen Blackman, Resources for the Future, Washington, DC, and Environment for Development Center for Central America, Turrialba, Costa Rica; and Jorge Rivera, George Washington University, Washington, DC, and Environment for Development Center for Central America, Turrialba, Costa Rica; <http://www.unep.org/stap/Portals/61/pubs/STAP%20Certification%20document%202010.pdf>

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	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.
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues</li> <li>(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</li> </ul> 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.
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	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.