

# 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: May 01, 2012

Screeners: Douglas Taylor

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

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT**    **GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4852

**PROJECT DURATION :** 4

**COUNTRIES :** Costa Rica

**PROJECT TITLE:** Sustainable Management of Ecosystem Services: A model for Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Terrestrial Landscapes

**GEF AGENCIES:** IADB

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Secretariat for Environment (SEAM)

**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

1. STAP welcomes this interesting project and finds the PIF to be well written, scientifically credible and commends the proponents for engaging in a productive dialogue with the GEF Secretariat that has resulted in many improvements to the original project design. In addition to the attention to effective impact evaluation within Component 4 (M&E), STAP commends the proponents for proposing the adoption of experimental design to test the effectiveness of the proposed interventions.
2. The PIF states that the proposed project when implemented will enable three ecosystem services to be characterized, although these are not identified in the PIF. STAP advises that the willing seller-willing buyer principle should be applied during the selection and valuation of these services, to ensure that (i) the market is available and (ii) valuations (value assessment tools) are not conducted in a vacuum instead focusing on relevant valuations that will drive PES negotiations emphasizing opportunity costs rather than service values.
3. STAP accepts that by providing sufficient incentives to resource users existing protected areas will likely face fewer threats. However, within Component 3 the sustainability of the incentives applied is an issue not dealt with, including in the risks section of the PIF. Provided that the goal of a national land use policy (with accompanying guidance) is achieved by the end of the project, the financial viability of the incentive schemes in specific areas in the project area may not matter at a strategic level, but sudden cessation of support at the end of the project could have negative consequences for the region being targeted. In connection with agricultural practices, certification is another market-based mechanism that has potential to deliver global environmental benefits and STAP draws the proponent's attention to the GEF guidance on this issue. The proponents are advised to clarify in the full project brief whether GEF funds are to be used to design and negotiate certification schemes or to subsidize improved agricultural practices (or both). If the latter then the same issue of sustainability arises.
4. STAP will read with interest the forthcoming full project brief and offers to contribute advice at any time towards the preparation phase of this project.

Reference.

Environmental certification and the Global Environment Facility: A STAP advisory document. 2010.  
(<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.