

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: 10 November 2008

Screener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

I. PIF Information

Full size project GEF Trust Fund

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3826

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 3997

COUNTRY: Colombia

PROJECT TITLE: Designing and Implementing a National Sub-System of Marine Protected Areas (SMPA) in Colombia.

GEF AGENCY: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Institute of Marine and Coastal Research (INVEMAR) and Administrative Unit of the Protected Areas System of Colombia (UAESPNN)

GEF FOCAL AREAS: Biodiversity - SO1

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM: BD SP1, SP2

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, noting that it is consistent with previous STAP advice on the Strategic Objective to Catalyze Sustainability of Protected Area Systems¹. The project includes activities in staff training and development of academic programs which will contribute to the sustainability of the scientific capacity to maintain marine protected areas in Colombia.

The project aims to test the financial and technical feasibility of Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES) through pilot studies. STAP has undertaken to produce a guidance document indicating the ways in which the GEF can be supporting initiatives on Payments for Environmental Services (supplemented by a brief summary of the empirical evidence to date on effectiveness)². This paper can be provided to the project proponents when it is available in late 2008

3. The project proposes to put six (6) MPAs under pilot co-management arrangements. Little is known empirically about the impacts of co-management on marine environments. There are many case study narratives, but little rigorous empirical analysis aimed at inferring impact of co-management on social and ecological indicators. The relative effectiveness of different types of PA management is an important open question in conservation science and policy. A forthcoming paper in *Conservation Biology*³ ("An assessment of 100 questions of greatest importance to the conservation of global biodiversity") lists this question as one of the top 100 questions that, if answered, would have the greatest impact on conservation practice and policy. Thus the project should consider if there is a way to select the six MPAs in a way that will allow one to rigorously test the impact of co-management. Such a test would incorporate some experimental variation into the location decisions for co-management interventions. In other words, the biophysical and socio-economic characteristics that affect where co-management is tried also affect the indicators that are measured. If some spatial or temporal variation can be created in the way in which co-management interventions are located so as to make some of the variation in location or timing independent of the outcome indicators, there will be a greater chance of identifying the impact of co-management on the relevant outcome indicators (small sample sizes may still hinder identification, but feasibility should be considered). STAP is available to assist the project proponents in considering the potential for such a design.

¹ Reflected in the GEF Council paper on FOCAL AREA STRATEGIES AND STRATEGIC PROGRAMMING FOR GEF-4 (GEF/C.31/10, May 2007: http://www.thegef.org/interior_right.aspx?id=17634)

² See the STAP work program for FY09, GEF/C.34/Inf.11 at http://www.thegef.org/interior_right.aspx?id=22710

³ <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/118487636/home>

<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.	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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 <p>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.</p>
3. Major revision required	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>