

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: 29February 2008

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

I. PIF Information

GEFSEC PROJECT ID1: 3548

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: EC-X1004

COUNTRY(IES): Ecuador

PROJECT TITLE: Marine and Coastal Biodiversity Conservation in Ecuador

GEF AGENCY(IES): IADB

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S):

GEF FOCAL AREA (S): Biodiversity, SO-1

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): SP2

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT:

Full size project GEF Trust 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 on "Marine and Coastal Biodiversity Conservation in Ecuador" . The first outcome appears to be an output and doesn't seem to connect clearly to the outputs listed next to it. Also, STAP recommends that a baseline is included when the proposal is further developed, so the outputs can be measured and monitored.

The proposal asserts that resource user resistance towards the establishment and operation of MPAs can be reduced through education ("documentation of economic, social and ecological benefits of MPAs"), alternative livelihoods and local participation in management. These assertions are common in conservation proposals but rarely, if ever, tested empirically. The project could be much stronger if it were designed with the intention of testing the effectiveness of these interventions through the careful selection of test sites and control sites. The IADB and host-country proponents should consider the feasibility of such a design. STAP would be willing to assist in assessing this feasibility.

| STAP advisory response | Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 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. |