

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: 29 January 2010

Screener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: Brian Huntley

I. PIF Information

Full size project **GEF Trust Fund**
GEF PROJECT ID: 4105 **PROJECT DURATION:** 42 months
GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: P118900
COUNTRY: Sierra Leone
PROJECT TITLE: SPWA - Integrated Ecosystems Management Project
GEF AGENCY: World Bank
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER: Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security (MAFFS)
GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity
GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM: SP 2
NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: WEST AFRICA BIODIVERSITY PROGRAM

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:
Minor revision required

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. This is a high risk project under the GEF Program in West Africa and its success will depend more on the political situation and the strength of project leadership than on design or budget. The Panel refers the World Bank to its screening report on the biodiversity component of the Program Framework Document (PFD) for further guidance in developing the full proposal. It has not been cited in the PIF but remains highly relevant and a minor revision is required to better address the concerns set out in the PFD screen.

<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 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.