

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 08, 2013

Screener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Brian Huntley
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 5288

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Colombia

PROJECT TITLE: Implementing the Socio-Ecosystem Connectivity Approach to Conserve and Sustainable Use Biodiversity in the Caribbean Region of Colombia

GEF AGENCIES: FAO

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MADS)

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 proposal for addressing biodiversity conservation and mainstreaming challenges in the Caribbean region of Colombia. The approach presented, through (1) developing new protected areas and improving management effectiveness of these and existing protected areas; (2) development of land and resource management plans which fully integrate social, economic, and ecosystem connectivity concerns; and (3) creating and improving the necessary policy frameworks to support (2) above represents a logical approach that has a reasonably high likelihood of success. The project clearly addresses national priorities, and is supportive of both the GEF BD Strategy and CBD Aichi Targets. The only major potential constraint STAP wishes to underscore is the project timeframe. While components 1, 2, and 4 appear achievable within the 48 month project timeframe proposed, it is likely doubtful that the proposed outcomes and outputs of component 3 can be effectively achieved within this time period.

2. STAP notes the reference to information gaps (pages 13/14) and how these gaps affect management outcomes. It would be useful to note how the project intends to help address these gaps (notwithstanding item 1.2.3 in the project framework), as well as to access existing data and information assets which the authors note. It is commendable that the project will contribute to data collection and monitoring of a number of keystone species, however changes in species population and distribution may not be attributable (or only partially attributable) to project interventions, and results tend to require a longer timeframe than the 48 months of this intervention. Collection and monitoring of spatial data, such as change in land use, may be a more appropriate monitoring approach for this project. Please note the STAP advisory document on experimental design for additional guidance regarding the development of monitoring protocols which are able to generate empirical data [1].

3. The entire project is premised on the notion of "socio-ecosystem connectivity" and the creation of "mosaics" in areas between protected areas. With regard to the latter, presumably these mosaics already exist as outlined in the brief on fragmentation of pg. 11 (the effects of which have been well documented in the literature). However, the notion of socio-ecosystem connectivity is a term which is not well reflected in the literature (the definition on pg 17 is noted) nor is it well defined in The National Policy for the Integrated Management of Biodiversity – although the term "socio-ecosystem" (or socio-ecosistema in Spanish) is used extensively and defined. We therefore interpret this as an approach which explicitly addresses the sustainable management of integrated socio-ecological systems in a spatial context – in effect the mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation concerns in within boarder sustainable land management goals, or the ecosystem approach as defined by the CBD. While it is perhaps a minor point in the context of an otherwise well conceptualized project, STAP urges consistency wherever possible in the use of terminology which is well reflected in the literature and CBD.

4. Much emphasis is placed on use and management of ecosystem services in this project. STAP urges that the proponents consult the STAP advisory document on Payments for Ecosystem Services in the development of the full project brief [2].

Sources:

[1] <http://stapgef.org/experimental-project-designs>

[2] <http://stapgef.org/payments-for-environmental-services-and-gef>

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	<p>STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved.</p> <p>Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.</p>
2. Minor revision required.	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency: (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.</p>
3. Major revision required	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>Follow-up: (i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</p>