

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: 2 February 2010

Screener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: Brian Huntley

I. PIF Information

Full size project

GEF Trust Fund

GEF PROJECT ID: 4191

PROJECT DURATION: 48 months

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 3374

COUNTRY: Guatemala

PROJECT TITLE: Promoting ecotourism to strengthen the financial sustainability of the Guatemalan Protected Areas System (SIGAP)

GEF AGENCY: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER: National Protected Areas Council - CONAP

GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAMS: BD-SP1 Financing; BD-SP3 PA Networks

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:
Consent

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP supports this proposal which provides a strong case for both global biodiversity benefits and regional environmental benefits. The importance of Guatemala to sustaining and strengthening the Mesoamerican Biodiversity Corridor is clear.
3. The focus on strengthening the financial sustainability of the Protected Area system through enabling policy and financial capacity development is appropriate. Ecotourism is an obvious and high growth potential, from an existing strong, but under-exploited base.
4. The project is essentially one of policy and capacity development, but includes research and monitoring components on ecosystem services and environmental thresholds. It is not clear how much investment will be made in these components, and whether they will be cost effective in comparison with the other components.
5. In relation to the development of a new ecotourism certification system (para. 9), STAP will provide UNDP with its own study on environmental certification¹, currently in peer review, to help inform the development of the full proposal.

¹ See STAP work program at

http://stapgef.unep.org/docs/Activities/STAPWPDocs/GEF_C.35_Inf.11%20STAP%20Work%20Program%20FY10.pdf.

<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: <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 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.