

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: 9 February 2010

Screener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: Brian Huntley

I. PIF Information

Full size project **GEF Trust Fund**

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 4085

COUNTRY: Brazil

PROJECT TITLE: Amazon Region Protected Areas Program Phase 2

GEF AGENCY: World Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: KfW Entwicklungsbank, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ), WWF (World Wide Fund for Nature – the WWF Global Network, through WWF-Brasil), Fundo Brasileiro para a Biodiversidade (Funbio), Government of Brazil, through the Ministry of Environment (MMA), Instituto Chico Mendes de Conservação da Biodiversidade (ICMBio), Brazilian Amazon States (Acre, Amapá, Amazonas, Mato Grosso, Pará, Rondônia, Roraima and Tocantins)

GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAMS: BD-SP1, BD-SP3

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 large, well funded project which anticipates a range of scientific design issues. There is no question of the conservation importance of the proposal, nor of the ability of the participating institutions to implement the project. However, the PIF is too generalised in its description of objectives and methods to permit STAP assessment at this time of its scientific and technical merit. The Panel's comments and advice may be offered during the development of the full project document, for that reason a rating of Minor Revision has been recorded to ensure that STAP is consulted further before CEO endorsement.

<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.

IV. STAP PIF Screening (based on Part I A Project Framework and Part II Questions of the PIF)

Background logical consistency informing STAP's scientific and technical screening:

- 3. Is the Project Objective consistent with the Problem/Issue? YES NO PARTIAL
- If "No" or "Partial" explain:
- 4. Are the expected outcomes consistent with the Problem/Issue? YES NO PARTIAL
- If "No" or "Partial" explain:
- 5. Global environmental benefits scientifically valid? YES NO UNKNOWN
- If "No" or "Unknown" explain:

Relevant Scientific and Technical issues contained in proponent responses to Questions A to H

- 6. Problem definition scientifically valid? YES NO UNKNOWN
- If "No" or "Unknown" explain:
- 7. Proposed intervention scientifically justified? YES NO UNKNOWN
- If "No" or "Unknown" explain:
- 8. Methodology proposed:
 - Is there a scientifically valid baseline? YES NO UNKNOWN
 - Is a scientific control explicitly included? YES NO UNKNOWN N/A
 - Is there scientific or technical innovation? YES NO UNKNOWN
 - Is the methodology replicable? YES NO UNKNOWN- If any of the above are marked "No" or "Unknown" explain:
- 9. Is the incremental reasoning scientifically valid? YES NO UNKNOWN
- If "No" or "Unknown" explain:
- 10. Are the risk statements scientifically valid and comprehensive? If "No" explain: YES NO UNKNOWN