

# 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: 11 March 2008

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

### I. PIF Information *(Paste here from the PIF)*

**GEFSEC PROJECT ID:** 3574

**GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:** P104687

**COUNTRY(IES):** Colombia

**PROJECT TITLE:** Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Sustainable Cattle Ranching

**GEF AGENCY(IES):** World Bank

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S):** Center for Research in Sustainable Agricultural Production Systems (CIPAV), Colombian Cattle Ranching Association (FEDEGAN)

**GEF FOCAL AREA (S):** Biodiversity, Land Degradation

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S):** BD-SP5, LD-SP1

**NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT:** N.A.

**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. The PIF is well written and STAP believes the project is scientifically justified. The earlier GEF-funded SilvoPastoral Project was notable in that it attempted to determine, through careful design and analysis, how effective the various interventions were. STAP encourages the proponents to continue such a focus in this proposed extension to that earlier project. In particular, although the experimental design was flawed in the original SilvoPastoral Project and thus did not allow as many questions to be answered as was originally hoped, STAP hopes that the World Bank and its partners continue to use experimental designs to test the implicit and explicit assumptions in the proposal. For example, the current proposal emphasizes financial and technical assistance, but the SilvoPastoral Project did not find a strong impact from technical assistance. The current project should be designed to test this hypothesis explicitly (for example, by randomly assigning financial assistance to some eligible farmers and technical and financial assistance to others). Although the ecological impacts of the interventions can be reasonably well ascertained in this kind of project in the absence of a carefully selected control group that receives no silvopastoral intervention (because the land use changes are so dramatic), the same cannot be said of the social welfare impacts. Thus choosing a control group that receives no silvopastoral assistance may still be worthwhile in this project (e.g., through an oversubscription method, or randomized order of phase in).

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	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.
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	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.
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	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

	<p>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.</p>
--	--