

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, 2012

Screener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Thomas Lovejoy
Consultant(s): Paul Grigoriev

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 4846

PROJECT DURATION : 8

COUNTRIES : Cuba

PROJECT TITLE: A Landscape Approach to the Conservation of Threatened Mountain Ecosystems

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment (CITMA) and Ministry of Agriculture (MINAG)

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

STAP welcomes this important, innovative and ambitious proposal to safeguard the targeted threatened mountain ecosystems' global environmental values by shifting from a site based approach to a strategic landscape and ecosystem based management approach, and developing tools and mechanisms for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into production landscapes.

The problem is complex and its multiple dimensions are well defined and the objective is consistent with the problem's analysis. The proposed outcomes are consistent with the objective and should lead to the realization of global environmental benefits.

The global environmental benefits are numerous and well articulated and should be progressively captured through the project.

The baseline, however, is lacking and needs considerable development. Where elements of the baseline are provided, they are descriptive and general than quantitative and specific to individual sites. This, along with baseline METT scores for PA management effectiveness should be addressed and provided during further project development. This applies to all project components.

The definition and analysis of barriers is appropriate from a technical standpoint. However, given the multiple levels at which this complex project is to operate, there is an important institutional dimension that is not captured in the table. Overcoming institutional deficiencies, standard operating procedures and the absence of coordinating mechanisms will be of paramount importance in such a multi-stakeholder project that promotes an important and for many a difficult paradigm shift among all players. This concern is captured in the risks table and ought to be seen as a barrier as well.

It is recommended that during project preparation, perhaps more consideration be given to the interface between the observable and potential impacts of climate change and the project's design in terms of maximizing options for enhancing ecosystem resilience. Connectivity at the landscape scale certainly is being promoted but lower level options could also be considered and incorporated to a further extent. There is mention of natural events such as hurricanes, drought and extreme rainfall events. These are likely to increase in terms of their impact and this should be factored into the design to a greater degree, considering the location of the project and mountainous context.

<i>STAP advisory</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
----------------------	---

<i>response</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.	<p>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:</p> <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 <p>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>
3. Major revision required	<p>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.</p> <p>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>