

# 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: 20 May 2009

Screener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: Michael Stocking

### I. PIF Information

**Full size project**      **GEF Trust Fund**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 3952      **PROJECT DURATION:** 63 months

**GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:** 4153

**COUNTRY(IES):** Algeria

**PROJECT TITLE:** Conservation of globally significant biodiversity and sustainable use of ecosystem services in Algeria's Cultural Parks

**GEF AGENCY:** UNDP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S):** Ministry of Culture

**GEF FOCAL AREA (S):** Multi-focal areas

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S):** BD – SP3; LD – SP1

**NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT (if applicable):** MENARID

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 welcomes the continuation of UNDP's work on cultural parks in Algeria under the MENARID programmatic approach. Also welcomed is the integration of cultural aspects of conservation with biodiversity.
3. Under Component 1, STAP suggests that scientific structures and frameworks are also needed in order to make operational the intended integration between biodiversity concerns and ecosystem services. The GEF-financed Millennium Ecosystem Assessment has developed one such framework, which has the benefit in the case of this project of including cultural services derived from ecosystems alongside the broad categories of provisioning and regulating services. Building a conceptual framework for Algeria's cultural parks that include the full range of ecosystem services provided by the protection of the parks will be an essential aspect of the sustainability of the whole approach. This should be considered as the full project is developed.
4. Global environmental values/benefits (GEBs). Since the project is to be financed partly from the LD focal area and SP1, STAP suggests that GEBs also be specified relevant to the control of land degradation. Currently the values that are described in the PIF all relate to the important biodiversity of the area. STAP would be willing to engage with the project proposers to develop GEBs and indicators that will address the potential impact of the project for sustainable land management. Tracking total system carbon would, for example, be a significant addition to the cultural park network, showing the co-benefits to be derived in mitigating climate change and providing a more productive and less degraded ecosystem. GEF currently is investing in a Carbon Benefits project<sup>1</sup> to develop monitoring and measuring tools for project managers who need to know changes in fixed carbon. It is suggested that this project could be an ideal partner in the testing and implementation of these tracking tools.
5. Climate change risks are not addressed at part G of the PIF and should be considered in the full project document.
6. Partly related to Point 4 above, paragraph 21 of the PIF refers to the development of impact indicators spanning land degradation and biodiversity. STAP would like to be consulted on these indicators to

<sup>1</sup> <http://gefonline.org/projectDetailsSQL.cfm?projID=3449>.

ensure scientific and technical consistency with emerging GEF indicators and indicators under the relevant Conventions.

<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 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.