

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 10, 2016
Screener: Guadalupe Duron
Panel member validation by: Annette Cowie
Consultant(s):

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

| FULL SIZE PROJECT | GEF TRUST FUND |
|---------------------------|--|
| GEF PROJECT ID: | 9429 |
| PROJECT DURATION: | 6 |
| COUNTRIES: | Cuba |
| PROJECT TITLE: | Incorporating Multiple Environmental Considerations and their Economic Implications into the Management of Landscapes Forests and Production Sectors in Cuba |
| GEF AGENCIES: | UNDP |
| OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: | Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment (CITMA)/National Centre for Protected Areas (CNAP) |
| GEF FOCAL AREA: | Multi Focal Area |

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):
Concur

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes UNDP's proposal "Incorporating multiple environmental considerations and their economic implications into the management of landscapes, forests and production sectors in Cuba". The project aims to achieve multiple benefits by strengthening the enabling environment to support integration across biodiversity conservation, sustainable land and forest management through the valuation of ecosystem services. STAP appreciates the PIF's candid assessment that integration will require understanding complex and dynamic interrelationships between the provision and demand of ecosystem services, and diverse stakeholders' interests. STAP looks forward to the learning generated from the project on the valuation of ecosystem services, and the plans for scaling-up that UNDP and Cuba intend to put in place.

To strengthen the project design, STAP recommends addressing the following points:

1. The balance between the supply and demand of ecosystem services to achieve environmental, social and economic benefits will require a careful analysis. STAP would like to see an assessment of the scale and value of the market for ecosystem goods and services, in Cuba.
2. Developing a full understanding of the inter-linkages between the various issues and the many actors will be challenging, as will devising effective interventions that accommodate this complexity. STAP recommends its "Resilience, Adaptation Pathways and Transformation Assessment" Framework (RAPTA) to assist with this analysis, and project planning. RAPTA is based on a multi-stakeholder and systems approach that is suitable for planning landscape-scale management, and identifying key controlling variables needed to manage the system with a focus on sustainability. RAPTA also provides guidance on selecting and applying adaptive implementation pathways, to avoid unwanted, or unexpected, thresholds being reached. The RAPTA and its guidelines can be found at: <http://www.stapgef.org/the-resilience-adaptation-and-transformation-assessment-framework/>

3. Additionally, the project developers may wish to refer to the following paper describing a conceptual framework for identifying indicators for terrestrial and marine planning (e.g. land use planning, integrated coastal management, marine spatial planning) based on research in Cuba: Botero, C.M. et al. "An indicator framework for assessing progress in land and marine planning in Colombia and Cuba". *Ecological Indicators* 64 (2016) 181-193.

4. STAP also appreciates the preliminary identification/description of the target sites, and criteria that were used to justify their selection (e.g. opportunities for achieving multiple benefits) (table on page 16). To further strengthen this information, STAP suggests detailing the baseline information on ecosystem goods and services in each target site. It also proposes defining the methods that will be used for the valuation of each ecosystem service. Additionally, the PIF states a number of studies (e.g. 50 studies) on methods used in Cuba on economic valuations of ecosystem services. It would be good to cite them in the full proposal to support the description of the components.

5. STAP would suggest that are the opportunities to link this project with UNDP-Cuba's BIOFIN project (<http://www.biodiversityfinance.net/countries/cuba>). If applicable, please specify these opportunities in project development and how they would strengthen meeting the outputs (e.g. component 1), and the project objective.

6. STAP recommends the following paper for the project design to describe the conditions, and threats to marine biodiversity in the Guanahacabibes National Park: Perera-Valderrama, S. et al. "Condition assessment of coral reefs of two marine protected areas under different regimes of use in the north-western Caribbean". *Ocean & Coastal Management*. Volume 127, July 2016, Pages 16â€“25.

| <i>STAP advisory response</i> | <i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i> |
|---|--|
| 1. Concur | In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple "Concur" response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement. |
| 2. Minor issues to be considered during project design | STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to: <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised.</p> <p>(ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</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> |
| 3. Major issues to be considered during project design | STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to: <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP's concerns.</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> |