

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: 3 March 2008

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

I. PIF Information

GEFSEC PROJECT ID:

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 3973

COUNTRY: Cuba

PROJECT TITLE: Application of a regional approach to the management of marine and coastal protected areas in Cuba's Southern Archipelagos

GEF AGENCY: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment (CITMA), through the National Center for Protected Areas (CNAP); WWF Canada

GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM: BD-SP2

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: NA

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. STAP has a few minor suggestions on improving the proposal, which it encourages UNDP to address as it develops the proposal. First, the proposal could state more clearly how the marine protected area (MPA) will be designed. For example, how will the local and diverse stakeholders be involved in the design of the MPA. What are the socio-economic considerations that need to be included in the design and management of MPA, and how will this information be gathered. Second, the proposal could include more precise information on how the project goal - "address the shortfalls in the ability of existing MPAs to effectively conserve natural ecosystems in the Southern Archipelagos"-- will be regularly monitored and checked to assess its effectiveness. Third, the proposal would have been stronger if it had justified better expending the proposed budget on marine protected areas in the Southern Archipelagos, which are relatively isolated and not facing strong threats, versus the same expenditures in Cuba's MPA system in other areas where, as the proposal notes, pressures from tourism, sedimentation and fishing are much stronger and likely to persist or increase with time. The argument may be one of cost-effectiveness, but the proposal does not make it clear.

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
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

	<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>
--	--