

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: 5 June 2008

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

I. PIF Information

PART I: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3616

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 4150

COUNTRY(IES): Haiti

PROJECT TITLE: Establishing a financially sustainable National Protected Areas System

GEF AGENCY(IES): UNDP,

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): National Agency for Protected Areas (ANAP), Ministry of the Environment, Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources

GEF FOCAL AREA (S): Biodiversity,

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): SO1-SP1

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 welcomes this proposal on "Establishing a financially sustainable National Protected Areas System" in Haiti. STAP believes the project interventions are well-aligned with the three barriers to the establishment of financially sustainable protected areas. However, what is less clear, or specified, is whether the project will also contribute to strengthening the Government's capacity to assess the management effectiveness of the protected area system. Implementing management effectiveness of protected areas is an activity included in the CBD's programme of work on Protected Areas Management Effectiveness, and which the Parties suggested to implement by 2010 (which is within the project's lifetime) - <http://www.cbd.int/protected/PAME.shtml>

| <i>STAP advisory response</i> | <i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</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. | 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: <ol 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 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 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. |