

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: 7 October 2008

Screener: Douglas Taylor, STAP Secretary

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

I. PIF Information

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3752

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 4176

COUNTRY: Cape Verde Islands

PROJECT TITLE: Consolidation of Cape Verde's Protected Areas System

GEF AGENCY: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: General Direction of Environment, Ministry of Environment, Rural Development and Marine Resources

GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM: SO1: SP2 + SP3

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. Although the proposed actions seem ambitious given the requested budget, STAP has no objections to this project proposal.
3. STAP notes that given the biophysical characteristics and location of the Cape Verde islands, the proposal's claim that the risk of climate change-induced losses is "low" and that planning and management efforts can substantially mitigate this risk may be questionable on scientific grounds.

<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: (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.