

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: October 08, 2013

Screeners: Paul Grigoriev

Panel member validation by: Sandra Diaz

Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 5524

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Cape Verde

PROJECT TITLE: Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into the Tourism Sector in Synergy with a Further Strengthened Protected Areas System in Cape Verde

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Environment, Housing and Land Planning (MAHOT); in collaboration with Ministry of Tourism, Industry and Energy (MTIE)

GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity

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): **Consent**

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the submission of this clearly well thought through project concept.

The proposal is very well structured and presented. The problem definition and threats are clearly and thoroughly presented and documented. The GEBs are well documented. The proposal likewise demonstrates coherence between the project objective, desired outcomes and planned outputs. The chosen indicators are appropriate. It is recognized that baselines and targets will be further developed and agreed upon during the PPG. The barriers are well articulated as well. The risks and their levels are well defined and assessed and the proposed mitigation measures are appropriate and realistic. The key stakeholders are well defined, as are their roles for the most part, in some cases this being more implicit than explicit though. Gender considerations will need to be addressed further during the PPG.

The proposed project builds nicely upon past initiatives and dovetails well with ongoing and developing projects which will amplify its impact and result in resource economies. Coordination with the other initiatives should not be problematic.

Overall, this is a very well-articulated and presented concept for a timely project.

| <i>STAP advisory response</i> | <i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i> |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Consent | STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved. Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement. |
| 2. Minor revision required. | STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development. Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency: (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions. |
| 3. Major | STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and |

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| revision required | recommends significant improvements to project design. Follow-up: (i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns. |
|------------------------------|---|