

# 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 11, 2012

Screener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Thomas Lovejoy  
Consultant(s): Margarita Dyubanova; Brian Huntley

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT    GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 5078

**PROJECT DURATION :** 4

**COUNTRIES :** St. Kitts And Nevis

**PROJECT TITLE:** Conserving Biodiversity and Reducing Habitat Degradation in Protected Areas and their Buffer Zones

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNDP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Ministry of Sustainable Development

**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 this project "to expand and strengthen the terrestrial and marine protected area systems, and reduce habitat destruction in PA buffer zones" of St Kitts and Nevis, which has two key components "strengthening the existing management effectiveness of the PA system, and secondly, to expand the system and strengthen institutional and individual capacities."

The proposal is developed within the framework of national priorities and both GEF strategic objectives and Aichi targets.

The outcomes and outputs in components 1 and 2 might have been arranged more sequentially to avoid apparent overlap of systemic and site-based actions, but this will no doubt be clarified in project development.

The baseline situation is adequately described but STAP would have appreciated references being cited for key information sources. The threats listed "habitat destruction; degradation of land and water resources and ecosystem services; overexploitation of biological resources; and climate change threats could have been more strongly argued with information on trends and rates of these impacts.

Given the very high threat attributed to invasive alien species on islands, it would be useful to have a fuller description of this key threat and approaches to reduce its impacts. Further, the importance of ecosystem restoration in reducing threats across the landscape and seascape and approaches to addressing these will need greater detail in project development.

The importance of mainstreaming approaches to addressing the threats across production landscapes and seascapes is made in paragraph 16, but could be more strongly emphasized. The proposed solution "through establishing various committees to coordinate activities" does not address the inherent difficulties and costs of land management and habitat restoration projects and the institutional capacities required to make these both effective and sustainable.

The two components present a large number of diverse activities without clear indicators or time-lines for completion. While such detail can be defined in project development, the proposal is perhaps a little ambitious as it stands. The project might benefit from a clearer focus on two key objectives "first, strengthening the PA system (i.e. systemic strengthening at institutional level and capacity level, plus implementation of effective PA management systems monitored via METT, and, second, expanding the system to include under-represented ecosystems following gap analysis. These objectives need to be approached simultaneously to addressing some of the key drivers of change such as invasive species, soil erosion, forest degradation, over-fishing, etc, through mainstreaming approaches.

In addition, STAP would like to commend that the baseline on which the project builds is strong, which is a one of the keys to the project's success.

The consideration of barriers is realistic, although expectations of significant increases in tourism revenue serving both local community and biodiversity conservation needs in the short-term might be a little optimistic. Similarly, the assessment of risks appears to be rather optimistic given the challenges described elsewhere in the proposal.

Despite these weaknesses, which can be adequately addressed during the development of the project document, STAP recommends support for this project.

[Note: Brian Huntley was the principle screener on this PIF]

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>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.</p>