

# 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: May 12, 2016  
Screener: Thomas Hammond  
Panel member validation by: Brian Child  
Consultant(s): Douglas Taylor

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9402
PROJECT DURATION:	3
COUNTRIES:	Antigua And Barbuda
PROJECT TITLE:	The Path to 2020 - Antigua and Barbuda
GEF AGENCIES:	UNEP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Department of Environment, Ministry of Health and the Environment
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):  
**Major issues to be considered during project design**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP notes that this project follows up the baseline work established by several prior GEF and non-GEF investments and which is intended to build on the framework of the recently approved Environmental Protection and Management Act. The PIF sets out the baseline situation, including regional context, and identifies barriers regarding protected area designation and management that need to be addressed through the three Components proposed. The proposal does, however, need substantial work to clarify how the proposed GEBs will be achieved and STAP requests that the PPG stage addresses the comments and suggestions provided below.

The project justification, while succinct, is confusing in places. For example, paragraph 3 states that 'threats to national biodiversity have been dominated by human activities in pursuit of economic development', but later in the same paragraph it is stated that 'Addressing these threats has become increasingly difficult given the country's small size of approximately 90,000 people'. Does the proponent mean that there are too few people, too many people or that the country is too small?

Later in this section, under Component 1, the funding shortfall for (existing PAs etc.) biodiversity management is estimated at \$3 million annually and the challenge mentioned is the need to achieve effective (cheaper) financial planning and management and greater income. The SIRF Fund is proposed as the means to plug the gap, but nowhere in the PIF is it estimated what actual income to the SIRF Fund (and potential ring-fenced amounts to biodiversity) is likely to be, or whether the project will be able to manage the risk that it is not sufficient, given the extra areas of land to be gazette and increased costs. The risk table rates as low the lack of financial resources, which appears unjustified. At PPG stage it would be helpful if the proponents include a summary of the progress of the SPPARE project relevant to the underpinning of the SIRF Fund (GEF ID 5390)

The outputs 1.1 develop regulations 1.2 framework for PA coordination and 1.3 systems business planned are vague, and no convincing technical detail is provided for how training programmes, monitoring, information systems, and outreach will be implemented except in the vaguest terms, and with little reference to current capacities and gaps. This provides little confidence that the project has a plan to achieve them, while the exact pathway to GEBs is unclear, especially as the indicator includes METT (?) scores without any specific indicators for GEBs or biodiversity at all.

Outputs 2.1 and 2.2 also lack anything but the vaguest detail for how they will be operationalized. Despite quite a lot of text about finances, there is no data whatsoever about tourism numbers, expected revenues, how revenue will be controlled and which areas or activities will be prioritized for financing.

This vagueness, lack of technical detail, lack of economic costs and benefits, and failure to incorporate intellectual or scientific input, references to lessons and failures of other projects, continues with the outputs listed for component 3. What, for instance is 3.1. "community management pilots" or 3.2 a "sustainable use feasibility study" of options for storing genetic materials, what activities in 3.3 will "target farmers" and so on.

The scientific and technical aspects of the proposal are in general satisfactorily outlined; however, the intervention logic and sequencing within and between the Components and linkages to other work could be improved. For example, in Component 2 the proposed targets comprising the gazetting of the Shekerley Mountains and then instilling effective management (including all the necessary community outreach and participatory management training) to achieve objective biodiversity conservation outcomes would be likely to take up most if not all of the timescale of the project (36 months), but achievement of Component 1 outcomes to facilitate Component 2 will likely alone take 24 months, so the overall project timescale looks to be too short. The Risk Analysis provided in the PIF does not consider this risk therefore the project preparation stage should include a logical framework that includes a mitigation strategy

Component 1. This Component proposes a complex set of actions the sequencing of which is presently unclear, i.e. are the sub-components inter-dependent or standalone? Sub-component 1.1 to establish regulations would logically come first, but if delayed would presumably also delay sub-components 1.4 and 1.7 from being realized. STAP suggests that this Component should be more clearly presented in terms of the sequencing of expected outputs to achieve the outcomes. Also related to this Component STAP understands that UNDP has proposed a GEF medium sized project (GEF ID 9467) which would partly duplicate sub-component 1.6 regarding upgrading of the Environmental Information Management and Information System (EIMAS)

Component 2. While this Component has relatively straightforward aims, i.e. to increase the protected area estate and intensively manage a showcase area within the new PA, the preamble states that the outcome is the expansion of protection and sustainable use of globally significant biodiversity in protected areas and surrounding communities. The latter part of this statement is unsupported by the proposed sub-component actions and therefore needs to be amended to reflect merely that expansion of protection is to be achieved. Alternatively sub-components 3.1 and 3.2 need to be moved into Component 2.

Component 3. This is an ambitious component with many interlinked actions proposed and calling for extensive technical assistance and through the building of key infrastructure (sub-component 3.2) expensive and with long lead times.. STAP considers each of the actions proposed interesting but does not understand how the evident trade-offs implied between sub-components can be managed regarding agriculture and biodiversity conservation; the description of sub-component 3.4 does not adequately describe how this challenge can be resolved. At PPG stage STAP would expect to see how the spatial (land use planning and ridge to reef aspects) challenges of agricultural and grazing pressures can be reconciled with practical PA management.

Overall, there are too many actions that are not likely to yield effective outcomes as proposed. Very little is stated about links between land and sea, although the PIF implies comprehensive conservation on the scale of ridge to reef but unsupported by the proposed actions.

Institutional fragmentation and sustainable financing are key to making this project work. It is correct that they are risk factors, but because the project is basically about resolving them, they need to be analyzed in much more detail, with clearly specified mitigation measures.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
-------------------------------	---

<p><b>1. Concur</b></p>	<p>In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple “Concur” response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.</p>
<p><b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b></p>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised.  (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</p> <p>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>
<p><b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b></p>	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP’s concerns.</p> <p>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>