

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: April 21, 2015

Screeener: Virginia Gorsevski

Panel member validation by: Brian Child
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 9095

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Fiji

PROJECT TITLE: Building Capacities to Address Invasive Alien Species to Enhance the Chances of Long-term Survival of Terrestrial Endemic and Threatened Species on Taveuni Island and Surrounding Islets

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Dept of Env/Biosecurity Authority of Fiji

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):
Minor issues to be considered during project design

III. Further guidance from STAP

Addressing the impacts of invasive alien species (IAS), both current and future, represents a key component of any national strategy to conserve biodiversity and ecosystem services, and STAP therefore welcomes this initiative to address IAS in Fiji.

The objective of this project is: To enhance the chances of the long-term survival of terrestrial endemic and threatened species on Taveuni Island and surrounding islets by building national and local capacity to prevent, detect, control and manage Invasive Alien Species.

This is a well conceptualized project that addresses the conservation of important endemic and endangered species on unmodified Pacific Islands by establishing a comprehensive system for controlling and eliminating alien invasive species. The project justification is strong, as are the descriptions of baseline projects, root causes and barriers.

The proposed alternative scenario is also basically sound, though the actual implementation strategy is somewhat vague. The project could be strengthened by a theory of change that explains how the four project components should be sequenced, while the PPG must strengthen outcome targets, and clarifying project outputs, some of which are quite general and wordy.

The UNDP/GEF Grasslands Project in South Africa employed a very successful long-hook (tightly defined indicators) short-hook (success at field sites) approach (see Terminal Evaluation) that could well provide a theory/strategy for change for this project. Thus, the implementation of component 3 (i.e. eradication of Giant Iguana from Taveuni) could be used to build a community of practice around developing IAS guidelines, action plans, methods, etc. through practical action. This could trial both component 2 (surveillance and control strategies) and component 4 (awareness). With communities of practicing gelling around doing real things together, this community of practice could be carefully managed (by a champion) to evolve into component 4 (IAS policy, institutions, coordination, outreach at national level). Perhaps the components should be re-numbered to reflect this theory of change.

Component 1 however is vague "what, for example, is a "national inter-sectoral, multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism? This vagueness infuses both the narrative and project description table. What about: IAS policy, national action plan and implementing agency in place; risk analyses of x conducted; surveillance shows y trends in IAS, funding for IAS control increases partly due to business case?

Component 2 is sufficient, with the exception of 2.1 which is too general and overlaps with 4 (awareness raising). How about: Early detection and rapid response system in place; key personnel trained at spread control points. Note that surveillance is mentioned both here and in Component 1, while awareness training is here and in Component 4. Which is it?

The narrative (p9) and outcomes for Component 3 are good. Outputs are repetitive and unclear. How about: survey status of GII and damage caused; implement eradication plan; develop model cost/benefit analysis for eradication; develop model awareness strategy?

Component 4 is called "knowledge management" but outcomes and outputs are public awareness.

While not a major issue, the PIF could be strengthened by clarifying the narrative in the Component description, and making sure this matches the table, while making clearer and shorter statements in the table.

The document states that there is strong commitment from the Government of Fiji (under Sustainability section), but this needs to be validated.

The document does not refer to lessons from elsewhere, and surely should review and refer to similar actions that have been implemented elsewhere.

Finally, The risk from global climate change is listed as 'high' which is accurate since warming temperatures and changes in CO2 concentrations are likely to increase opportunities for invasive species. The project will address this by including climatic parameters in the projects' risk analysis activities. Will the project employ specific models/simulation approaches to ensure that IAS strategies are effective both now and in the future under changing conditions? This should be elaborated further in the PPG.

The PIF needs relatively minor edits to respond to the comments above. However, the PPG needs to include a much stronger assessment of the extend of the IAS threat, together with much clearer indicators of baseline and intended targets for IAS to be achieved by the project.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Concur	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.
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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>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>
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal</p>

<p>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>
---	---