

# 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 12, 2016  
Screener: Virginia Gorsevski  
Panel member validation by: Brian Child  
Consultant(s):

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

FULL-SIZED PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9553
PROJECT DURATION:	6
COUNTRIES:	Mauritius
PROJECT TITLE:	Mainstreaming IAS Prevention, Control and Management
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Agro-Industry and Food Security
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

The threats facing Mauritius and Rodrigues are listed as invasive alien species, land degradation and over-exploitation of natural resources, pollution and climate change. However, the project objective is "To safeguard globally significant biodiversity in vulnerable ecosystems through the prevention, control and management of Invasive Alien Species (IAS) in the Republic of Mauritius."

Therefore, the project would benefit from a more succinctly defined problem statement related to IAS that is tied directly to the objective. Conversely, if all of these threats are to be addressed by this project, they should be explicitly integrated into the project components and reflected in the project title. That said, if successful, this project should contribute to a reduction in the threat to globally significant biodiversity – a clear global environmental benefit.

One of the barriers identified in this project is insufficient knowledge, awareness, and access to useful, timely and detailed information of relevance to IAS management and "the full economic cost of IAS is unknown and not accounted for in planning decisions" (p. 10). Though not specifically mentioned, it may be advisable to undertake this type of economic analysis during the early stages of the project in order to lay the foundation for policy development and action. If it is the case that IAS control would lead to significant economic benefit, this information could be useful in supporting legislation at the national and local level (see Mwebase et al., 2010).

The risks identified in this project document are valid and comprehensive. However, given the high risk of changing climatic conditions to Mauritius, perhaps this issue and its impact on invasive alien species should be made explicit and directly incorporated into the project components (particularly as climate change is also listed as a threat, as mentioned earlier). See Pyke et al., 2008 regarding the intersection of these two issues.

One area that could be strengthened in the PIF or during the PPG phase is socioeconomic issues and their contribution to the global environment. How will local people benefit from the eradication of IAS? What will be their role?

In terms of knowledge management, many GEF projects have supported IAS activities in SIDs. Therefore, STAP recommends that project managers reach out to representatives involved in past and ongoing projects to share information and avoid any pitfalls. Also there is a new community of practice that could be of interest to this and related projects – INVASIVESNET (See Lucy et al., 2016)

#### References:

Lucy, F. E., H. Roy, A. Simpson, J. T. Carlton, J. M. Hanson, K. Magellan, M. L. Campbell, M. J. Costello, S. Pagad, C. L. Hewitt, J. McDonald, P. Cassey, S. M. Thomaz, S. Katsanevakis, A. Zenetos, E. Tricarico, A. Boggero, Q. J. Groom, T. Adriaens, S. Vanderhoeven, M. Torchin, R. Hufbauer, P. Fuller, M. R. Carman, D. B. Conn, J.R.S. Vitule, J. Canning-Clode, B. S. Galil, H. Ojaveer, S. A. Bailey, T.W. Therriault, R. Claudi, A. Gazda, J.T.A. Dick, J. Caffrey, A. Witt, M. Kenis, M. Lehtiniemi, H. Helmisaari and V. E. Panov (2010). INVASIVESNET towards an International Association for Open Knowledge on Invasive Alien Species. *Management of Biological Invasions* 7(2): 131–139.

Mwebaze, P., A. MacLeod, D. Tomlinson, S. Roy and H. Barois (2010). Economic Valuation of the Influence of Invasive Alien Species on the Economy of the Seychelles Islands. Contributed paper prepared for presentation at the Special Session on “Environmental Issues facing Small Island Developing States (SIDS)” at the Fourth World Congress of Environmental and Resource Economists, Université du Québec Montréal. June 28 – July 2, 2010.

Pyke, C., R. Thomas, R.D. Porter, J.J. Hellmann, J.S. Dukes, D. M. Lodge and G. Chavarria (2008). Current Practices and Future Opportunities for Policy on Climate Change and Invasive Species. *Conservation Biology* 22(3): 585 – 592.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Concur</b>	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.
<b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	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"> <li>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised.</li> <li>(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.</li> </ul> <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>
<b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b>	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"> <li>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;</li> <li>(ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</li> </ul> <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>

	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.
--	--