## **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: 29 January 2010	Screener: David Cunningham
Р	nel member validation by: Brian Huntley
I. PIF Information	
Full size project GEF Trust Fu	nd
GEF PROJECT ID: 4023 PROJECT DUR	<b>гіон</b> : 36 мonths
COUNTRIES: Cook Islands, Nauru, Ton	a, Tuvalu
<b>PROJECT TITLE:</b> Implementing the Islam management of island biodiversity. <b>GEF AGENCY:</b> UNEP	Biodiversity Programme of Work by integrating the conservation
	at of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (lead) collaborating
GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAMS: BD-SP3	supported by BD-SP2, BD-SP4, BD-SP7 ROJECT: PACIFIC ALLIANCE FOR SUSTAINABILITY (PAS)
II. STAP Advisory Response (see ta	le below for explanation)

1. Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency: **Consent** 

## III. Further guidance from STAP

- 2. STAP acknowledges this project under the Pacific Alliance for Sustainability (GEF-PAS) programmatic approach. The program is led by the World Bank, with participation from UNEP and UNDP, ADB and FAO, and consists of 24 proposed projects under various focal areas (BD, CC, IW and POPs). This project is one of the few dealing with biodiversity conservation. The Panel refers UNEP to its screening report on the PAS Programmatic Framework Document in developing the full proposal.
- 3. The implementation of the Ecosystem Approach/Mainstreaming Biodiversity is most effective where good governance, strong institutions, extensive knowledge base, and inspired leadership are available. The PIF does not refer in any specific way to the barriers that might exist to mainstreaming, other than weak technical capacity. An analysis of the preconditions to mainstreaming and the level to which they are met in each of the four islands groups should be included in the full proposal.
- 4. Given the biodiversity outcomes expected from the project, a listing of the key biodiversity indicators against which success will be measured (e.g. threatened species and habitats; invasive alien species impacts) should be included in the full project document.

	AP advisory	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
1.	Consent	STAP acknowledges that on scientific/technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasising any issues that could be improved and the proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2.	Minor revision required.	<ul> <li>STAP has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. One or more options that remain open to STAP include:</li> <li>(i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues</li> <li>(ii) Setting a review point during early stage project development and agreeing terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>
3.	Major revision required	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical omissions in the concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. Normally, a STAP approved review will be mandatory prior to submission of the project brief for CEO endorsement. 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. CEO endorsement.