

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 16, 2016
Screener: Douglas Taylor
Panel member validation by: Brian Child
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9406
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	St. Lucia
PROJECT TITLE:	Integrated Ecosystem Management on the South East Coast of St Lucia
GEF AGENCIES:	UNEP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Sustainable Development, Energy, Science, and Technology
GEF FOCAL AREA:	Multi Focal Area

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):
Concur

III. Further guidance from STAP

1. STAP welcomes this proposal to restore and rehabilitate degraded ecosystems in the context of economic development, which is one of the most challenging areas in which to work. The proposal is well researched and written and if it achieves its targets the approach should be replicated and scaled up across St Lucia. There are some significant omissions and improvements that should be addressed at the next stage of project development, but overall STAP supports the approach proposed.
2. The principal land use sectors mentioned in the PIF include agriculture and forest-related rural communities, industry and private landowners including non-resident owners within the context of an undeveloped planning system and the PIF makes clear that facilitation of partnerships among key stakeholders is essential for management of ecosystems. Regarding Outcome 1, The PIF includes discussion of the need for stronger consultation mechanisms and mentions IWCAM as the proposed example for test. However, there is no corresponding output or target for this proposed action within Component 1.
3. STAP notes that the title of the project omits mention of sustainable economic development, which is rightly at the core of the proposal. One of the principal root causes of degradation, the change from banana cultivation towards an ad hoc mixture of land/forest exploitation, hunting and related activities by the rural population is mentioned several times in the PIF but specific actions such as capacity building, agricultural extension support towards the hoped for shift towards some form of sustainable agro-forestry could be better explained, including who is to provide this support, which is critical to the achievement of Outcome 2.
4. Additionally, there is brief mention of Payments for Environmental Services (PES) regarding a potential link with conservation easements in the context of a St Lucia National Conservation Trust Fund. When conducting the proposed review of this and related mechanisms the proponents could also consider how to build incentives for rural communities in a ridge to reef context both to protect downstream coastal ecosystem quality and to benefit from income flows from tourism that builds upon ecosystem quality. This could be the basis for an innovative private public partnership.

5. The proposal includes a large number of outputs that may or not add up to a coherent set of outcomes, but without a clear theory of change to unify and test the approaches it is hard to be sure whether the project will make a sustainable impact in terms of GEBs, their replicability and potential for scaling up. The PPG phase should include such a theory of change.

6. STAP notes that the expected concluding section on Knowledge Management is missing entirely, this is an unfortunate omission considering that the stated ambition in the PIF includes that: "The project will promote novel models of public-private partnerships that can be scaled up to other parts of the country". Without an effective KM strategy, this ambition will likely not be achieved and the omission should be rectified at PPG stage.

<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	<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>
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	<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>