

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 30, 2017
Screener: Douglas Taylor
Panel member validation by: Ferenc Toth
Consultant(s):

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

FULL-SIZED PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9791
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Bahamas
PROJECT TITLE:	Meeting the Challenge of 2020 in The Bahamas
GEF AGENCIES:	UNEP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	BEST Commission, Department of Marine Resources (DMR), Bahamas National Trust (BNT), The Nature Conservancy (TNC), Department of Agriculture
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):
Minor issues to be considered during project design

III. Further guidance from STAP

1. STAP welcomes this project, which is a helpful combination of technical assistance and close involvement of local stakeholders towards sustainable management of selected MPAs. Significant benefits will be obtained through co-working with the several related ongoing projects in the region, and given the dispersed islands geography, knowledge sharing and lesson learning will be critically important outcomes to emphasize. Although supportive of the project, STAP advises that there are a number of project design improvements that should be addressed within the full project brief. Further details follow.

2. STAP notes that the project combines a biodiversity and climate mitigation focus, includes climate vulnerability and adaptation concerns, takes an Integrated Natural Resource Management approach, and aims to encourage the equivalent of Marine Spatial Planning to integrate the interests and needs of the MPAs included. A great deal of training and knowledge generation are major outputs. In STAP's opinion the knowledge management aspects of the project are too vague about sustaining and sharing the knowledge and lessons likely to emerge, within the Bahamas and across the region. A more specific framework regarding KM that explicitly addresses needs, connections with other projects and the KM relationship to the strategy for replication and upscaling would be greatly appreciated at CEO endorsement stage.

3. Improving the management of MPAs, increasing their protection from current external pressures and restoring already degraded components and areas are the main objectives of this project. It will be crucial to consider the vulnerability of MPAs to the emerging impacts of climate change, in order to make the investments robust to climate change, as mentioned among the risks and in the UNFCCC part of the Linkages section. The full range of vulnerability reduction and adaptation options will need to be considered (including possibly painful retreats), especially in impact domains where the causes are fully external such as sea level rise and the associated salt water intrusion.

4. Concerning mitigation, the carbon calculation in Annex 2 (taken verbatim from www.hunker.com) is far too simplistic. What matters is not fuel consumption but the amount of electricity in kWh produced by the two technologies and the associated total emissions. The intermittency of solar generation (especially in the wet=cloudy period of the year) and the associated need for back-up generation (probably diesel) or electricity storage is fully ignored. On a life cycle basis, current PV technologies are certainly low (but not zero) emitters of CO₂, while current storage technologies are rather CO₂ intensive. At a minimum, a rough cost comparison is needed to estimate the relative costs of the two technologies to supply the required amount electricity at the required level of reliability. Moreover, renewable power technologies are also vulnerable to extreme weather events (see for example articles in Climatic Change Vol 121, No.1) but this aspect is totally ignored in the Threats section (page 8). These deficiencies should be dealt with.

5. Some clarification about the sub-components of Component 3 would be welcome, including why the proposed outputs (3.1.1 and 3.1.2) related to invasive alien species (IAS) and agrochemicals do not appear to be disaggregated in the outcomes statement. What measures are proposed to track 'reduced impacts' (of IAS), and 'reduced use' of agrochemicals? And why are the impacts not also dealt with? The proposed indicator for outcome 3.1 needs to be more specific about the changed state of the ecosystem, for example, in terms of species recovery and water quality within the MPAs, beyond the indicator proposed to track 'appreciation', which requires unpacking.

6. It will also be important (perhaps in the proposed 'adoption pilots') to extract from Component 3 the necessary, robust and practical field-based indicators to assist the local stakeholders in deciding for themselves what the ecological stress threshold should be to trigger action. Please address the above points in the final project brief.

7. The proposals for mangrove restoration across 60ha (sub-component 3.1.1) are welcome: their development and replication if successful would be an excellent outcome. The feasibility test will be careful measurement of the effort and costs involved, particularly the major (and costly) intervention proposed of shoreline grading and substrate change. The effort to develop 'costs coefficients' is very necessary, and fully supported by STAP. Is there data from the equivalent trials of mangrove restoration underway within the Pine Islands project (GEF ID 4847), which aims to restore 50ha within Andros Davis Creek, Grand Bahamas? From a technical perspective, STAP advises that the species chosen for planting should be declared and preferably be selected from local ecotypes. If possible, sediment transport studies should be undertaken to check whether investment in substrate improvement is worthwhile, given the risk of tidal (and storm) displacement. Please review these comments and respond within the project brief, including adjusting planned work as necessary in close coordination with the Pine Islands 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	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:

project design	<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>
-----------------------	---