

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: February 18, 2014

Screener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Sandra Diaz

Consultant(s): Paul Grigoriev

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 5514

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Mauritius

PROJECT TITLE: Mainstreaming Biodiversity into the Management of the Coastal Zone in the Republic of Mauritius

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Mauritius Oceanography Institute (MOI) in collaboration with Rodrigues Regional Assembly and national entities in charge of environment, fisheries, tourism, agriculture and physical development

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):
Consent

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP welcomes the submission of this well thought through and clearly presented concept for a project intending to mainstream the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services into coastal zone management and into the operations and policies of the tourism and physical development sectors through an integrated management approach based on the ESAs.

The concept is a model PIF submission in almost all respects. The proposal is clear, coherent and concise. The linkages between the problem, the barriers and the proposed outputs and outcomes are logical and are presented very clearly. The presented Outcome indicators are all relevant and appropriately presented.

The problem, root causes and principal barriers are well defined and described. The baseline activities are well documented and clearly presented, as is the baseline scenario.

The GEBs are evident and the incremental cost reasoning is presented convincingly.

The proposed project certainly has elements of innovation and a large potential for being scaled-up. The rationale for the sustainability of its results is acceptable and credible.

The principal stakeholders are defined clearly as are their roles in the project. The importance of gender considerations to the project's design and implementation is also well recognized.

The principal risks are defined well and the proposed mitigation measures are realistic in terms of their implementation potential.

Considering the importance given to invasive alien species as threats to biodiversity and ecosystem services, STAP would propose that additional details about them (i.e. the main invasive species; what exactly do they threaten and how) should be provided at this stage.

Although global environmental change is mentioned in the text (section 7), including the specific threats of warming waters (bleaching) and acidification to corals, paradoxically it does not appear in the risk table. A footnote mentions that this is a slowly emerging threat but given the nature of the ESAs that the project will

work in, current trends and the 5 year timeline of the project, we would argue that this is a present and growing as opposed to just an emerging threat “ and requires more analysis. This should receive further attention during the PPG, along with the definition of appropriate mitigation measures.

This project will fit in well with other ongoing initiatives and will build upon the results of previous initiatives. Coordination with other projects and initiatives should not be difficult but the specific mechanism(s) and procedures for ensuring this will require further development during the PPG.

In summary, this well developed and presented concept satisfies all essential requirements for a successful initiative.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	<p>STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved.</p> <p>Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.</p>
2. Minor revision required.	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.
3. Major revision required	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>Follow-up:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.