

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:	9431
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Seychelles
PROJECT TITLE:	A Ridge-to-Reef Approach for the Integrated Management of Marine, Coastal and Terrestrial Ecosystems in the Seychelles
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change
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 appreciates this well-designed and cost-effective project to transfer ridge-to-reef (R2R) best practice to the Seychelles. There is exemplary use of baseline information and associated referencing that present a well-argued case for applying R2R to reduce sectoral isolation in terms of policy and practice. Accordingly STAP has no concerns regarding the scientific and technical case presented in the PIF, and the following suggestions are intended to strengthen the likely impact of the project.
2. The strategy presented in the PIF envisages harmonization of policies and practice through existing inter-ministerial structures, across the three principal relevant planning processes, Marine Spatial Plan, the Seychelles Strategic Plan, and Land Use Plans, supported by best practice on the ground interventions in each of the domains of these plans. The outcome is expected to be take-up of R2R thinking across sectors resulting in improved sustainability of the land, freshwater and coastal marine environment, and associated biodiversity. STAP agrees that this approach is basically sound and addresses the barriers described. There are two observations that STAP has regarding the implementation strategy regarding: i) capacity-building and outreach; and ii) balance of effort between components.
3. Regarding the innovative aspects of the project, i.e. the establishment of forest/watershed management committees, these are clearly critical to the sustainability of the investment made at formal governance levels to instill R2R practices. Presumably members of such committees would be drawn from local communities and also be expected to champion the R2R practices relevant to their livelihoods. STAP would agree that these committees, or equivalent local community-driven groups, are key to the sustainability of the SLM/SFM practices promoted by the project. Successfully involving local communities would further enhance the demonstration effect of this project, and encourage other regions facing similar problems to adopt this type of integrated management approach to deal with linked marine, coastal and terrestrial systems.

4. The PIF is rather weak on outlining how communication and outreach would be implemented and by whom (other projects partly responsible?) to consolidate support at the local level for the specific field-based interventions. And also how this support could be generalized across similar communities, including the coastal fishing communities, to learn lessons, and to enable transfer and upscaling. The stakeholder communications and outreach plan needs work: the risk table should mention the risk of poor or low engagement by local communities whether within project sites or more generally, and the mitigation efforts planned.

5. The project's proponents should consider is the practical risk of ensuring that the project site activities in Components 1 and 2 do not overly distract from achieving the strategic outcomes planned for Component 3, i.e. the promotion and consolidation of R2R policy and practice

6. It is encouraging that this project will work with and rely on outcomes of many other activities with similar or closely related objectives, but this will increase the need for thorough coordination in order to avoid overlapping and duplicated efforts on the ground.

7. Finally, cross-regional learning from the series of GEF-supported Pacific R2R projects under implementation is an excellent, albeit implied, intention of the project. At CEO endorsement stage the modalities of this aspect should be explained.

<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>