

# 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: November 09, 2017  
Screener: Sarah Lebel  
Panel member validation by: Brian Child  
Consultant(s):

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

FULL-SIZED PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9846
PROJECT DURATION:	48
COUNTRIES:	Solomon Islands
PROJECT TITLE:	EREPA - Ensuring Resilient Ecosystems and Representative Protected Areas in the Solomon Islands
GEF AGENCIES:	IUCN
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	SPREP
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

STAP welcomes the IUCN proposal "EREPA – Ensuring resilient ecosystems and representative protected areas in the Solomon Islands." The project's stated objective is the "effective management for healthy, complementary networks of protected, productive and restored landscapes in Guadalcanal, Malaita, Rennell-Bellona and Temotu". STAP feels that this is a well-written and solidly argued proposal, with a good understanding of process and the central role of communities in the context of the Solomon Islands. STAP is somewhat concerned, however, that while the project is logical, it is simply taking on too much for a 48-month \$4.9 million project.

As mentioned, the PIF has some strong and relevant scientific and technical components to meet the overall objective. However, STAP has some concerns that will need to be addressed to help strengthen the project.

First, STAP is pleased to note that Components 1 and 2 are well developed, and explicit references to the linkages between outputs and outcomes are made. The key barriers identified are directly being addressed, proposed interventions incorporate significant stakeholder engagement, and governance challenges are well acknowledged.

That being said, Component 3 appears to be a weaker add-on to an otherwise interesting proposal. There is no clarity as to how it relates to the other two components, and the concept of integrated landscape management appears without much justification. Should the project proponents choose to use an integrated landscape management approach, it would be useful to consult some of the recent literature on the subject, and then use it to build a set of better related Components – see, for example, "the five elements of integrated landscape management" put forward by Ecoagriculture Partners which might be useful in defining shared objectives and identifying how to address synergies (Defining Integrated Landscape Management for Policy Makers. Ecoagriculture Policy Focus No. 10, October 2013). Other relevant references include: Reed, et al., (2016). Integrated landscape approaches to managing social and environmental issues in the

tropics: learning from the past to guide the future. *Global change biology*, 22(7), pp.2540-2554. For more information on methods, these references may be useful: Sunderland, et al. (2017). A methodological approach for assessing cross-site landscape change: Understanding socio-ecological systems. *Forest Policy and Economics*.; and the project website <https://www.cifor.org/library/5867/agrarian-change-in-tropical-landscapes/>

Second, the PIF explicitly states that it aims to gather lessons which can be up-scaled to the region, and the project proposal comprises several items which relate to the thorough documentation of practical experiences. It states that the lack of replicability of other local interventions is a key pitfall which this project should attempt to avoid. However, there appears to be no formal knowledge management system or monitoring and evaluation components to the project. At this stage, STAP's on-going advice to the GEF on knowledge management (available here: <http://www.stagef.org/knowledge-management-gef>) might be a useful starting point to help address this issue.

Finally, the PIF is quick to criticize other projects for their lack of replicability, yet it appears that there is limited information as to how this project can build upon existing interventions. This may become a concern when noting the wide array of proposed interventions and the seemingly modest financial resources available for this project. STAP does note, however, that there is some mention of the ambition to enhance cooperation between various actors using a range of strategies including the collection and exchange of information.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Concur</b>	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.
<b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	<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>
<b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b>	<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>