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 05, 2013 Screener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Michael Anthony Stocking
Consultant(s): Douglas Taylor

I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*
FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID: 5550
PROJECT DURATION : 5
COUNTRIES : Tuvalu
PROJECT TITLE: R2R Implementing a Ridge to Reef Approach to Protect Biodiversity and Ecosystem Functions
GEF AGENCIES: UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Department of Environment, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Trades, Tourism, Environment and Labour (FATTEL)
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

1. STAP welcomes this well-structured and researched proposal focused on ecosystem services and livelihoods with opportunities for community participation and which connects well with the regional program for Ridge to Reef. The project, hopefully, will break some of the sectoral barriers that impede IWRM/ICM and similar approaches to address the need for effective land/coastal planning and management.

2. The project design is sound, in particular the sequencing of the investigations proposed, and STAP commends especially the knowledge management, communications and outreach and capacity building elements of the design. The principal remaining concern is the sustainability of the outcomes expected, which does not feature in the risks table, especially those that relate to the rapid staff turnover noted in the PIF and the financial sustainability of the support mechanisms cited.

3. STAP recommended in its screening of the regional support project (GEF ID 5404) that it should include support for a multi-focal "PacIW:LEARN" for the region, which could act to sustain a peer to peer scientific and technical network for in-service training. This would satisfy the long standing demand under the Mauritius Strategy for Implementation, at least in this Pacific SIDS area. This advice was provided for the reason that, given the complex multidisciplinary threats and barriers shared by many of the PICs to be overcome, the sharing of expertise between PICs would strengthen sustainability of individual projects within the Program, but also across the other GEF and non-GEF projects delivering against allied environmental targets. In this connection the inclusion of knowledge management (Component 4) is welcomed and STAP advises that beyond fulfilling IW:LEARN obligations (for the IW-funded elements), that the project should connect more formally to the proposed regional network as discussed above. STAP notes and welcomes the linkages to regional IW program support project already reflected in Output 3.2.2 and the monitoring and evaluation and sharing of lessons learned included in Output 4.1.3. Additionally, the baseline PacIWRM project's successful delivery of distance learning and twinning for IWRM capacity development is an excellent basis to build on regionally and nationally.

Specific component-related comments.

Components 2 and 3.

4. Activities described in these components regarding governance and integrated natural resource management plans are welcomed, particularly the inter-sectoral linkages across fisheries, agriculture, water quality and supply and health. The PIF states that inventories of land and water resources will be undertaken to obtain a basis for integrated planning

and management (spatial planning-related datasets). This is welcomed provided that the mapping conceptualization has full community participation â€“ e.g. "planning for real" methods to engage communities.

5. STAP advises that Component 2 and 3 actions should also take account of spatial planning, which takes a strategic viewpoint and which is capable of resolving conflicting uses by spatially planning activities and determining different zones for different uses, or the need to balance development and conservation by spatially planning and zoning according to objectives (conservation, economic development, maintaining existing uses, etc.). For example, in the form of Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) as applied to the Convention on Biological Diversity, it is marine and coastal planning that is forward looking, participatory, iterative, and which includes environmental and socio-economic considerations; it is also management that is comprehensive, science-supported and area-based, and promotes sustainable development.

6. Related to spatial planning, Component 2 activities need to identify landscape and spatial linkages especially those that become operative where protected areas are instituted. On small islands it is imperative that trade-offs between use of parts of the upper landscape for agriculture (67% of the land area is noted in the PIF as being under agriculture) and coastal/marine areas be carefully identified and included in planning. The wash out of chemical fertilizers and soils will be very prevalent here. STAP advises that trade-off analysis has been used in similar circumstances on Caribbean islands (see second reference below)

Component 4.

7. STAP advises that the proposed GIS-based information portal should be sited and managed within a host that can participate within a regionally sustainable network. The PIF does not make clear how this vital project element will be sustained or connected to capacity building, although the use of the Tuvalan language is welcomed. The project could consider making a demand upon the regional support project (GEF ID 5404) to integrate and link the project and its demonstration sites into the regional portal.

References

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel GEF (2012). Marine Spatial Planning in the Context of the Convention on Biological Diversity: A study carried out in response to CBD COP 10 decision X/29, Montreal, Technical Series No. 68, 44 pages

Brown, K., Adger W.N. et al (2001). Trade-off analysis for marine protected area management. Ecological Economics 37: 417 -434 [this paper outlines an approach to natural resource management that incorporates multiple objectives for protected area management within a decision-making framework, and then tests these in Tobago]

STAP advisory response	*Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed*
1. Consent	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. 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.
2. Minor revision required.	STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development. Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency: (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	STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design. Follow-up: (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.