

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: @@@@ @@, @@@@

Screeener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Thomas Lovejoy
Consultant(s): Paul Grigoriev

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 4769

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Trinidad and Tobago

PROJECT TITLE: Improving Forest and Protected Area Management

GEF AGENCIES: FAO

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Housing and Environment (MOHE); MOHE Forestry Division (National Forest and Protected Areas Management Authority or NFPAMA); Tobago House Assembly; and selected local NGOs and other institutions

GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity

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

STAP welcomes this proposal to consolidate Trinidad and Tobago's protected area system, build up essential management capacity and decrease the funding gap through the development of supplementary funding mechanisms. It is also noted that this project is being proposed at an opportune time, taking advantage of favourable baseline processes and reforms conducive to the outcomes of the proposal, including contributing to the implementation of the new National Forest Policy, National Protected Areas Policy and National Wildlife Policy.

While the biodiversity values of the country are described in a general manner, they are not clearly tied to the proposed outcomes and thus it is not clear how the global environmental benefits will be realized. The benefits of consolidating the national PA system and strengthening management capacity and developing supplementary funding options are more inferred than made clear. The better definition of global environmental benefits was asked for previously by GEFSEC and this element could still be improved. Similarly, the increasing threats to biodiversity are presented in a very general manner and are not related enough to specific intended project locations. There is also no provision of a baseline for the level and impact of the threats on global biodiversity values specifically. The baseline on global biodiversity values could also be improved. This certainly should be done in the course of further project development. The barriers are presented in two locations of the PIF, and while there is some overlap in their description, they also show some divergence. In one location, forest degradation is presented as a barrier. It is recommended that forest degradation is not a barrier but rather a result of the lack of an operational and effective policy and legal framework, among other reasons.

The project framework is for the most part consistent and logical. The objective is clear and straight forward and the outcomes and outputs support its realization. The proposed indicator for Outcome 3.1 (sustainable financing plan produced) is not an outcome indicator but rather a process indicator. Another indicator should be proposed for measuring a "sustainable financing system". Another related concern revolves around the implicit assumption that training will automatically lead to improved performance of PA and related staff. It is recommended that this should be carefully assessed and certain elements be added to actually track changes in performance of personnel vis a vis the objective of the project and renewed and expanded responsibilities.

The establishment of the Forestry and Protected Areas Fund will be a central element of this project and it is recommended that effort should be devoted during the PPG to assessing the lessons learned from other similar initiatives to ensure that it will actually be feasible and sustainable. Because the establishment of such a fund is central to the project's success, a "Plan B" outlining alternative options should also be considered in this regard.

The risk analysis is adequate although the mitigation measures proposed could be more specific, particularly in relation to the impacts of climate change and resistance to change in government agencies.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	STAP acknowledges that on scientific/technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasising any issues that could be improved and the proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor revision required.	STAP has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. One or more options that remain open to STAP include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (ii) Setting a review point during early stage project development and agreeing terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review 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.
3. Major revision required	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical omissions in the concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. Normally, a STAP approved review will be mandatory prior to submission of the project brief for CEO endorsement. 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.