

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 16, 2012

Screeener: Guadalupe Duron

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

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT **GEF TRUST FUND**

GEF PROJECT ID: 5057

PROJECT DURATION : 3

COUNTRIES : St. Lucia

PROJECT TITLE: Iyanola - Natural Resource Management of the NE Coast

GEF AGENCIES: UNEP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Sustainable Development, Energy, Science and Technology - Sustainable Development and Environment Division

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 revision required**

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP is supportive of this multi-focal area project that has a core objective in the conservation of critically-endangered biodiversity on the NE coast; and a 'headline' objective of "Increased management effectiveness and sustainable use of the North East Coast's natural resource base to generate multiple global environmental benefits." These objectives are to be enabled through a cross-sectoral strategic approach to integrated landscape management involving forest, coastal and land use management. With component 2 "the largest in financial terms" intended to deliver global environmental benefits, the overall design of the project is ideal for GEF-finance in that the delivery of multiple benefits are within the envelope of the project and that BD, CC, LD and SFM impacts may be anticipated.

There are a number of issues that the project proposers should consider seriously in the PPG phase so that the full project may deliver its intended benefits. STAP further advises that points 3, 4 and 5 below should be revised "hence the minor revision response above - for the PIF so that the PPG phase commences with sufficient baseline information:

1. The project will need to take into account the status not only of the St Lucia iguana but also of the non-native Green iguana, as well as other forest animals and reptiles. There is little evidence in the PIF of comprehensive knowledge and analysis of the distribution of native endangered species, their habitats and threats from non-native species. This will necessarily have to be included in the full project document. STAP understands that a considerable amount of research has been devoted to distributional aspects of St Lucian fauna and their respective habitats. A key reference is Daltry, J.C. 2009. The Status and Management of St Lucia's Forest Reptiles and Amphibians. National Forest Demarcation and Bio-Physical Resource Inventory Project, Caribbean "Saint Lucia, SFA 2003/SLU/BIT04/0711/-EMF/LC. FCG International, Helsinki.

2. Land use planning (Component 1) in and of itself cannot create the conditions for protection of biodiversity. Traditional approaches to LUP are often inflexible and rigid, and enlightened thinking is often required to ensure ecosystem values and consideration of wildlife can be built in. The creation of "hard edges" between protected areas and human land use has often proved counter-productive. STAP strongly urges the project in St Lucia to build its own approaches on what has been shown to work elsewhere. Useful guidance on land use planning involving conservation is to be found in Naughton, L. 2007. Collaborative Land Use Planning: Zoning for Conservation and Development in Protected Areas. Tenure Brief No.4, Land Tenure Center, Wisconsin-Madison. WWF have also produced guidelines.

3. STAP notes the intention in Component 2 to "increase capacity and income derived from tourism by 10 percent in the NE Coast". Currently, in the PIF text there is only one very short paragraph at the end of Section B1 on the

sustainable use of biodiversity, and no mention as to how this can be achieved. St Lucia, in common with other parts of the Caribbean, struggles with a legacy of the plantation economy, producing agricultural goods for export while importing most domestic agricultural needs - including those for the tourism industry. "Research in St Lucia suggests that promoting linkages between hotels and groups of farmers such as cooperatives has the greatest potential to stimulate local agricultural production for hotel and domestic consumption." (Timms, B. 2006. Caribbean agricultureâ€“tourism linkages in a neoliberal world: Problems and prospects for St Lucia. International Development Planning Review 28: 35-56). Attention to issues of marketing agricultural produce and connections with local farmers needs to be highlighted if the sustainable use of biodiversity is to be protected.

4. The proposal rightly identifies (in Section B3) gender as an important issue to address to ensure socio-economic benefits are appropriately distributed. The text in the proposal gives the impression that, other than consulting women's groups, gender impacts will mostly be tracked as part of the project M&E system. STAP suggests that gender should feature more prominently as part of the project design, including how labour and income issues are tackled. Although a little dated, the chapter by J. Momsen (1993) â€“Gender and environmental perception in the Eastern Caribbean' [in Lockhart, D.G. et al. The Development Process in Small Island States. Routledge, London, pp. 57-70] could prove a useful analysis as to where and how interventions can be made in a Caribbean context.

5. STAP has difficulties in accepting the third specified risk in the risk analysis table in Section B4 â€“ "New regulations and guidelines for land use planning and enforcement thereof may meet with resistance". Essentially, this appears to be saying that there is a risk that the project will fail. Risks should be because of forces and pressures outside the remit of the project. It is not acceptable to say that the measures introduced by the project may not be good enough.

6. Commendably, the project is to deliver global environmental benefits along with domestic livelihood support and human development. However, the benefits need to be linked explicitly to the impact indicators of the GEF-5 focal area strategies relevant to the project (BD, CC, LD, SFM). For example, changes in land cover would serve well as an indicator that assesses the project contribution to delivering benefits in all four of the focal areas. Opportunities in identifying cross-cutting impacts are being missed.

<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.