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 12, 2012 Screener: 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: 5069
PROJECT DURATION : 5
COUNTRIES : Grenada
PROJECT TITLE: Implementing a "Ridge to Reef" Approach to Protecting Biodiversity and Ecosystem Functions within and Around Protected Areas
GEF AGENCIES: UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Agriculture (Fisheries and Forestry Department); Ministry of Environment
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

STAP welcomes this multi-focal area project â€˜To ensure that biodiversity and ecosystem functions within and around marine and terrestrial PAs in Grenada are better protected from threats through the adoption of an integrated "ridge to reef" approach that increases PA management effectiveness and applies targeted sustainable land management practices'.

To further strengthen the proposal, STAP recommends addressing the following points during the proposal development â€“

1. This ambitious project is well designed and the relationships between objectives, outcomes and outputs are clearly articulated. The viability of the project is conditional on how well linkages are made between the two executing partners (Agriculture and Environment ministries) and the land use types in the landscape/seascape (PA and MPA, small-farm agriculture, forest, spice production etc.). The description of how these linkages will be achieved both organizationally and practically during project implementation will need to be more strongly defined in the project document, ideally supported by maps illustrating the connections of the various activities at site and landscape/seascape scale.

2. STAP would recommend that such multi-focal area PIFs include appropriate maps and more importantly, brief references to the key information sources on which recommendations are based. This is particularly pertinent to the baseline description, which although sound and comprehensive, could easily be strengthened by inclusion of key references. There have, for example, been some efforts by scientists in the Ministry of Agriculture to follow FAO's Land Capability Classification for Grenada â€“ see Ternan, J.L. et al 1989. Land capability classification in Grenada. Mountain Research and Development 9(1). In the past, the Land Use Division in the MoA has used what is known as the Grenada Land Information System (GLIS) to provide physical and economic suitability assessments of land holdings, which was then extended to forestry and watershed management â€“ see Jackson et al 2004. Managing Watersheds for a Better Future. DFID Forestry Research Programme R7937 - . http://www.dfid.gov.uk/r4d/pdf/outputs/Forestry/R7937_Managing_watersheds_for_a_better_future.pdf . The research literature also has some analysis of the problems of land fragmentation for small-holder agriculture. These issues and more recent references would add credibility to the proposal and ensure that the project builds on a base of existing knowledge.

3. The description of threats to biodiversity and ecosystem services indicates the substantial challenges to achieving the project goals given the long history of land transformation on the island, and the pervasive impacts of invasive species,

soil erosion and pollution of freshwater and marine systems. Responding to these threats might be most effectively implemented through project component 1, which is focused on systemic, site and capacity strengthening of the PA system following approaches that have a sound foundation in the GEF PA portfolio.

4. Component 2, to develop climate resilient SLM practices in a pilot watershed, is perhaps more challenging given the time needed to achieve such changes in land use practices, but equally important. It is appropriate that this component focuses on six, rather small, watershed communities, from which experience can be replicated to other sites on the island. Even so, the complexity and cost of such interventions should not be under-estimated, and the timescale for success might be beyond that provided by this project. Thus the integration of this project with other similar projects on the island and in the region is therefore welcomed. This component might be strengthened by consideration of design approaches suggested in the STAP Advisory Document â€˜Experimental Project Designs in the Global Environment Facility' (Refer to the STAP website â€“ www.stapgef.org)

5. STAP is pleased to see the intention of using the GEF-FAO-LADA tools to develop a national system for assessing and mapping land degradation, monitoring land degradation processes, and consolidating information systems and protocols. At national level, the LADA project used primarily the database provided by the World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies (WOCAT). Because of the emphasis on SLM practices and technologies in Component 2, STAP suggests that a WOCAT-type database of practices be compiled in order to build a knowledge platform for up-scaling SLM practices in Grenada and perhaps elsewhere in the region.

6. The choice of species to be used in reforestation activities, which selects many exotic crop species, is no doubt pragmatic and most cost-effective. But it would be useful to include indigenous tree species more strongly in these activities, making use of some of the experience gained by projects such as those led by RBG Kew in habitat and species restoration, and by the global experience held by the Society for Ecological Restoration.

7. Paragraph 21 of the PIF promises description of the global environmental benefits of the project in the accompanying table. The third column of the table provides primarily domestic and national benefits. These benefits need to be linked explicitly to the impact indicators of the GEF-5 focal area strategies relevant to the project (BD, LD, SFM). For example, changes in land cover would serve well as an indicator that assesses the project contribution to delivering benefits in all three of the focal areas. Opportunities in identifying cross-cutting impacts are being missed.

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.