

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: April 30, 2012

Screener: Douglas Taylor

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

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 4932

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Regional (Antigua And Barbuda, Barbados, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Jamaica, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Grenadines)

PROJECT TITLE: Implementing Integrated Land Water and Wastewater Management in Caribbean SIDS

GEF AGENCIES: UNEP and UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:

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

1. STAP commends the project proponents for assembling a multi-focal project that strives to integrate GEF support for the 'ridge to reef' concept in the Caribbean SIDS. Many diverse challenges present within the region have been identified and the PIF, while over long, does focus effectively upon the challenge of inter-sectoral actions. However, STAP wishes to highlight a number of areas which require further work with regard to this initiative. In addition, STAP wishes to remain informed of the development of this initiative in advance of CEO endorsement (please see paragraph 10 below).

2. The PIF document is written more in the style of a programming framework than a project concept document, resulting in many enabling statements, in some cases presented with targets at regional level, but which will require more specificity at country and sub-country level by the time of CEO endorsement. Accordingly STAP has screened the project from a strategic perspective and intends therefore to re-examine the draft full project brief at the earliest opportunity prior to CEO endorsement.

3. STAP notes the statements towards the end of Section B1 (pp.20-21) that indicators for monitoring and assessment for water resources, land degradation and biodiversity will be "further elaborated and mainsteamed into national accounts". It is strongly suggested that criteria for choice of indicators should be specified clearly, preferably based on Convention guidance (e.g. the UNCCD national reporting of impact indicators under PRAIS) and on the GEF-5 focal area strategies. It is vital that chosen indicators integrate the multiple processes of change in status of land and water, enabling also the tracking of the impact of project investments on key global environmental benefits. It is disappointing that there is very little emphasis on GEBs and impact indicators, even if only to flag the criteria by which they will be determined.

4. STAP understands that the coherence of the proposed actions depends largely upon the baseline achievements of the GEF-IWCAM project (GEF ID 1254) which has provided a technical foundation for an integrated approach to the management of watersheds and coastal areas (IWCAM) along with best practice toolkits, including for legislation. The Protocol Concerning Pollution from Land-Based Sources and Activities (LBS Protocol) appears to provide at policy level a common platform for building regional action. The country profiles discussed in section B.1 are valuable summaries of policies and plans.

5. However STAP finds it surprising that, in spite of these excellent foundational achievements and country profiles, the following section (B.2) proposing Component 1 actions do not always match the gaps identified in the profiles,

therefore it is hard to follow the strategic gap-filling argument being advanced. Within the description of the proposed menu of 'indicative interventions' and national project interventions discussed in this section, STAP also finds disappointing the lack of a strategic context to ensure that each possible action contributes to an integrated result. STAP suggests that the proposals should have been placed into context within an inter-sectoral framework that builds towards a coherent national or regional set of results and thence to global environmental benefits.

6. Component 2 has the potential to address the question of whether the project can achieve its overall vision and is very promising. STAP looks forward to the elaboration of Component 2 at country and regional level, including how to deal with feedback to (and from) SIDS that are not participating within the project but which may wish to buy into the project data and knowledge bases (Component 4) at a later date.

7. There is a commendable emphasis in the project on sustainable and innovative practices and technologies, with an explicit aim that best practices will be disseminated and shared. What STAP finds missing in the proposal is the analysis of what makes a technology a 'best practice' and the Knowledge Management system that will enable (a) the storing of technology descriptions and performances, (b) the analysis of biophysical and financial performance of these technologies, and (c) the sharing of information. STAP suggests that an existing database, such as WOCAT or LADA, be utilized, so that lessons might be more widely drawn for all SIDS. The KM component should be an integral part of the project.

8. Although somewhat outside of the scope of this assessment, STAP believes that the project could benefit from considerable strengthening of the financial analysis, incentive and intervention options. Additionally, the risk table at B.4 should include lack of sustainable finance as a high risk. Also, the first risk, "IWRM and ICZM policies and plans are not accepted by the governments" may not be the best formulation of the more important risk, namely that the policies and plans will be accepted but not (or poorly) implemented.

9. At the IWCAM Final Project Conference (Kingston, Jamaica, 16 – 18 November 2011), it was noted that there was difficulty of engaging the private sector and key ministries such as the Ministries of Finance; the inability of technocrats to successfully communicate to politicians the urgency of the need for IWRM; and, the lack of secure finding for follow-on actions. STAP suggests that the present project proposal should address this deficiency, including options for payments for environmental services especially within a ridge to reef context, drawing on experience from other projects including those within the GEF portfolio.

10. Clearly there are many scientific and technical arrangements to be worked out by the project proponents and partners and therefore STAP requests that it be copied drafts of the emerging project brief to enable timely and constructive feedback to the proponents, as well as to agree to a formal review point prior to submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.

<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.