

# Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel



The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility (Version 4)

## STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: November 29, 2007

Screener: Douglas Taylor, STAP Secretary

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

### I. PIF Information (Paste here from the PIF)

Full size project      GEF Trust Fund

### II. STAP PIF Screening (based on Part I A Project Framework and Part II Questions of the PIF)

#### Background logical consistency informing STAP's scientific and technical screening:

1. Is the Project Objective consistent with the Problem/Issue?      YES  NO  PARTIAL   
- If "No" or "Partial" explain: *No Objective is stated clearly, but STAP is assuming it is: "...the project will ensure a reduction of the risk posed by national and regional risk for invasive alien species on a national and a regional level, thereby safeguarding of biodiversity of global significance...", regarding GEBs, it is hard to assess in any quantitative manner what the likely impact of GEF support might be.*
2. Are the expected outcomes consistent with the Problem/Issue? YES  NO  PARTIAL   
- If "No" or "Partial" explain:
3. Global environmental benefits scientifically valid? YES  NO  UNKNOWN   
- If "No" or "Unknown" explain:

#### Relevant Scientific and Technical issues contained in proponent responses to Questions A to H

4. Problem definition scientifically valid?      YES  NO  UNKNOWN   
- If "No" or "Unknown" explain:
5. Proposed intervention scientifically justified?      YES  NO  UNKNOWN   
- If "No" or "Unknown" explain:
6. Methodology proposed:  
Is there a scientifically valid baseline?      YES  NO  UNKNOWN   
Is a scientific control explicitly included?      YES  NO  UNKNOWN  N/A   
Is there scientific or technical innovation?      YES  NO  UNKNOWN   
Is the methodology replicable?      YES  NO  UNKNOWN   
- If any of the above are marked "No" or "Unknown" explain: *There are a number of uncertainties regarding methodologies, and whether baselines would be appropriate that cannot be assessed from the PIF*
7. Is the incremental reasoning scientifically valid?      YES  NO  UNKNOWN   
- If "No" or "Unknown" explain:
8. Are the risk statements scientifically valid      YES  NO  UNKNOWN   
and comprehensive? *If "No" explain: The risk posed by transport-shipping introductions of IAS are not directly addressed, except by reference to other initiatives aiming at reducing accidental introductions. There is a risk that accidental and deliberate introductions may reduce the effectiveness of the measures being considered, which although correctly targeting internal/regional risks may not effectively address external risks*

### III. STAP Advisory Response (see next page for explanation)

9. Based on this PIF screening, STAP recommends the following action to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency (ies): **No Objection**

### IV. Further guidance from STAP

10. In addition to stated links with other initiatives, there may be a need to establish a regional framework for scientific/professional strengthening. It is not clear in the PIF whether the project specifically builds capacity in a coordinated manner between agencies in the countries, to enable an effective technical response to address the need for coherent prevention and mitigation across the line ministries of agriculture, trade, environment and water for example. Alien invasive species introduced into a single nation can potentially affect all other nations, even if the latter have mechanisms in place for managing IAS. Thus the amount of the public good that can be provided in the region is strongly constrained by the nation that makes the lowest investment. Thus it is not simply, as the PIF states, the "small scale of the

Caribbean economies” that necessitates a regional approach, it is also necessary to encourage participants in the project to adhere to mutually agreed targets.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. No objection</b>	STAP has no scientific/technical grounds to object to the approval of the concept. However, in Section IV, 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.
<b>2. No objection, but follow-up action required.</b>	STAP has no objection to the approval of the PIF, but has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities, stated in section IV, 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: (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (ii) Setting an independent expert review point during early stage project development and agreeing terms of reference for this review The proponent should provide the report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.
<b>3. Objection</b>	STAP objects to the approval of the PIF on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical faults in the concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. In the case of the project concept nevertheless being approved by the CEO of the GEF for development of the full project brief, a STAP review should be mandatory prior to submission of the project brief for CEO endorsement.