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I. PIF Information (Copied from the PIF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FULL-SIZED PROJECT</th>
<th>GEF TRUST FUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEF PROJECT ID:</td>
<td>9785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT DURATION:</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRIES:</td>
<td>St. Kitts And Nevis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT TITLE:</td>
<td>Improving Environmental Management through Sustainable Land Management in St. Kitts and Nevis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF AGENCIES:</td>
<td>UNEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:</td>
<td>Ministry of Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF FOCAL AREA:</td>
<td>Multi Focal Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 issues to be considered during project design

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP acknowledges UNEP's proposal on "Improving environmental management through sustainable land management in St. Kitts and Nevis". STAP welcomes the proposed interventions to tackle environmental degradation in a holistic way. Integrated land use planning will be applied to mainstream biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management and climate change mitigation. Policies on environmental management also will be strengthened, in tandem with local capacity for implementing sustainable development on the islands. STAP encourages UNEP to identify indicators to monitor and assess the proposed multiple benefits. STAP supports applying a conceptual framework to organize the connections between the theoretical underpinnings and the proposed actions; this will help to strengthen the project's logical reasoning, and structure.

During project development, STAP encourages UNEP to consider these issues and the following recommendations:

1. STAP welcomes the project's use of georeferenced data to monitor changes in land use and land cover change in the islands. Remote sensing can assist with quantifying land use change and land cover resulting from urbanization and tourism to better inform biodiversity conservation, and environmental management of mangroves. The following paper can assist with detailing component 1, and the application of digital maps to monitor and assess environmental management. The paper also offers evidence on the application of remote sensing data to observe mangrove degradation and the effectiveness of protective legislation to reduce mangrove loss in the Caribbean: Tuholske, C. et al. (2017). "Thirty years of land use/cover change in the Caribbean: Assessing the relationship between urbanization and mangrove loss in Roatan, Honduras". Applied Geography 88 (2017) 84-93.

2. STAP encourages UNEP to define in detail the images used, and the method used to assess the images for vegetation changes; this includes defining the spatial and temporal scale, and describing the
parameters that were used to characterize and assess agricultural dynamics, and deforestation. STAP encourages the project proponents to complement the georeferenced data with ground-truth information. This entails considering socio-economic factors, and farming characteristics (cultivation period so that it matches the images’ time-series). It also would be valuable to describe the opportunities and limitations in using georeferenced data to monitor and assess vegetation degradation. The project proponents are encouraged to think about how to scale-up, or transfer, the georeferencing method so it can be used for future projects.

3. For component 2, STAP recommends drawing from the literature review in STAP's paper on "Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Practice: A STAP Advisory Document". In particular, STAP recommends acting on the finding that project proponents should give attention to the design, implementation and assessment of mainstreaming biodiversity activities. The results will build the evidence base of GEF (and non-GEF) mainstreaming projects, in particular how and why mainstreaming is important, and what has been learned from it. STAP's mainstreaming paper can be accessed through this link: http://stapgef.org/node/1600

4. For Component 3, STAP is pleased to see the intention in the title of the component to address Knowledge Management (KM) issues. The project's intentions to address the potential for scaling-up will need to use the lessons from this project, which therefore demands some sort of KM system, rather than ad hoc assimilation of outcome experiences. However, the outcomes in Component 3 described in the text are, unfortunately, not what STAP considers to be KM. Outcome 3.1 appears to be financing the attendance at conferences, technology fairs and supporting partnerships. Outcome 3.2 is education and awareness-raising. Sound KM practices require a KM Strategy that includes the explicit storage of experiences and lessons from the project, and their accessibility to future initiatives; it may also include a dedicated KM system, such as a decision-support system. The project proponents are urged to examine some of STAP's on-going advice to the GEF at http://www.stapgef.org/knowledge-management-gef as well as some of the recommended knowledge management tools – see, for example http://www.knowledge-management-tools.net/knowledge-management-systems.html

5. STAP encourages the project proponents to consider using a framework to address problems and organize interventions. STAP proposes the Scientific Conceptual Framework for Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN). The framework can assist in implementing strategies to address land degradation, generate multiple benefits, and achieve LDN. (The LDN approach focuses on tracking and balancing anticipated new losses with gains, based on principles designed to limit unintended outcomes.) The framework is an integrated land use planning that can help organize the interventions (e.g. component 2) in a coherent way. The framework also provides methods to monitor and assess indicators – indicators that are complementary to the project's indicators. Applying an LDN framework can also assist with assessing the land potential and land degradation status. This is relevant for assessing the rehabilitation potential of the land prior to investing in the rehabilitation measures described in the project. The framework can be found at: http://www2.unccd.int/sites/default/files/documents/LDN%20Scientific%20Conceptual%20Framework_FINAL.pdf

6. STAP recommends developing a stakeholder plan that describes the different responsibilities and accountabilities of individuals. The plan also should detail how stakeholders’ knowledge and learning will be brought together so that a shared understanding of the problems and responses is conceived. The project deals with multi-dimensional challenges across sectors and actors that are likely to result in divergent perspectives that need to be captured for effective stakeholder participation. STAP suggests looking at this paper for evidence on how to engage stakeholders dealing with environmental change and local development challenges affecting islands in the Caribbean: Saint Ville, A. et al. (2017). “How do stakeholder interactions influence national food security policy in the Caribbean? The case of Saint Lucia”. Food Policy 68 (2017) 53–64.

7. Finally, STAP urges the project proponents to reconsider the title of the project and its objective. A shortened version of the project objective would make more sense: something like "Transforming degraded forests through sustainable land and biodiversity management". STAP also proposes the use of ‘climate-resilience’ in the project objective, because it provides an achievable target of building the national capacity to absorb the stresses of climate change while at the same time not contributing to further climate change.
1. **Concur**  
In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple “Concur” response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.

2. **Minor issues to be considered during project design**  
STAP has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:

(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised.
(ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to 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 issues to be considered during project design**  
STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:

(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.

The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP’s concerns.

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.