

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: @@@@ @@, @@@@

Screeener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Thomas Lovejoy

Consultant(s): Doug Taylor; Edas Munoz

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 4708

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Honduras

PROJECT TITLE: Strengthening the Sub-system of Coastal and Marine Protected Areas

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Directorate of Biodiversity (DIBIO) of the Environment Ministry (SERNA), Institute of Forest Conservation and Development (ICF) and General Directorate of Fisheries (DIGEPESCA) of the Ministry of Environment and Livestock (SAG)

GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity

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 project proposal to more effectively conserve biodiversity in Honduras focused upon coastal and marine areas. STAP especially welcomes the commitment to utilize fully the lessons learnt from other GEF projects and also to focus on actions to improve the relatively poor condition of the Honduran section of the Meso-American reef system nearby.

As well as the proponents' commitment to draw on lessons from the cited GEF projects, STAP also draws attention of the proponent to STAP's advice on invasive lionfish (mentioned in the PIF) management and control provided to GEF projects in the region, which should be considered within reef-related management plans for existing and new MPAs within the present project. Additionally there is a relevant Small Grant Project in neighbouring Belize focusing on lionfish, with useful NGO delivery experience.

STAP urges the proponents to critically examine the standards/methodologies for monitoring already implemented via existing projects (GEF ID 1032, 1515 and 2885) to inform the establishment of well documented environmental baselines for each of the proposed new PAs to enable systematic monitoring of conservation impact, and to consider how to sustain the necessary databases and expertise required into the future for the existing and new PAs.

Finally, STAP strongly encourages proponents to consider monitoring the threats posed to MPA effectiveness from land-based sources of pollution and sedimentation, and addressing these where possible " similar to the strategy outlined in the Guatemala MPA project (GEF ID 4639). Moreover, STAP would also encourage project teams in Guatemala and Honduras to collaborate where possible in training and capacity building, data collection, and lessons learned.

Reference

- STAP advice on lionfish control options in the Caribbean, 2009
http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/repository/Caribbean_lionfish%20control_GEF_3729_and_3813_STAP_comments_June2009.pdf
- The Lionfish Project: Increasing the Capacity of ECOMAR and the National Coral Reef Monitoring Network to Prepare and Implement an Effective National Lionfish Response Plan Utilizing the Assistance of Government

Organizations, Civil Society, Private Sector, Artisanal Fishermen and Tour Guides.
http://sgp.undp.org/web/projects/14411/the_lionfish_project_increasing_the_capacity_of_ecomar_and_the_national_coral_reef_monitoring_network.html

<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.