

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: May 08, 2017
Screener: Virginia Gorsevski
Panel member validation by: Brian Child
Consultant(s):

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

FULL-SIZED PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9705
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Cabo Verde
PROJECT TITLE:	Managing Multiple Sector Threats on Marine Ecosystems to Achieve Sustainable Blue Growth
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Agriculture and Environment (MAE) / General Directorate for Environment (DGA) with Ministry of Economy and Employment (MEE) / General Directorate Marine Resources (DGRM)
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):
Concur

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP believes that the global environmental benefits targeted by this project in Cape Verde are legitimate and worthwhile and that the strategy is logical and comprehensive.

Having said that, STAP feels that the project is somewhat over-ambitious and we are concerned about the practical viability of taking on so many activities simultaneously, even after noting the assertion that Cape Verde has strong technical capacity.

For example, there are a total of 26 discrete activities, many of which are complex, require technical/system development, and involve multiple stakeholders. Component 1 alone includes no less than a dozen activities, including regulatory and policy alignment and reform (which is notoriously time consuming) conducted with a significant number of stakeholders and agencies within a budget of \$USD 1.160 million. In sum, there appear to be too many moving parts for this project to be technically feasible within the time frame, budget and institutional capacity.

In addition, the risks that stakeholders will engage in, and implement, activities, policies and regulations are noted. Individually these are ranked as "medium", but together perhaps they are "high?". For example, if there are so many risks associated with using drones, is this a good approach?

Given these concerns, STAP recommends that as part of the PPG, project managers undertake a rigorous assessment of whether this complex project is feasible within the project time frame and capacity, and the capacity of implementing agencies to deliver the project. Through the project they should engage with the stakeholders that will need to be involved (through a workshop) to assess buy-in, capacity and feasibility.

The current assessment of risks does recognize these problems, but should be specifically expanded to assess the assumptions that all these actors and (often complex) technical solutions mentioned in the PIF will work in practice within budget and time frame.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
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	<p>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:</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>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.</p>
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	<p>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:</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP’s concerns.</p> <p>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.</p>