

# 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 14, 2014

Screener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Sandra Diaz  
Consultant(s): Paul Grigoriev

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT    GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 5759

**PROJECT DURATION :** 4

**COUNTRIES :** Indonesia

**PROJECT TITLE:** Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Inland Fisheries Practices in Freshwater Ecosystems of High Conservation Value

**GEF AGENCIES:** FAO

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:**

**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 the submission of this concept for a project intending to mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into inland fisheries practices in HCV freshwater ecosystems and increase their level of protection.

The following observations pertain to the presented project framework. The framework exhibits general coherence between the problem, root causes and barriers – although additional work to further clarify this chain of causality will be required in the PPG stage. It is noted that no Executing Partner is mentioned – perhaps this should be the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries. STAP would propose that GEBs should be prominent in the objective, and in Component 1 BD values should be addressed. Outcomes and indicators appear to be mixed in the framework. STAP would propose that outcomes should be clearly stated and potential preliminary indicators should be presented on their own rather than being mixed with Outcomes. Outcomes such as 1.1, for example, could be simplified, including breaking down this down into possibly two outcomes (knowledge improved and sectoral plans incorporate BD). Outcome 2.1 can be made more specific than improved development and management of inland aquatic ecosystems. Mentioning 1050 households (as a target) is inappropriate at this stage as part of the Outcome. Indicators will require further development and refinement during the PPG stage. STAP would propose the use of the capacity assessment scorecards and quantitative baseline measures at that stage.

The remaining comments pertain to the description of the project. The description of the problem, root causes and barriers is adequate, although the link between the presented barriers and the project's components and outputs could be made more clearly and succinctly, and thereby strengthened.

While the description of the baseline scenario is clear, there is an overall lack of specific baseline information on environmental, social and economic conditions in the project areas. STAP looks forward to this issues being rectified during the PPG. Baseline activities are presented well but their specific relationship to the project's elements could be better explained and related to the project's specific Outcomes and planned Outputs. In addition, the incremental cost reasoning could also be more explicit regarding what specifically the project will achieve with GEF support.

The GEBs are well presented and STAP is confident that they are attainable. Use of the table for their presentation is useful and appreciated. The principal stakeholders are clearly defined and it is noted that consideration is given to gender issues in the project's design and eventual implementation.

STAP wishes to note that the specific mechanism and processes to be employed to ensure coordination with other relevant ongoing initiatives presented will require much more specific definition and further development. In addition, the project's innovation and prospects for its sustainability and scaling up are not adequately addressed and require more attention. The defined risks are adequate at this stage but will require further investigation and appraisal during the PPG.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	<p>STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved.</p> <p>Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.</p>
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency:            (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions.            (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.</p>
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>Follow-up:            (i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP.            (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</p>