

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: February 26, 2014

Screeners: Kristie Ebi

Panel member validation by: Anand Patwardhan
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT SPECIAL CLIMATE CHANGE FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 5667

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Regional (Antigua And Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, St. Vincent and Grenadines)

PROJECT TITLE: Climate Change Adaptation in the Eastern Caribbean Fisheries Sector

GEF AGENCIES: FAO

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism (CRFM), Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission (WECAFC), Caribbean Network of Fisherfolk Organizations (CNFO), University of the West Indies (UWI), fisheries and environment agencies and ministries in participating countries, private sector, CARIBSAVE and The Nature Conservancy (TNC) .

GEF FOCAL AREA: Climate Change

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 FAO proposal "Climate change adaptation in the Eastern Caribbean fisheries sector". The proposal aims to increase resilience and reduce vulnerability to climate change impacts in the fisheries sector of seven countries in the Eastern Caribbean through introduction of adaptation measures to fisheries management and capacity building of fisherfolk and aquaculturists. The PIF provides clear and often comprehensive descriptions of the current level of vulnerability and of the benefits of implementing targeted adaptation measures. However, it is not often not clear exactly what outputs would be undertaken with SCCF funding separate from what will be accomplished under the baseline projects.

To further strengthen the proposal, STAP recommends addressing the following during its development.

1. The current text states the SCCF funding will contribute to various components, without specifying how. STAP strongly encourages describing the relationships between the proposed SCCF project and the baseline projects, clarifying what outputs will be accomplished with the different funding streams, and the management arrangements (including roles and responsibilities) to ensure strong coordination among the various partners.
2. Page 28 mentions that Dominica, Grenada, Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent, and the Grenadines were selected to participate in the Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR) of the Climate Investment Fund. It would be helpful to understand the relationship between the proposed project and the activities that will be undertaken in the PPCR.
3. STAP encourages including information and data on the evidence of impacts of hurricanes on fishers and on stocks. In addition, it would be helpful to provide:
 - a. information and data to support the statements on page 11 about changing rainfall patterns and flooding;
 - b. a description of and results from the assessment study mentioned on page 12;
 - c. a description of the information generally collected in damage assessments conducted after every major disaster (page 14); and

- d. information on the numbers of accidents and fatalities.
4. It would be helpful to have a more complete picture of the current situation for aquaculture, comparable to the other paragraphs on livelihoods. In addition, STAP encourages FAO to provide additional information on how the project would ensure that any aquaculture implemented would be sustainable.
5. The proposed project states it will use an ecosystem approach to fisheries. It would be helpful to have a description of the key aspects of this approach that will be implemented.
6. STAP appreciates the efforts to leverage ICT for supporting fishermen and fisheries. The availability of smartphones and the ability of the platform to support fishermen's information needs may be further elaborated during the course of project development.
7. The adaptive alternative to component 1 states that climate models will be used to improve projections of biophysical parameters, but does not provide information on which models, which emission and socioeconomic scenarios, time slices, etc. Such information would be helpful.
8. Component 1 also mentions the SCCF project will expand on MARSIS. STAP encourages FAO to include in the full proposal how that will be done.
9. In component 2, STAP encourages FAO to provide further detail linkages between the proposed project and NOAA and CDEMA. In addition, the text on mFisheries is not quite clear; will the project build on this application and, if so, how? How will locale-specific information be determined? Further, STAP recommends including consideration of how use of communication technologies could affect stocks, and proposed solutions for when negative impacts could arise.
10. In component 3, STAP encourages FAO to provide further information on:
 - a. Whether the participants in the fisher meetings/workshops are representative of all fisherfolk, including women;
 - b. The effectiveness of an ecosystem approach to fisheries, and where, when, and how it will be implemented;
 - c. How the project will assist in developing innovative approaches, with a description of each; and
 - d. Who will decide what practices will be designated "best practices" and the criteria for making that determination.
11. In component 4, STAP encourages FAO to provide further information on:
 - a. How the project will address that investments by the Fisheries Divisions and line Ministries neglect the potential impacts of climate variability and change;
 - b. Who will decide what practices will be designated "best practices" and the criteria for making that determination; and
 - c. How the project partners will ensure the dissemination of best practice adaptive technologies and management measures.
12. In component 5, STAP encourages FAO to provide information on the number of facilities that will receive small-scale support.
13. STAP encourages FAO to provide further details on how the extra-budgetary support sought will be sustained after the project.
14. On page 22, the text is presumably providing a series of indicators for monitoring and evaluating the outputs and outcomes. It would be helpful if these would be taken up in the descriptions of the appropriate components; e.g. a description of how the 2000 most vulnerable small-scale fisherfolk will be identified, trained, and tested. A similar comment for the 200 staff mentioned three bullets down.
15. STAP strongly encourages strengthening the proposal in terms of adaptive risk management. It is often unclear whether outcomes and outputs are focused solely on reducing current vulnerability or are also intent on increasing the capacity for adaptive management as the climate continues to change. Further, it would be helpful to have a better understanding of the mainstreaming aspects of the project.

16. STAP welcomes the mention of the importance of gender, and looks forward to seeing this aspect further developed in the full proposal. It would be helpful to include criteria for ensuring women, youth, and other vulnerable groups are included in project activities.

17. Other issues include:

- a. A list of acronyms would be helpful.
- b. References for statements of fact would be helpful. FAO is encouraged to include relevant information on weather and climate trends and projections from the IPCC Special Report on Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation (2012), instead of the IPCC 4th Assessment Report.
- c. For components 2 and 3, some of the text in the baseline scenario appears more relevant to the adaptation alternative, such as using mobile phones as part of an early warning response plan.
- d. On page 20, presumably FAO intended to say that fisheries management projects would not be silo type.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	<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>
2. Minor revision required.	<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>
3. Major revision required	<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>