

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: March 10, 2013

Screener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Jakob Granit
Consultant(s): Stephen B. Olsen

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 5271

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Global (Costa Rica, Ecuador, Indonesia, Philippines)

PROJECT TITLE: Global Sustainable Supply Chains for Marine Commodities

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: National Government Agencies in four countries; Sustainable Fisheries Partnership Foundation (SFP)

GEF FOCAL AREA: International Waters

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 revision required**

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the public-private partnership approach taken in this PIF. The activities at different scales targeting information systems, demonstration projects, enabling environments and behavioral change at the consumer level tackling global supply chains are innovative. The design calls for addressing the overfishing problem by the attainment of credible fisheries improvement projects (FIPs) and, where feasible, promoting the certification of selected fisheries. The PIF has the potential to be a valuable contribution to long-standing and seemingly intractable problems of chronic overfishing.

1. A strength of the design is that it calls for a comparative approach in which fisheries management initiatives are carried simultaneously in a diversity of contexts. The project focal area specific framework (Section 1) includes pollution abatement, port management, ICM and habitats (blue forest) restoration/conservation. At the PPG stage, proponents should clarify whether these non-fisheries topics would be considered for intervention, perhaps by stating that these are elements of the broader context within which fisheries management initiatives evolve.
2. The emphasis upon demonstration projects is strategically important. However, if the full benefits of learning and drawing lessons from a diversity of initiatives conducted in distinct governance contexts are to be drawn, the project needs to strengthen its lesson-drawing, monitoring, and evaluation component. The project should select a common conceptual framework that can be applied to all the demonstration projects and thereby promote a consistent approach to drawing conclusions. Those leading each country initiative should be brought together periodically, for example at 18 month intervals, to report on their strategies, progress made and the barriers encountered and how changes in the larger context within which they are operating is influencing their outcomes. Such comparative assessments are most useful when they apply a common conceptual framework and are managed by a competent facilitator familiar with the methods that are being applied. STAP recommends exploring the possibility for strengthening learning and evaluation component of demonstration projects.
3. An important issue will be to focus at the beginning of each country component on the degree to which the enabling conditions for new practices in fisheries are present - with particular emphasis on political will expressed as sustained governmental support for each initiative. The status of the enabling conditions should be characterized at the initiation of each country component and then periodically reviewed during program implementation. The governance baseline documentation and subsequent monitoring through self-assessments provides for framework for the assessment of shifts in enabling conditions (LOICZ 2009).

4. The commodities and knowledge information system described in component 4, places an emphasis upon the delivery of actionable information to seafood buyers to assist them in assessing whether their sources of sea food are on track to meeting sustainability standards. This is a potentially useful strategy but should not replace learning and lesson drawing on the process of transitioning to sustainable fisheries at the fishers and national government levels. Project proponents are advised to consider introducing a coherent approach to knowledge and lessons learned during this project taking into account the entire supply chain of sea food products.

<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>