

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: October 11, 2011

Screeners: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: Douglas Taylor; Meryl Williams
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT **GEF TRUST FUND**

GEF PROJECT ID: 4487

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Regional (Comoros, Mauritania, Mozambique, Tanzania)

PROJECT TITLE: LME-AF Strategic Partnership for Sustainable Fisheries Management in the Large Marine Ecosystems in Africa (PROGRAM)

GEF AGENCIES: World Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: African Union, FAO, WWF

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

1. This PFD describes a strategy to reallocate offshore take of Africa's fish towards onshore landing and processing in order to maximize economic benefit for Africa. However, this strategy does not address directly the status of the resource base and its sustainability and from an economic viewpoint instead appears to assume that the fisheries would continue to produce at estimated current rates. The World Bank has stated that moving towards maximum economic yield (MEY) is the goal for fishing effort rather than maximum sustainable yield; this approach is supported in the scientific literature which often equates MEY with optimum sustainable yield. Typically, MEY occurs at a lower total catch than MSY and is theoretically more biologically sustainable. This targeting of MEY is a welcome development and therefore STAP advises that the World Bank reconsider its earlier emphasis on supporting the indicator Percentage increase in the number of commercially targeted SSA marine fish stocks at levels that can support the maximum sustainable yield in the context of the Outcome Indicators of the overall Strategic Partnership for Fisheries in Africa (see original reference under Component 1 outcomes in the West Africa Regional Fisheries Program, GEF ID 3558).

2. In addition, the key indicators of success each need careful interpretation. All three could experience a possible dip before turning around over a number of years, depending on the rapidity of the reforms and the depth of the cuts in effort. CPUE measures often require additional, fishery independent data, to be correctly interpreted. In terms of Core Outcomes, would the increased local landings come because of reducing the foreign landings? If local landings increased and foreign landings did not, than an apparently successful indicator for local landings may in fact be an on-balance negative Outcome.

3. The problem statements made are mostly well argued and for example encompass a valid summary of the critical ecosystem components (mangrove, and wetlands more generally) upon which fish reproduction depends. However some of the specific justification for the approach in the program is inferred from the 2006 World Bank publication *Where is the Wealth of Nations?*, which asserts that there is a "strong economic justification for sustainably managing renewable resources to provide long-term contributions to growth", yet the evidence cited in that report does not include any significant discussion of fisheries as suggested in the PFD. Data deficiency, regarding fisheries and their supporting ecosystems, is likely to remain the principal barrier to understanding the economic potential of fisheries managed for onshore rather than offshore benefit, and the evidence presented in the PFD in this regard appears highly speculative, and coupled with the delay in implementing previously approved projects leaves the environmental context less well defined that would be expected at this point in program development.

4. STAP notes that, in its 2008 PIF screening report on the West Africa Regional Fisheries Program (GEF ID 3558), it offered to provide advice to the proponents regarding suitable indicators for estimating global environment benefits. This advice was not taken then and does not appear to have been addressed in that program or carried forward into the present PFD and for that reason STAP has concerns that there remains no acceptable documented framework for estimating the degree to which proposed GEBs are delivered within the program as a whole and its constituent projects.

5. Modeling indicates that fisheries catch potential in the selected countries will change with climate change and these changes might have different directions in the EEZs and open ocean in project regions (Cheung et al. (2009). Large-scale redistribution of maximum fisheries catch potential in the global ocean under climate change. *Global Change Biology*). While the PFD acknowledges climate risks, no systematic analysis of vulnerabilities of the fisheries sector and activities to increase resilience of local communities are provided. Such an analysis is recommended before CEO endorsement.

6. Finally, STAP notes that the 4 countries involved (one from West Africa and three from East Africa) are an unusual geographic combination. Whereas the East African countries fit into one LME (Agulhas Current), they share little in common with Mauritania in the West. This raises questions about why this is considered a 'Program'. The PFD does not spell out how the work would relate to the projects underway at LME level. The document mentions that the program will coordinate with the ongoing work of other LME programs conducting research and monitoring of fisheries to set management goals and targets. How specifically will this program support national efforts or coordinate closely with international initiatives to inform management decisions?

<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.