

# 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: September 21, 2013

Screener: Douglas Taylor

Panel member validation by: Jakob Granit  
Consultant(s): Thomas Hammond

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT    GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 5542

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Regional (Antigua And Barbuda, Barbados, Brazil, Belize, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Haiti, Jamaica, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, Mexico, Panama, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, St. Vincent and Grenadines)

**PROJECT TITLE:** Catalysing Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the Sustainable Management of Shared Living Marine Resources in the Caribbean and North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystems (CMLE+)

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNDP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** UNOPS

**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. STAP welcomes the focus on regional governance and support to investment activities with the ambition to scale up investment into the sustainable management of the Caribbean and North Brazil Shelf LMEs. STAP notes the solid work during the foundational capacity building phase that has resulted in the governments' approval for the TDA and SAP.
2. STAP further notes the analysis of regional governance mechanisms that has been carried out by the Centre for Resource Management and Environmental Studies as an important part of the first phase of the CLME project. This study concludes inter alia that there are many weaknesses in the regional governance arrangements and that the interface between regional and international arrangements is in need of strengthening. However, it is also noted that there are many regional or sub-regional organizations that are fulfilling all or parts of marine governance in a nested framework. Further it is recommended to operationalize a regional governance policy coordination mechanism with a focus on regional science and living marine resources in the SAP. This ambition is well captured in the SAP.
3. STAP is concerned that the important aspect of regional governance is not well described in the PIF and recommends that this section receives further attention. In a region with 26 independent states and fifteen dependent/associated territories including many regional single purpose and multipurpose organizations key to the project's success and sustainability will be to anchor it appropriate in the regional organizations' mandates. Regional EBM governance of the two LMEs may not match the mandate of economic integration as outlined by e.g. CARICOM. CARICOM is noted in the project with some of its special functions on e.g. Climate Change but its overall mandate to integrate the region economically is not discussed. The broader mandate of the UNCLOS on marine governance in these areas that are part of national jurisdiction is also not mentioned. Could there be a possibility to utilize the UNCLOS as a stepping stone for regional ocean governance more strongly and promote concept such as marine spatial planning (see references 1,2,3) as a key tool for collective action?
4. The capacity building focus in component two is important for future success but it would be advisable to focus this component on only a few capacity building activities in some key organizations or at the national level to have a real impact. It is recommended that the process to identify the institutions that deserve capacity building and in what specific fields is outlined in the PIF.

5. Component 3 is focusing on piloting activities. The process for selection of such pilots and where should be better captured in the forthcoming project document to ensure a fast start up of these activities.

6. The ambition to leverage financing for sustainable investment is welcomed and is also noted in the draft GEF VI IW strategy as an important area for GEF to be involved in. This component in the PIF would benefit from a stronger description. What is the modality the project will utilize to engage e.g. the private sector beyond preparing pre-feasibility studies? Will the project support e.g. innovation in the ocean governance and investment field, support small scale entrepreneurs and provide a seed funding facility for the private sector? The full project brief should outline the basic principles in a better way and note a strategy for how this could be developed during the project preparation phase (see e.g. current discourse on blue growth, reference 4).

7. Component 5 monitoring and assessment and particularly communication is at the core of the project, as stated in the PIF. Additionally it would be advisable to include some form of project 'dashboard' to enable clear and up to date feedback on progress towards all agreed implementation targets to be made available to the intersectoral ministerial coordination mechanisms (Component 1), which may actually drive and enable incentives towards operationalization of the regional governance policy coordination mechanism. To this end, a CLME+ wide IW:LEARN platform, set up as an active regional node of the global platform, would be a good investment, drawing upon the expertise of the IW:LEARN team to set up, and going beyond mere reporting of results through IW:LEARN. This augmentation of policy-relevant information will also more easily enable civil society to follow progress and, if necessary, hold governance at various scales to account.

References:

1. UNCLOS. (1982). United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982: Overview and full text. Retrieved June 30, 2012 from [www.un.org/Depts/los/convention\\_agreements/texts/unclos/closindx.htm](http://www.un.org/Depts/los/convention_agreements/texts/unclos/closindx.htm).

2. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel "GEF (2012). Marine Spatial Planning in the Context of the Convention on Biological Diversity: A study carried out in response to CBD COP 10 decision X/29, Montreal, Technical Series No. 68, 44 pages.

3. Granit, J., Liss Lymer, B., Olsen, S., Lundqvist, J. & Lindström, A. (2012): Strengthening the Management of Water Resources in the Continuum from Land to the Coastal Sea with Spatial Planning. Conference Paper East Asian Seas Congress 2012.

4. Blue Growth. Scenarios and drivers for Sustainable Growth from the Oceans, Seas and Coasts. Final Report, ECORYS 2012

<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>