

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 09, 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: 5278

PROJECT DURATION : 3

COUNTRIES : Global

PROJECT TITLE: Strengthening Global Governance of Large Marine Ecosystems and their Coasts through Enhanced Sharing and Application of LME/ICM/MPA Knowledge and Information Tools

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: IOC/UNESCO

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 in principle this capacity building initiative that promotes exchanges and learning among those involved in LME, ICM and MPA governance. The major barriers to achieving sustained progress towards more sustainable and equitable forms of LME and coastal development lie in the weaknesses of the governance systems involved. A stronger focus on the governance dimension is in general needed. STAP has the following recommendations for the development of the full project document:

1. It is unclear as to whether the scope of the project is limited to GEF related initiatives or more broadly to these fields as a whole. The second option would be more likely to identify lessons of wide applicability and would therefore be more useful.
2. The root causes and barriers to the practice of the ecosystem approach are not identified and discussed in the PIF. The proposal acknowledges that there is much "re-inventing of the wheel" in the implementation of ecosystem-based initiatives but does not state the analytical basis that will guide the assembly of a toolkit for more effective practices. The design appears to assume that the task is merely to assemble and organize experience and related tools from existing and past projects. The proposal design does not provide for conceptual frameworks by which the very large amount of experience and existing attempts will be examined to identify and codify emerging good practices. Without such analysis, the identification of the knowledge and skills that are proving to be most critical establishing successful governance systems as a result of GEF investments will remain a matter of opinion and tied to the context in which such initiatives have been implemented.

The selection and application of such conceptual frameworks should be a feature of this project. Such analysis should be conducted at the PPG or early implementation stage so that the knowledge and skills to be disseminated through this program are identified and drive the design of the capacity building program. Section 2.1 identifies as an output "validated methods and new tools" but does not suggest how they will be validated and on what criteria. Similarly, what are the criteria for selecting ICM/MPA/LME best practices (Section 2.2)?

3. The target audiences have not been identified. This is a crucial omission. The capacity building needs and related tools should be segregated by categories of target audiences and include both junior and senior staff and strategically important partners in the private sector and governmental agencies. Those implementing IW GEF projects, especially those at senior levels that would benefit by exposure to a rigorous examination of the capacities most critical to success may not benefit as expected. Failure to attend (for example) program events is identified as a risk classified as low.

This may prove to be a more significant risk when linked to the target audiences (e.g. senior managers/directors) and should be reconsidered.

4. The proposal does not enumerate what vehicles are already available and, more importantly, what forms of exchange and information sharing have proved to most useful and effective in the past 15 years - a period in which there have been a multitude of workshops, conferences, training programs and books generated on these topics. Such analysis is required as a part of PPG process.

5. The major source of "in-house" experience, the IW Learn program, is given only passing acknowledgement. What will be the relationship between the proposed initiative led by IOC and other initiatives with similar objectives and strategies? What is already being done and how will this proposal fit in, add to, or duplicate those efforts?

<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>