

# 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: January 21, 2010

Screeener: Douglas Taylor, STAP Secretary

Panel member validation by: Meryl Williams

### I. PIF Information

**Full size project**      **GEF Trust Fund**

**GEF PROJECT ID: 4198**

**PROJECT DURATION: 54 months**

**GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: N/A**

**COUNTRY: Morocco**

**PROJECT TITLE: Integrated Coastal Zone Management – Mediterranean coast**

**GEF AGENCY: World Bank**

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S):**

**GEF FOCAL AREA (S): International Waters**

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): IW1, IW2**

**NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: Mediterranean Environmental Sustainable Development Program ('Sustainable MED')**

### II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

1. Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):  
**Consent**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP welcomes this project, one which was identified earlier within the Sustainable MED program document, and one which focuses on a wetland system under pressure, the Ramsar Site Sebkh Bou Areg (not Lake Nador), and which could offer lessons for other coastal wetlands and designated sites in Morocco.
3. Regarding risks, and also addressing Component 1, identification of a future body or focal point for ICZM legal capacity would seem to be a necessary pre-condition to reduce the risk of lack of institutional ownership of a future ICZM law after testing the effectiveness of the inter-ministerial coordination committee. Experience elsewhere indicates that what is needed beyond coordination and empowerment is a technically competent body with monitoring and enforcement powers to support ICZM in the long term.
4. Component 2 of the project actions are welcomed but as STAP noted in its earlier screening reports on the Program Framework Document (GEF Program 3977) and the Governance and Knowledge Generation Project (GEF Project 4001) that there is an apparent weakness of the overall Sustainable MED Program Know-MED component of the Program which may reduce the effectiveness of knowledge sharing and exchange with the wider Mediterranean community.
5. Regarding risks and with respect to Component 3, support for critical pilot investments, the project should be aware of the difficulty of implementing the recommended fisheries solutions and therefore the risk of not achieving the desired fisheries sustainability.
6. Finally, in Part D. of the PIF towards the end of the first paragraph the first section A. State the issue..., includes the confusing sentence "...The project will also help local coastal communities strengthen their vulnerability to climate variability through knowledge management and natural resources conservation..." should be re-worded, "strengthen their resilience" or "reduce their vulnerability" would be suitable alternatives.

<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.	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues</li> <li>(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</li> </ul> <p>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.</p>
3. Major revision required	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>