

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 30, 2016
Screener: Douglas Taylor
Panel member validation by: Bierbaum Rosina M.
Consultant(s):

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

FULL-SIZED PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9592
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Regional (Chile, Peru)
PROJECT TITLE:	Catalysing Implementation of a Strategic Action Programme for the Sustainable Management of Shared Living Marine Resources in the Humboldt Current System (HCS)
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	IFOP, IMARPE, SUBPESCA, PRODUCE, MMA, MINAM, SERNAPESCA, SERNANP
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):
Concur

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes this proposal to implement the Strategic Action Plan (SAP) arising from the work of the predecessor project Towards Ecosystem Management of the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem (GEF ID 3749), which resulted in national reports for Peru and Chile and a Transzonal Ecosystem Diagnostic Analysis (TEDA) shared between the countries. In screening this PIF, STAP has referred also to the mid-term evaluation for the predecessor project, noting from other sources that there is believed to be a terminal evaluation completed, but this has not been made available to STAP.

The PIF provides a summary of the agreed SAP policies and of the matrix of actions with associated indicators under five general objectives in an annex to the PIF, which align with the proposed components of the present proposal. The work leading to the 'TEDA' and the agreed SAP is believed to reflect STAP's previous advice and UNDP's response regarding the predecessor project, therefore in general STAP supports the measures outlined in the PIF with the following recommendations intended to strengthen the science aspects of the proposal.

Linkage with protected areas and Marine Spatial Planning:

The predecessor project was supported from the International Waters and Biodiversity focal areas of the GEF; however, the present proposal is solely targeted at IW funds and as a consequence appears not to fully reflect the foundational work leading to designation and management of pilot Marine Protected Areas associated with transboundary cooperation. STAP's earlier advice regarding integration of designation and management of MPAs and the ecosystem approach to fisheries management appears not to be reflected in the proposed actions agreed through the SAP, although the proponents engaged in dialogue with STAP over this issue. Accordingly STAP recommends that the project brief includes a summary of the findings of the MPA assessments conducted and how the new project intends to take forward work on Marine Spatial

Planning (Component 3.2). Currently the description of Multiple Use MPAs is vague and needs clarification. Additionally these sub-sets of MPAs are not mentioned in the SAP matrix of actions, therefore it is unclear what indicators are proposed or indeed what links between MPAs and Marine Spatial Planning are envisaged, given that this process is also not specifically mentioned in the SAP matrix.

SAP matrix and actions proposed:

STAP agrees that the components presented in the PIF align well with the SAP ‘General Objectives’ in the annex to the PIF, however, in very few cases are the proposed indicators consistent with ‘SMART’ indicators. Although STAP understands that the SAP matrix is presented only in summary form without details of the indicators, lack of adequate indicators will be a significant barrier to implementation if not addressed at project design stage.

Amongst the major barriers mentioned in the PIF and accompanying SAP are development-related pressures including mining, agriculture, infrastructure, etc. However the stakeholders of these sectors appear not to have been included in the list of those to be involved. STAP notes that the mid-term evaluation considered the range of stakeholders involved to be overly restricted to the environmental and fishing communities, at the expense of major sectors that influence the quality and outlook for the coastal ecosystem. STAP understands that the TDA (and TEDA) identified land based sources of pollution as amongst major pressures on the coastal ecosystem. However, STAP suggests that Marine Spatial Planning should take into account the wider set of pressures beyond pollution to encompass relevant ‘ridge to reef’ planning issues as well as likely development impacts upon the immediate coastal environment. STAP recommends that the proponents carefully consider this point, because only if the full range of actors is included will Marine Spatial Planning be able to address the challenges presented.

It is encouraging to note that the project will seek coordination with other GEF-funded regional initiatives, but STAP is concerned that no specific mention of collaboration with the FAO is foreseen, regarding strategic advice on regional issues or to follow up the earlier commitment to collaborate on data sharing.

The narrative included the introduction of the five key Components which is clearly written and acts a useful guide to the detail presented elsewhere. This narrative could be improved to outline the socio-economic challenges and what the project can do to address those challenges regarding non-industrial users of the coastal fisheries. The outreach and capacity building measures in component 5 and diversification measures outlined in component 4 regarding diversification including aquaculture need to be much more detailed. The issues of diversification need to be included within Marine Spatial Planning to evaluate both opportunities and potential deleterious impacts from diversification (e.g. from aquaculture pollution).

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Concur	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple “Concur” response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised. (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review. <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 issues to be considered during	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:

project design	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP's concerns.</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>
-----------------------	---