

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 14, 2016
Screener: Douglas Taylor
Panel member validation by: Brian Child
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9369
PROJECT DURATION:	4
COUNTRIES:	Ecuador
PROJECT TITLE:	Implementation of the Strategic Plan of Ecuador Mainland Marine and Coastal Protected Areas Network
GEF AGENCIES:	CI
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Undersecretary of Marine and Coastal Management (MAE), CI-Ecuador
GEF FOCAL AREA:	Multi Focal Area

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 important initiative in Ecuador and congratulates the proponents for a well-articulated concept note. The project logic is clear, obviously based on previous experience, and is likely to result in the delivery of suggested outcomes and GEBs as it is based on a good knowledge of Ecuador's working environment. Equally obviously, it will contribute to GEBs. This PIF can be used as an example for many projects because it is clearly written, the Project Summary is strong, the text is clear and answers all required questions. STAP thanks the proponents for including a map, which facilitates understanding. While this PIF is very well conceived, it could be considerably strengthened by including an understanding of the economic governance of PAs. In this respect, there are several places where an already strong concept can be further strengthened during the development phase:

1. The strong economic case for PAs is not particularly evident, but could considerably strengthen the project and provide the basis for synergies and agreements between PAs and various stakeholders. Thus:
 - a. There is almost no mention of the likely positive socio-economic benefits of the marine protected area systems.
 - b. It is highly likely that a sound economic assessment would demonstrate that these PAs have a large positive impact (Ecuadorian graduate students in my class have conducted such studies of two PAs in Ecuador that show that PAs have very large positive economic outcomes which are probably generalizable). An economic modeling approach might be considered in the project design to further strengthen the project.
 - c. If the PAs have wide positive economic (as opposed to strictly financial) outcomes, this will provide the basis for considerable basis for systemic engagement between PAs, tourism, fishers and other local stakeholders. Indeed, theoretically one would assume that the rationale for improved PA management (including rule formation and exclusion of illegal uses) and collective action (e.g. with local authorities,

planners and so on) proposed in the project is to build synergies and optimize net outputs. New governance systems will encourage positive resources allocation, optimization and tradeoffs, and will replace current open access regimes and reduce/exclude low value or unsustainable uses.

2. There may be an over-dependence on a funding model based on government support and philanthropy. Consideration should be given to charging user fees (and other income generating approaches) in some of the PAs, and developing them as decentralized cost centers, as has been done in some PAs in Africa through UNDP, Norway and other projects.

3. The combination of four field pilots and national institutional development is welcome, but much more should be made of this in describing how the project will be operationalized. In other words, the PPG should deliberately state that the pilots will be used to develop guidelines, best practice and communities-of-practice that actively (and iteratively) inform institutional development at national level.

<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	<p>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:</p> <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, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</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>
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	<p>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:</p> <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>