

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: October 08, 2011

Screener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: Douglas Taylor; Meryl Williams
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 4635

PROJECT DURATION : 6

COUNTRIES : Regional (China, Indonesia, Philippines, Vietnam)

PROJECT TITLE: LME-EA Scaling Up Partnership Investments for Sustainable Development of the Large Marine Ecosystems of East Asia and their Coasts (PROGRAM)

GEF AGENCIES: World Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:

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): **Minor revision required**

III. Further guidance from STAP

1. STAP welcomes this Program which identifies an integrated approach on land and in water to remediate and to sustainably manage the Large Marine Ecosystems of East Asia and their coasts. The combination of the comprehensive "brown" agenda for a program of non point source pollution control with effective knowledge management, to complement existing and ongoing improvements in sewage and waste treatment plants is sound and if coupled to relevant monitoring systems will likely result in significantly improved water and habitat quality and reduction in risk to human health. Asia and particularly East Asia is the area with the world's greatest rate of increase in coastal pollution. Similarly the "blue" agenda highlighted could help promote better and more effective coastal and marine management including sustainably managed fisheries. To achieve this, however, the Program would need to work with other regional and national initiatives in fisheries management, especially the ASEAN-SEAFDEC Strategic Partnership, RPOA(IUU) (For example, see the recent regional publication on fisheries management capacity building priorities: Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry 2011. Net Returns " A Human Capacity Development Framework for Marine Capture Fisheries Management in South East Asia. Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, Canberra), CTI and APEC Fisheries Working Group efforts. Gradually, these groups are starting to identify each others strengths and opportunities for cooperation. If this Program initiates yet another overlapping effort without consultation, then ground will be lost in the eventual integration and harmonization processes. Coral reef interventions would also need to be well harmonized with the extensive work of the CTI.

2. Clearly STAP's assessment of the scientific and technical aspects of the five proposed projects will have to wait for the individual PIFs to be formulated; however, the overall approach as outlined in the PFD appears sound. The value of a regional programmatic approach compared to a project by project approach should also be measured in terms of its opportunity for capacity building and shared practices across the region, particularly when ICM is being promoted as this demands a high degree of cooperation across regulatory bodies. The reference to ICM should include clear reference to the Guidebook for the State of the Coasts, published by PEMSEA, which would be expected to supply the templates and methodology to inform baselines and to guide monitoring the outcomes of ICM (see PEMSEA 2011). Given that the existing framework for international technical cooperation on coastal and marine issues across the region is already invested in PEMSEA, STAP is surprised that only one component is explicitly delegated to PEMSEA " knowledge management, while it appears that the five projects proposed will each have separate project units which do not have a coordinating role vested in PEMSEA in the interests of long term "ownership" of the issues and localization of expertise.

3. From a scientific and technical perspective, the PFD does not identify the advantages of a regional approach. At present little structure or innovation can be discerned or efficiencies in scale by sharing common methodologies or technologies. It is unclear how a community of practice for example would be fostered across the region, one of the benefits of a regional program with a common framework for the "brown" and "blue" agendas under promotion. STAP looks forward to the issues raised in this screening report being addressed in a revised Program document and within the forthcoming five PIFs under the Program. STAP also stresses the need to coordinate with ongoing regional efforts, especially in fisheries management and coral reef conservation.

4. The selection of particular projects for pollution reduction control and focus on non-point sources of pollution is not explained. Because no prioritization of pollution sources (both point and non-point) and categories are provided, it is not evident whether pollution reduction activities in selected localities of East Asian Seas will have measurable impact on pollution status of the entire region and as such potentially generate GEBs. It is also not clear that the proposed interventions will be replicated and sustained in the long-term.

5. Pollution impacts on fisheries in the region are significant and include different categories of pollutants (nutrients, POPs, heavy metals, municipal sewage, organic compounds and etc.). Its impacts on biodiversity including fisheries are poorly addressed in the program. STAP recommends exploring potential synergies (positive and negative) between "brown" and "blue" agendas in selected demonstrations regions/localities.

6. How will the effectiveness of the program investments, including its individual projects, on the status of the marine and coastal environment including biodiversity be measured? STAP recommends exploring the feasibility of developing a common regional approach to assess the effectiveness and impacts of program activities taking into account, inter alia, the GEF IW tracking tool.

References:

PEMSEA, 2011. Guidebook on the State of the Coasts (Draft). Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia (PEMSEA), Quezon City, Philippines. 81p.

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