

# 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: May 16, 2016  
Screener: Lev Neretin  
Panel member validation by: Jakob Granit  
Consultant(s): Stephen Olsen

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9451
PROJECT DURATION:	4
COUNTRIES:	Regional (Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Grenadines)
PROJECT TITLE:	Caribbean Regional Oceanscape Project
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 issues to be considered during project design**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

1. This Project Concept Note is directed at the Management of the Shared Living Marine Resources of the Caribbean and North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystems Project (CLME+) as a GEF-funded catalyst and umbrella for initiatives and actions to help implement the region's Strategic Action Program (SAP) for enhanced ocean health in the Caribbean. It seeks to help implement niche areas of the CLME+ SAP framework.
2. The proposed project would promote ecosystem-based management (EBM) and the incorporation of marine ecosystem services into economic policy-making through the application of marine spatial planning (MSP) techniques. It would draw upon CLME+ efforts throughout the Caribbean to support national inter-sectoral coordination mechanisms. With the establishment of the regional Caribbean Biodiversity Fund (CBF), the marine spatial plans (MSP) are seen as the means by which the expansion of ocean economies will be achieved and additional funds will be attracted.
3. The proposal calls for linked marine spatial planning (MSP) and integrated coastal management (ICM) as a central strategy by which information on the multiple resources and human activities will be organized and provide a basis for well informed policy making. The proposal thereby addresses some of the linkages and challenges of resource management in source-to-sea systems. This is a positive step that calls for a strategic selection of the sites and issues to be addressed. This selection process, however, is not described. The proposal simply calls for generating MSP and ICM programs in each of the region's nations as a means for providing information for blue and green growth strategies. There is no mention made of the many decades of initiatives that have promoted ICM in the region with highly variable results. There are lessons emerging from experience elsewhere in the application of MSP that extends the integrated, issue driven and participatory practices of ICM into marine areas. As the design of this project matures it would be important to examine these bodies of experience to inform another investment in ICM and MSP practices.
4. Given the complexity of this region and the multiple projects, programs and institutions working to further collaboration in the management of critically important marine resources and activities, the proposed project would benefit greatly from a governance baseline that, through such tools as a timeline, would bring greater

clarity to how the existing governance system has evolved and where the strengths and weaknesses of the current system lie. The emphasis placed upon marine spatial planning, and to a lesser degree integrated coastal management, as methods for advancing the ecosystem approach deserves needs to build upon the experience gained in this region over the past two decades. As project preparation goes forward it will be essential to build upon past experience in ICM and to identify what features of the enabling conditions have been most critical to success or failure. Similarly, the more detailed design process needs to identify what changes in the behavior of the institutions involved, and resource user groups will be necessary if the fundamental goals of the project are to be achieved. Both MSP and IM must be seen as social and political processes as much as a technical response to complex issues.

5. STAP would welcome further integration between the development of MSPs and national coastal blue growth master plans in this project. MSP is not a mapping exercise alone, but the chain of processes that start from visioning and going towards institutional building (proponents may find useful some guidance in this respect developed by the STAP: <http://www.stapgef.org/marine-spatial-planning-in-practice/>). Stronger integration between Sub-components 1 and 2 of Component 1 is recommended. In addition, recent work of CBD on EBSAs in the region should provide important technical information to strengthen MPAs network in the Caribbean and integrate these data into MSP planning process (<https://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=RWEBSA-WCAR-01>).

6. The project success will depend strongly on the ownership by local communities involved in maritime activities including fisheries and aquaculture in addition to the regional institutions such as OECS. In STAP's opinion, the present iteration of the proposal does not emphasize links to local communities throughout the project and this should be developed and clarified during project preparation. Particularly in Component 1 focused on MSP development and marine governance reform, project support could be provided to establishing MSP multi-stakeholder consultations and committees or other institutional forms of stakeholder engagement in MSP and implementation.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Concur</b>	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.
<b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	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:  (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.  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.
<b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b>	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:  (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.  The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP’s concerns.  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.