

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: April 4, 2008

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Meryl Williams

PIF Information

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3420

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:

COUNTRY(IES):

PROJECT TITLE: GEF Pacific Alliance for Sustainability

GEF AGENCY(IES): World Bank (lead)

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: ADB, UNEP AND UNDP

GEF FOCAL AREAS: International Waters

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): MFA Strategic Program, (BD, CC, IW and POPs).

Full size project GEF Trust Fund

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): **Minor revision required**

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP welcomes the Alliance among all the GEF agencies and Pacific island partners as a strong effort to coordinate and strengthen the work of GEF in the Pacific, including across focal areas. Minor changes are recommended to improve the proposal, and the World Bank is encouraged to discuss with STAP the following suggestions.
3. On what basis is the Pacific GEF investment low by that for other regions? Certainly, it is less than required, but is the area comparison based on area or population numbers?
4. p. 1: common barriers (v): 'emphasising on the ground action rather than planning and assessments' seems to be an inappropriate way to look at the issue of lack of progress. Rather, it is a question of implementing the actions indicated by the assessments and embodied in the planning. In other words, on the ground action is not an either/or to planning and assessments.
5. p. 5: additional threats to marine biodiversity are from exploration for metallic nodules (e.g., manganese) and proposals for ocean fertilization
6. Overall: too little recognition of the problems of economic scale in the Pacific countries (several countries have a population of the size only of a town, others have the population of a small city, etc) and the 'fragile states' nature of several countries.
7. p.13: STAP supports the need to use the Samoa example to better identify the global environmental benefits of marine resources and defining the role of GEF in climate change adaptation
8. Suggest that AusAID papers such as Pacific 2020 (may 2006) and AusAID's 'Valuing Pacific Fish' (November 2007) reports be referred to also.
9. p. 23: FFA should also be included among the regional agencies
10. p. 35: M&E: not clear what the parameters of success for PAS will be. Will they be mainly the amount of and efficiency of GEF and co-financing achieved? Or the on the ground success of projects? And how will attribution of success between PAS and component partners and implementing country/regional agencies be made?
11. Sections 5 and 6: these are somewhat repetitive. STAP suggests that these sections be recut so as to clarify the arrangements
12. Location of the PAS secretariat: is this to be at GEFSec in Washington and has any thought been given to locating it in the region, including in Australia or NZ with NZAid or AusAID?

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
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"> (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 <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>