

# 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 21, 2012

Screeener: Douglas Taylor

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

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4746

**PROJECT DURATION :** 4

**COUNTRIES :** Regional (Cook Islands, Fiji, Micronesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Palau, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Samoa)

**PROJECT TITLE:** Implementation of Global and Regional Oceanic Fisheries Conventions and Related Instruments in the Pacific Small Island Developing States (SIDS)

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNDP and FAO

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA);  
Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)

**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): **Consent**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

1. STAP welcomes this well written project proposal, which amongst other regional initiatives, builds upon the foundational work of the Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project (GEF ID 2131). The PIF appears to be responsive to the terminal evaluation of that project and builds in the key desirable elements for updating the South Pacific Strategic Action Programme (SPREP, 1997 et seq.) and its implementation within this complex arena of fisheries interests. STAP particularly welcomes the emphasis upon the capacity building and integrated data and information systems (Component 3), and upon knowledge management (Component 4).

2. With the foundational work completed of supporting the Pacific SIDs to collaborate in the founding of the Commission of the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention (WCPFC), the project must now demonstrate that global environmental benefits result from its implementation.

3. The PIF identifies conservation of oceanic fish stocks and the protection of the associated non-target stocks, especially of sharks, seabirds and sea turtles, as the global environmental benefit for this project. To that end section B.2 identifies a detailed listing of actions to be taken including to strengthen foundational aspects of the relevant institutions and to set up monitoring programs, which, STAP emphasizes, should consolidate nationally reliable and regionally credible baseline data sets against which to measure GEBs. The WCPFC Commission itself estimates that some foundational research information that it depends upon is up to 40 years old.

4. STAP suggests that in addition to anticipated results from regional, sub-regional and national institutional strengthening the full project brief should clearly indicate the targets and indicators regarding GEBs to result from the project. These should include longer term targets beyond the life of the project to which the WCPFC Commission is committed.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	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.

<p>2. <b>Minor revision required.</b></p>	<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"> <li>(i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues</li> <li>(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</li> </ul> <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>
<p>3. <b>Major revision required</b></p>	<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>