

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: 10 March 2009

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Meryl Williams

I. PIF Information *(Paste here from the PIF)*

Full size project **GEF Trust Fund**

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3639

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: PIMS NO. 4164

COUNTRY(IES): Global

PROJECT TITLE: GEF IW:LEARN: Portfolio Learning in International Waters with a Focus on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands and Regional Asia/Pacific and Coral Triangle Learning Processes

GEF AGENCY(IES): UNDP, AsDB, (select)

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): UNOPS

GEF FOCAL AREA (S): International Waters,(select), (select)

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): Strategic Objectives 1 and 2; cross-cutting across all 4 IW Strategic Priorities

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: ASIA CORAL TRIANGLE

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. This FSP is a valuable contribution to the multi-level capacity building initiatives of IW:Learn, specifically focusing on the sectoral/network level (ocean, freshwater, marine and coastal management). Recognizing that capacity building occurs at the individual, organizational, sectoral/network and broader system level, however, STAP questions whether sufficient attention is yet being paid to the broader system level. Internationally, this level would equate to the global instruments, such as JPOI and the MDGs and this is well catered for. Nationally and regionally, however, impediments to adoption of integrated and ecosystem based management of aquatic system management abound, mainly due to lack of conducive enabling environments. Specifically, the weak enabling environment is often due to a lack of political national priority to aquatic environment issues and/or lack of relative priority of the environment against growth of certain industries. The project brief should also address this key implementation issue of how to achieve stronger enabling environments at the broader system level nationally and regionally. In addition, section F (Indicate risks...) should acknowledge this lack of attention/priority to the sector as a risk.
3. The project brief should address how the success of the FSP will be evaluated. Because this is a major capacity building exercise at the sectoral level, many of the measures will be soft measures and will require assessment of attendance numbers and quality/appropriateness of people attending the various events and their structured views on how they have benefited from involvement. The project brief should briefly address how the project will establish prior measures of success, such as appropriate target co-sponsorship levels, numbers and types of experts attending the various events, and, to address the point above, extent to which higher level bodies/decision makers in countries and regions give attention to the aquatic resource conservation issues.

| 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. | 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: (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>(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> <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. Major revision required</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> |