

# 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 28, 2013

Screener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Brian Huntley  
Consultant(s): Douglas Taylor

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT**    **GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 5171

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Indonesia

**PROJECT TITLE:** Coral Reef Rehabilitation and Management Program-Coral Triangle Initiative, Phase III (COREMAP-CTI III)

**GEF AGENCIES:** ADB

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (MMAF)

**GEF FOCAL AREA:** Biodiversity

### 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. The project proposal (PIF) for COREMAP-CTI III is broadly welcomed by STAP, which considers it to be consistent with the original outline for the sequencing of assistance to Indonesia's coral managers. Evaluations of the first two phases appear to indicate that the fundamentals of community-based management have been achieved across the target of over 400 communities; nevertheless evaluation of the conservation outcomes anticipated provides a more mixed picture. STAP observes that the PIF contains support for actions, including baseline surveys that might have been expected to have been completed in earlier phases, and also significant support for conservation-based livelihood development with significant implications for spatial and economic planning.
2. In related projects, within the GEF Pacific Alliance for Sustainability Program project cohort, the "Ridge to Reef" concept is being applied to more coherently consider land/coastal interactions and also the need for benefit transfers. The proponents are encouraged to consider closer scientific and technical coherence between that program and this project and the learning objectives that could be shared.
3. There are several points which if addressed would improve the project design and its likely impact, for this reason STAP recommends Minor Revision and requests that the proponents consider the following advice aimed at improving both design and delivery of the proposed project and further requests that the full project brief adequately responds to the advice provided.

Component 1, Institutional strengthening

4. The baseline Marine Protected Area (MPA) biodiversity surveys and monitoring systems proposed under Component 1.1 should be designed to address the design deficit noted under COREMAP Phase II, namely that general controls (baseline data on reefs outside the project area) were not part of the original design, which impeded evaluation of the impact of MPA management
5. The participatory planning process is vaguely described relative to the spatial and temporal challenges described. Integrated Coastal Management and Integrated Water Resource Management approaches are used extensively within GEF project practice, using baseline information to determine options for management which are fed into participatory planning. Please clarify whether the participatory planning undertaken to date is actually informed by a satisfactory baseline status analysis of relevant coastal catchments, to avoid impacts outside of the control of the participating communities to manage. In this connection Component 2 describes ecosystem-based resource management being

applied to "new areas", therefore STAP suggests that there is a case for re-examining existing management regimes developed under Phases I and II and applying the updated approach accordingly.

#### Component 2, Ecosystem based resource management

6. STAP welcomes the application of ecosystem based management principles to coral reefs and related ecosystems, but is uncertain how the sub-components and approach set out in this Component are to be sequenced/programmed and its linkage to current CBD/GEF guidance regarding Marine Spatial Planning (MSP). MSP offers a strategic viewpoint which is capable of resolving conflicting uses by spatially planning activities and determining different zones for different uses, or the need to balance development and conservation by spatially planning and zoning according to objectives (conservation, economic development, maintaining existing uses, etc.). STAP advises the program proponents to consider the guidance offered through the joint GEF/CBD publication on Marine Spatial Planning in order to maximize the potential of the ICM/IWRM approaches planned within this Component, which may have to accommodate changed pressures on related ecosystems to reflect uses of natural resources to support alternative livelihoods.

7. The proposal to introduce new measures to monitor and measure marine ecosystem health and climate resilience is essential to reporting on biodiversity/climate change resilience benefits of the project. The approaches and methodology, including the selection of ecosystem components to be measured, should be described, along with the results and an evaluation of monitoring activities from project Phases I and II in the full project brief.

#### Component 3, Development of conservation-based livelihood and economy

8. As mentioned under Components 1 and 2 STAP advises careful attention to forward looking support for strategic planning to build sufficient resilience regarding the alternative uses envisaged, otherwise unanticipated pressures may intrude into space that has been over Phase I and II of the COREMAP developing community-based management towards management objectives that may not be sustainable. In particular, the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF) and related guidance from the Network for Aquaculture Centres in Asia-Pacific for sustainable aquaculture, should be utilized to set baselines and outcomes capable of evaluation.

#### Risks.

9. Ad-hoc coastal development is judged by STAP to be a high level risk rather than medium; mainstreaming of MPA objectives into programs for the economic development and production sectors should rather consider using Marine Spatial Planning to look ahead in time and space and anticipate the full range of likely scenarios including mining, oil and gas production, land-sea interactions and demographic change.

#### References

- The Network for Aquaculture Centres in Asia-Pacific. <http://www.enaca.org/>
- FAO Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries. No. 5. Rome, FAO. 1997. 40p.
- Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel GEF (2012). Marine Spatial Planning in the Context of the Convention on Biological Diversity: A study carried out in response to CBD COP 10 decision X/29, Montreal, Technical Series No. 68, 44 pages

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved.  Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.  Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency: (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.  Follow-up:

<p>(i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP.</p> <p>(ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</p>
--