

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 07, 2014

Screener: Douglas Taylor

Panel member validation by: Jakob Granit
Consultant(s): Stophen Olsen

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 5768

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Regional (Indonesia, Timor Leste)

PROJECT TITLE: Enabling Transboundary Cooperation for Sustainable Management of the Indonesian Seas

GEF AGENCIES: FAO

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (MoMAF) or Indonesia
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAF) or Timore Leste

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):
Minor revision required

III. Further guidance from STAP

1. This project sits within a wider context of GEF investments focused on the Coral Triangle area, coordinated under the Coral Triangle Initiative (CTI) program (GEF ID 3647), and within which both Indonesia and Timor-Leste participate to varying degrees.
2. The present project proposal has received very constructive and sound advice from the GEF Secretariat regarding project design during PIF preparation and STAP's screening report aims to complement that earlier advice.
3. STAP's concern is principally that the PIF can be read as two separate projects; one that sets up a TDA/SAP for the ISLME and another that is formulated, apparently independently of possible TDA/SAP outcomes, to address fisheries issues. If the project proponent is convinced that sufficient baseline information already exists for ISLME fishery-related issues to be addressed (which STAP believes is indeed the case), then STAP's advice would be to invest instead direct in essential baseline data acquisition, capacity building and stakeholder participation to address more narrowly the fisheries problems directly and not put resources into a broader TDA/SAP that may not be adequately resourced by the present project proposal. The following advice is set out under two options, either sharpen the focus on fisheries or invest more effort in the TDA/SAP to arrive at a comprehensive assessment and SAP which addresses issues (including fisheries) within a broader ridge to reef context.

Option "refocus and target the project towards fisheries

4. STAP suggests sharpening the focus of components 1 and 2 on the fisheries related issues. It will be essential however, that the fisheries related issues remain nested in the larger ridge-to-reef ecosystem perspective. The GEF investment needs to be strategic and focused through strengthening the connections between the components and relying on Component 1 to strengthen the TDA/SAP analysis so that it focuses the activities undertaken in the Components 2 and 3 on actions with the highest potential to generate traction on fisheries related issues.

Option "strengthen the TDA/SAP coverage towards sustainable "ridge to reef" management

5. In general STAP's main suggestion is that the intervention logic regarding the concept for the Indonesian Seas LME (ISLME) should be revised and also clarified to accommodate a more open TDA/SAP approach, supported by the building of capacity, transboundary dialogue and cooperation and, once the SAP is adopted, invest in the agreed actions. Currently the PIF identifies in Component 1 a relatively conventional TDA/SAP development cycle, resulting in a SAP for the ISLME, which STAP fully supports, because, as described in the PIF the root causes of concern are essentially land-based or regulatory, and logically all aspects of coastal development (ridge to reef), social and political drivers, governance as well as ecological status of the coastal and marine environment would require attention within a TDA.

6. However, Components 2 and 3 do not connect effectively to Component 1. Component 2 would make more sense if it was a foundational investment in capacity building towards Component 1, but no mention of this is included. Instead Component 2 responds directly to issues identified in the problem analysis and barriers to be removed. Component 3.2, does address the necessary outreach and knowledge sharing required for effective SAP implementation, but Component 3.1 appears to selectively jump ahead to tackle IUU and open ocean issues, but does not mention coordination and monitoring of, for example, coastal development, deforestation, land degradation and sources of pollution, energy infrastructure development, any or all of which may be priority targets arising from a SAP.

7. Regarding scientific and technical aspects of the proposal, STAP largely welcomes the analysis of the problems, causes and barriers in the PIF, which highlight a huge mismatch in capacities and practices between the two countries within the same LME. The PIF mentions the potential of marine spatial planning to help resolve the complexities of existing poorly or unplanned development. Certainly if the concept of MSP is adopted, which is part of our advice, at all levels of government it would enable the outlines to be seen of major national infrastructural opportunities and constraints regarding oil and gas, ports and major coastal developments, and key changes likely in the coastal catchments. Then at more local scale, forest-friendly aquaculture, point sources of pollution and tourism development could be seen in a more logical context. There would also be further opportunities to link MSP to land use planning move towards a solid ridge to reef approach.

8. The project could be more explicit about this opportunity within Component 2, especially using to the maximum, advice and support from GEF-supported projects in the region. See for example the recent Introduction to Marine Spatial Planning, published by the Coral Triangle Initiative (November 2013).

9. Finally, independent of the results of project preparation phase in terms of re-focussing the project STAP would like to stress the importance to address the longer term sustainability of the investment. STAP refers to the findings and recommendations in the 2012 GEF Impact Evaluation of the GEF in the South China Sea and adjacent areas and supports the recommendation in the evaluation report that GEF projects should clearly define the role and linkages of regional mechanism/s as it relates to the longer term implementation of common activities of the two countries. STAP recommends that the preparation phase should include a regional governance baseline analysis that assesses the regional institutional frameworks and how best to synchronize national and regional concerns, incentives and benefits to create buy in at both the national and regional levels for cooperation.

References:

Charles N. Ehler. An Introduction to Marine Spatial Planning, November 2013. Coral Triangle Initiative on Coral Reefs, Fisheries, and Food Security

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (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

GEF (Global Environment Facility) (2012) Impact Evaluation of the GEF in the South China Sea and Adjacent Areas. Washington, D.C.: Evaluation Office, Global Environment Facility.

Sanderbaum, F., & Granit, J. (2014). The Political Economy of Regionalism: The Relevance for International Waters and the Global Environment Facility: A STAP Issues Paper. Global Environment Facility, Washington, D.C.

<i>response</i>	
1. Consent	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
2. Minor revision required.	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>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.</p>
3. Major revision required	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>Follow-up: (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. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</p>