

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: 5 March 2008

Screener: Douglas Taylor, STAP Secretary

Panel member validation by: Meryl Williams

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

Full size project **GEF Trust Fund**

GEFSEC PROJECT ID¹: 3619

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 604958

COUNTRY(IES): Malaysia², Philippines, Indonesia, Vietnam², Cambodia², Papua New Guinea², Thailand²

PROJECT TITLE: Strategies for Fisheries Bycatch Management

GEF AGENCY(IES): FAO

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): National fisheries authorities, Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC)

GEF FOCAL AREA (S): International Waters

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): SP1 Marine Fisheries (Restoring and Sustaining Coastal and Marine Fish Stocks and Associated Biological Diversity)

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: Coral Triangle Initiative (CTI)

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):
Consent

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. This is an important project on a major environmental issue.
3. It is not clear how links to the consumer will be made and this should be an active part of the project, not just presumed to follow-on. Consumers will be a wide group – national and international to the fishing country. Some supply chain analysis will be needed to determine this. A fisheries post harvest expert would not necessarily deliver this side of the analysis – a marketing/supply chain expert would be better.
4. Risks: risk mitigation efforts will need to be more specific. The risk statements are comprehensive but the main mitigation given is that the comprehensive approach will accommodate the risks. In reality, the market demand for fisheries product is very high and this is a very strong lure for illegal fishing and disincentive for uptake of more environmentally friendly practices. More explicit planning will be needed to address some of the risks.
5. The Project could benefit from also studying the level of uptake of results and impact. SEAFDEC, FAO and government technical projects have, in the past, not resulted in strong conservation outcomes in the fisheries sector.
6. Baseline information would be expected to come from existing fisheries survey data and statistics, though fishing gear surveys are not as comprehensive as fisheries resource surveys

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 (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 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.

¹ Project ID number will be assigned initially by GEFSEC.

² Letters of endorsements to follow

3. Major revision required	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. 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.
-----------------------------------	--