

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: October 30, 2017
Screener: Douglas Taylor
Panel member validation by: Ferenc Toth
Consultant(s):

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

FULL-SIZED PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9911
PROJECT DURATION:	3
COUNTRIES:	Regional (Benin, Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Cameroon, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Sao Tome and Principe, Togo, Congo DR)
PROJECT TITLE:	Strengthening of the Enabling Environment, Ecosystem-based Management and Governance to Support Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme of the Guinea Current Large Marine Ecosystem
GEF AGENCIES:	UNEP, FAO, UNDP and UNIDO
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Abidjan Convention Secretariat, Regional Fisheries Bodies, National Authorities
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):
Concur

III. Further guidance from STAP

1. This proposal is a welcome, coordinated and challenging intervention to empower and to equip 16 countries to collaborate, through the emerging Guinea Current Commission (GCC), in delivering against the Strategic Action Plan for the Guinea Current. The baseline projects provide solid foundations for the proposed project. The charts (especially Figs 3 and 4) are commendable in explaining components and structures/outcomes. Coordination will be key to the success, but the plan on p. 30 is convincing and demonstrates the synergistic effect with the World Bank Coastal & Fisheries programs: the targeted advancements will not only bring improvements in upstream regions and river basins but are likely to enhance results of the World Bank projects
2. STAP has no significant concerns about this phase of the support to the GCC and looks forward to the results of implementation of the SAP in due course. Minor suggestions for increasing the value of the proposed work are offered below.
3. STAP suggests that within Component 4 the project could include a conjunctive focus on alien invasive species (IAS) surveillance when conducting hotspot analysis of pollution which, in the case of excess COD/BOD and general nutrient runoff, provides opportunities for aquatic IAS. IAS concentrations, as well as algal blooms, can often be observed through remote sensing and sometimes act as indicators of pollution.
4. Various forms of support to planning are proposed in the project, including related to ICZM. STAP suggests that capacity building could usefully include effort to link geo-spatial planning to policy practice, an

approach which is usually applied to marine spatial planning. More generally capacity to develop spatial planning on a ridge-to-reef basis would be very helpful, in particular to take into account the dynamic aspects of catchments regarding flows and pollution, whether point source or diffuse.

5. STAP fully understands that the connection between coastal and local stakeholders and higher level governance will not be dealt with in this project. Nevertheless, there is an opportunity to design into the project, via Component 3, the future role and connection with governance that a network of Observatories might play in building the inter-sectoral monitoring; this will be needed in future at a regional level, responsive to coastal communities and their observations, taking especial note of regional examples from e.g. the Volta Basin Authority, Senegal River Basin Organization (OMVS) and the Benguela Current Commission. This suggestion flows from barrier number 5 within the PIF: "Absence of functional and effective regional observation system", which should be further explored, and connected with the proposed Outcome 3.2 Operational Regional knowledge-sharing mechanism for decision-making.

6. A technical note: it is difficult to see why points 1-3 are repeated verbatim as points 4-6 in the table in section F. Project's target contribution ... (p. 6).

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Concur	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple "Concur" response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised.</p> <p>(ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to 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>
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP's concerns.</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>