

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 11, 2011

Screener: Douglas Taylor

Panel member validation by: Meryl Williams
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 4658

PROJECT DURATION :

COUNTRIES : Russian Federation

PROJECT TITLE: ARCTIC Integrated adaptive management of the West Bering Sea Large Marine Ecosystem in a Changing Climate

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: UNOPS

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): **Consent**

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the project on Integrative Adaptive Management of the West Bering Sea Large Marine Ecosystem in a changing climate. This foundation project applies the standard LME TDA/SAP process to one of the LMEs in the Arctic, so in general UNDP have applied a standard project design, but have provided innovative analysis of the problems of a strongly climate change influenced region. Thus, from a scientific viewpoint, the PIF is commendable, subject to the need for better data that is stated to be a general issue in the region.

Component 3 (Targeted demonstration projects) of the project is too vague and reads more like a PFD description. This section should be made more precise in the full project brief, and STAP offers to peer review the design of these projects prior to CEO endorsement.

Governance concerns are again an issue, i.e. what is the likelihood that the project manages to establish a future regional joint management framework for the natural resources of the LME for the future?

The gender equity statement indicates that suitable attention will be paid to gender audit, analysis and intervention design.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
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.
3. Major revision	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

required	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.
-----------------	--