

# 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: May 16, 2016  
Screener: Lev Neretin  
Panel member validation by: Jakob Granit  
Consultant(s): Stephen Olsen

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9433
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Madagascar
PROJECT TITLE:	S3MR Sustainable Management of Madagascar's Marine Resources
GEF AGENCIES:	WWF-US and World Bank
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Environment, Ecology, Oceans and Forests; Ministry of Living Marine Resources and Fisheries; WCS; Blue Ventures
GEF FOCAL AREA:	Multi Focal Area

### 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 issues to be considered during project design**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

1. The purpose of the project is defined as follows: "The Program aims to reverse the current trend of continued degradation of marine and coastal biodiversity together with the closely related decline in fisheries and other valuable maritime resources". Specifically, the program aims to: (i) Develop and implement detailed MPA, LMMA and fisheries planning in critical seascapes; (ii) Strengthen biodiversity and fisheries policy and legislation within the framework of a multi-sectoral blue economy; (iii) Expand and consolidate the MPA and LMMA networks in key seascapes; and (iv) Improve priority small-scale fisheries and increase the economic and social benefits that they provide." To achieve these objectives the program proposes two child projects: MPA network development and, Improved small-scale fisheries.
2. This program proposal begins with a description of the multiple investments made by the GEF in the region and the additional ongoing and anticipated support for the management of Madagascar's marine resources. The PFD proposes to build off two decades' of GEF initiatives and to support actions from the European Union, USA, Germany, France and others, regionally funded activities through the IOC, and private sources that include a range of private foundations. Key GEF initiatives include the ASCLME, WIOLAB, and SWIOFP efforts. The proposal states that these projects and programs present "an often piecemeal approach missing opportunities for coordination among ministries, organizations, and funding efforts". The proposal therefore calls for investing in "coordination, synergy, and sustainability for a more integrated and strengthened management of marine resources".
3. The context within which the proposed activities will be carried out is challenging. As described (pages 33-34) "the fisheries sector is hampered by a weak institutional and legal framework. The Ministry of Aquatic Resources and Fisheries, which comprises over 40 separate directorates, services and agencies, is responsible for the fisheries sector, while other Government agencies are responsible for related activities (e.g. the Ministry of Environment and Forests administers environmental regulation and marine protected areas planning, and the Prime Minister's office oversees Integrated Coastal Zone Management). All these agencies suffer from a lack of human, technical and financial resources but also from high staff management

turnover. The policy and legal framework governing the sector is ambiguous and outdated. The national sector strategy expired in 2008 and, despite renewed commitment to updating and coordinating the fisheries policy framework, the preparation of updated sector-wide legislation is showing little progress and lacks consensus among stakeholders. The recent National Development Plan (2015-2019) underlines the lack of a Fisheries Law and its implementing legislation essential to enable the development of a consistent legal framework for sustainable fisheries."

4. One of the many issues is that the fisheries sector's legal production is estimated as only double that of the illegal catch. Fisheries institutions are weak and capacity to address such problems is inadequate. How the high incidence of illegal fishing will be addressed by MPAs and efforts to improve the fisheries value chain is not addressed. For these reasons the overall risk rating is classified as Substantial for both preparation and implementation of the project.

5. Despite such challenges the project does not attempt to prioritize or discuss how the actions taken through the two child projects will be sequenced. The proposal repeatedly makes reference to learning from past experience and capitalizing on the results of previous and on-going initiatives in Madagascar and the region. For example, the proposal recognizes that local support for marine protected areas is contingent on increased revenues from fisheries and additional resource utilization activities generated, for example, by ecotourism. Given that fishery resources continue to decline while the coastal population dependent on fisheries increases, there should be some indication of what strategies the project will adopt to generate such support and generate improvements in the fisheries value chain. What has been learned from market chain strengthening that can be applied at the focal sites of this project? These are not superfluous details but should be at the core of this project's design.

6. Rather than presenting strategic responses to classical fisheries related management challenges tuned to the features of the focal sites the project briefly enumerates the features of generic responses to the highly complex and area-specific issues in the selected focal sites. These responses are so broadly defined that they would apply to almost any site where fishery habitats are degraded and overfishing is rampant and poverty prevails in coastal communities.

7. There is no attempt to enumerate the enabling conditions most critical to the success of this project and to assess the degree to which they are present at project inception. Evidence of commitment and capacity to achieve the necessary forms of collaboration among the ministries and multiple donors are not offered. The table of risks identifies major uncertainties but appears to assume that they can and will be overcome through currently available mechanisms. The structure and mechanisms for coordination (page 24) among child projects simply assumes that regular information exchange will suffice.

8. Therefore, one of the important success factors for this program would be an establishment of the effective institutional coordination mechanisms both at the national level and between project components managed by two program agencies (WWF and WB). The PFD lists a range of interventions and financing for channeling information and expertise to local and regional institutions and communities. However, STAP notes that higher-level coordination and information flow is insufficient, particularly when it comes to the development of MPAs and fisheries management plans. STAP encourages project proponents to explore stronger program links with the National Integrated Coastal Development Commission as a basis for future development of the national and regional marine spatial plans. How this program would advance earlier ASCLME efforts and MPA and LLMA and fisheries management plans towards nationally coordinated marine spatial planning framework has to be explored during program preparation. An MSP framework is the best suited planning tool to start reconciling interests of commercial fishing fleets and small-scale coastal fisheries.

9. Policies targeting small-scale fisheries should be closely aligned with national strategies and measures supporting local socio-economic development, poverty alleviation and food security. Small-scale fisheries value chain including pre-harvest, fishing and post-harvest activities are closely related to social and economic development of local communities, including gender aspects. There is a need in the program to support collection and use of socio-economic data (livelihoods data) on small-scale fisher folks in the country to inform policy and institutional building.

10. The knowledge management system is a generic listing of KM attributes that could be applied anywhere. A KM system that targets the issues addressed by this project and serves to inform and enrich a self assessment system designed to track progress towards project goals and objectives and capture learning would be highly beneficial and a better approach to be considered in further preparation of the program.

11. Madagascar is ranked among tropical countries with high climate vulnerability and the lowest climate adaptive capacity. Some studies suggest that if current fishing trends continue, significant declines in small-scale fisheries nationwide would happen within the next 10-20 years (Le Manach, F., Gough, C., Harris, A., Humber, F., Harper, S., Zeller, D., 2012. Unreported fishing, hungry people and political turmoil: the recipe for a food security crisis in Madagascar? Mar. Policy 36, 218–225). There is an urgent need to start building small-scale fisheries resilience at the regional, national and local levels. Small-scale fisheries sustainability and community resilience are closely connected. This aspect in the program is poorly developed across all project components and has to be strengthened. STAP recommends using its recently

released guidance on project and program level resilience in the development of small-scale fisheries policies and plans in the program. Guidance document - O'Connell, D., Abel, N., Grigg, N., Maru, Y., Butler, J., Cowie, A., Stone-Jovicich, S., Walker, B., Wise, R., Ruhweza, A., Pearson, L., Ryan, P., Stafford Smith, M. (2016). "Designing projects in a rapidly changing world: Guidelines for embedding resilience, adaptation and transformation into sustainable development projects. (Version 1.0)". Global Environment Facility, Washington, D.C. - is available at: <http://www.stapgef.org/the-resilience-adaptation-and-transformation-assessment-framework/>. Some aspects of this framework are also relevant for program Component 1 aimed at the expansion of MPA and LMMAs.

12. In summary, this proposal would be much strengthened if it featured a process for the documentation of baseline social/environmental/governance conditions at each of the focal sites at the inception of the program/projects and then constructed an M&E and lesson learned process designed to promote the sharing of experience and the collaborative generation of lessons learned. Such an approach would document progress and setbacks as they unfold at each site and at the national level and would reveal how best to build capacity where the needs are greatest.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Concur</b>	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.
<b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	<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>
<b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b>	<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>