

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: March 15, 2016
Screener: Lev Neretin
Panel member validation by: Jakob Granit
Consultant(s): Douglas Taylor

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9360
PROJECT DURATION:	4.5
COUNTRIES:	Regional (Guinea, Liberia, Sierra Leone)
PROJECT TITLE:	West Africa Regional Fisheries Program, Additional Financing
GEF AGENCIES:	World Bank
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission (Commission Sous-Regionale des Pêches, CSR), Guinea Ministry of Fisheries and Aquaculture (MPA), Liberia Bureau of National Fisheries (BNF) within the Ministry of Agriculture
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

The proposed Project Development Objective is to secure fish supplies to targeted communities and improve governance and sustainable management of targeted fisheries. STAP welcomes this project and strongly supports the strategy for the additional GEF financing to the ongoing World Bank project activities that are demonstrating results towards establishing and improving sustainable fisheries in the region. There is a strong rationale to utilize GEF funding for projects addressing the most vulnerable communities that have been severely affected by the Ebola epidemic. Such a strategy is not common for GEF financing but it is supported by STAP.

The identified linkages to the two other GEF financed LME projects demonstrate that the project proponents seek complementarity with the ongoing projects in the region. In addition, the importance of creating an enabling environment (good governance) through building institutions at the national and regional levels and supporting fisheries management activities is noted and supported by STAP. The supplemental activities focusing on achieving tangible results for fishermen are welcome too. Table 1 illustrating both original and AF project activities and costs is instructive and provides a strong logic to the PID.

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
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

	<p>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.</p>
<p>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</p>	<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. (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>
<p>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</p>	<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>