

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: February 26, 2013

Screeners: 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: 4940

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Regional (Kenya, Comoros, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mozambique, Seychelles, Tanzania, South Africa)

PROJECT TITLE: Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the Protection of the Western Indian Ocean from Land-based Sources and Activities

GEF AGENCIES: UNEP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Nairobi Convention Secretariat, WIO-C Partners: Birdlife International, CORDIO, IUCN, WIOMSA and WWF; COI

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): **Minor revision required**

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes this ambitious (perhaps overly ambitious?) and complex project which has been designed to support implementation of the Strategic Action Program that was adopted by the parties to the Nairobi Convention in 2010 (UNEP/Nairobi Convention 2009). In particular it welcomes the approach to connect coastal and marine governance and management issues with major (transboundary) river basin management efforts in this large region.

Based on earlier investments made, the screening report therefore focuses upon whether the design of the project adequately addresses the objectives set out within the WIO-SAP delivered by the predecessor GEF project WIO-LaB (GEFID 1247), taking into account the extensive dialogue on technical matters between the GEF Secretariat and UNEP during PIF preparation, also the relevant findings of the terminal evaluation report for the WIO-LaB project.

The WIO-SAP promotes a 25 year vision supported by work towards four objectives, thus the present project within its limited five year life would be expected to focus on short-term actions that assure sustainable implementation of the SAP. The results-based indicator framework of the WIO-SAP defines these short-term (until 2015) results.

The project would also be expected to draw upon the regional strengths of the scientific and technical partnerships created during WIO-LaB project activities as well as by other national and regional projects and initiatives operating in the region including for the major transboundary river basins such as the Zambezi and other regional frameworks such as the SADC and the EAC that span the project area. Conceptually, the PIF reflects upon the four environmental quality objectives of the WIO-SAP.

However, the PIF, in proposing its suite of actions to the GEF, appears not to strategically place these proposed activities within the development timeframe of the WIO-SAP, nor to identify the need to prioritize explicitly the proposed actions against the WIO-SAP targets and related indicators. Proposed in the PIF activities in Components A to D in most instances are not aligned with each other and do not utilize potential synergies. Given an extensive network of projects, programs and partners active in the region, activities to be funded by the GEF do not distinguish them qualitatively from other funding agencies. The major advantage of the GEF intervention would be to focus on the incremental regional governance and policy aspects in the four components thereby complementing other ongoing activities on the ground.

To address such strategic alignment of project activities with WIO-SAP goals and utilize catalytic role of the GEF funding, STAP has the following recommendations:

1. In general the activities proposed in Components A-D should stress the common governance, policy, regulatory and analytical tools identified as critical to achieve the outcomes defined in each heading of components. Thereby the proposed project could avoid potential overlaps with other investment programs focused on on the ground activities. Potential linkages with regional cooperative frameworks such as ZAMCOM, SADC and the EAC could be explored to enhance long-term sustainability of project outcomes.
2. Activities proposed in Component A are not properly connected and their cumulative impact seems to be limited. WIO-SAP among short-term priority actions proposes development of marine spatial planning as part of national development plans and strategies. Marine spatial planning is emerging as the most progressive framework for sustainable management of the coastal and marine environment. STAP believes that re-focusing Component A activities so that they specifically support marine spatial planning frameworks at the national and regional levels in the WIO region, would make significant impact on the sustainable development of the coastal and marine environment.
3. In general the mapping of the project components in the PIF Project Framework to their equivalents in the WIO-SAP is clear and STAP notes that some consolidation of the policy aspects has been done drawing together sub-actions in all WIO-SAP sections to be addressed in Component D of the PIF. There are, however, some examples of relevant priority actions within the SAP that do not seem to be addressed in the PIF. These include, in Component A, incentive schemes, public awareness raising, economic valuation; in Component B, establishment of pilot wastewater plants in each country (not just pilot sites), sensitization of stakeholders. These examples are cited to underline the need in the project brief to be more explicit about the mapping of WIO-SAP actions against project actions, to enable strategic gaps to be more clearly expressed and tested against proposed actions. This comment also applies to the relation between the LBSA Protocol implementation needs against the project brief which is discussed further below.
4. The evaluation report on the WIO-LaB project recommended that the utility of the various task forces and expert committees formed for that project should be reviewed by the Nairobi Convention Secretariat. Scientific and technical guidance proposed for the present project appears to be available from a diverse range of partners, but the PIF is not very clear about the legacy role of the WIO-LaB expertise and it would be helpful if the project brief could map the consultative and advisory relationships of scientific and technical focal points to the project components. Furthermore, because of the multiple partners and initiatives addressing project-related goals, it is advisable to establish a consultative group or mechanism aiming at coordinating and aligning donor activities for strategic impact. Under Component D, STAP recommends considering support for such coordination mechanism.
5. The WIO-LaB evaluation report also recommended that a follow-on project should focus on implementation of the WIO-SAP and mainstreaming of activities at the national level to support implementation of the Protocol for the Protection of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Western Indian Ocean from Land-based Sources and Activities (LBSA Protocol), which emphasizes actions to address pollution by particular chemicals and sources. STAP notes that the present PIF addresses more broadly the targets of the WIO-SAP rather than focusing on the Protocol, except for mention in Component D.
6. Component D of the project focuses on selected policy goals (e.g., adoption of the ICZM protocol, ratification of the LBSA protocol) and knowledge exchange and dissemination. Financial sustainability of the WIO-SAP is not addressed while it is recognized in the SAP document itself as a target. STAP recommends that the project proponents consider development of the regional resource mobilization strategy and financial mechanisms supporting SAP implementation.
7. This project as it's written could be seen as a stand-alone and an "end in itself" initiative supporting WIO-SAP implementation while the actual SAP was developed envisioning short-term, medium-term and long-term outcomes. During project preparation, this first integrated project for SAP implementation is the most critical and foundational step for follow-up activities in the WIO region. STAP recommends that project proponents consider and explicitly acknowledge in the project document how proposed activities pave the way for follow-up projects and initiatives.

References

- WIO-SAP. UNEP/Nairobi Convention Secretariat, 2009. Strategic Action Programme for the Protection of the Coastal and Marine Environment of the Western Indian Ocean from Land-based Sources and Activities, Nairobi, Kenya, 140 pp.
- WIO-LaB. Addressing land-based Activities in the Western Indian Ocean, GEFID 1247

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	<p>STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved.</p> <p>Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.</p>
2. Minor revision required.	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.
3. Major revision required	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>Follow-up:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.