

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 16, 2009

Screener: Douglas Taylor, STAP Secretary

Panel member validation by: Meryl Williams

I. PIF Information *(Paste here from the PIF)*

Full size project **GEF Trust Fund**

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3862

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 4205

COUNTRY: Argentina

PROJECT TITLE: Strengthening fisheries governance to protect freshwater and wetland biodiversity in Argentina

GEF AGENCY: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Secretariat of the Environment and Sustainable Development (SAyDS), and the Sub-secretariat of Fisheries (SAGPYA). Associated partners are Buenos Aires, Entre Ríos, Formosa, Chaco, Misiones, Corrientes and Santa Fe States.

GEF FOCAL AREAS: Biodiversity

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): SO2 SP4/5 (with benefits to SO1 SP3)

II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

1. Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):
Consent

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP is pleased to recognize a project on freshwater BD conservation, an area that is often overlooked in the GEF portfolio.
3. The catchment/ecosystem approach proposed is commendable together with the well connected policy and regulatory frameworks that have been proposed at least within the fish/agriculture/protected area related authorities. While the basin wide approach and the development of the Parana Delta Integrated Strategic Plan (PIECAS) appear to be excellent tools with strong institutional support, it is less clear how the authorities responsible for water and energy management will be involved regarding negotiations regarding flow management, which could independently impact the favourable conservation status otherwise achieved through spatial planning tools. The proposal mentions the links with the Ramsar Convention strategic guidelines for Argentina and the intention to connect this within a regional wetland strategy for Paraná-Paraguay; it would be helpful to show how the delivery of the PIECAS for example can be assured through support for the regional approach that is mentioned.
4. The proposal mentions the increasing importance of fisheries to food security and the need to create alternative, economically attractive livelihoods, of which tourism fishing may be suitable. STAP also urges the proponents to take women's and whole household livelihoods as well as men's into account in studies of current dependencies and alternative approaches.
5. With respect to risks, STAP notes that risk to fisheries and freshwater biodiversity, including Ramsar sites, due to increases in upstream water development projects is not mentioned. Given the migratory nature of many key fish species and the dependence of all on certain flow regimes, this should also be included in the risk statement.

<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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (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

	<p>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 revision required</p>	<p>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 submission of the project brief for CEO endorsement.</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>