

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: January 31, 2012

Screener: Douglas Taylor

Panel member validation by: Meryl Williams; Thomas Lovejoy
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 4505

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Peru

PROJECT TITLE: Strengthening Sustainable Management of the Guano Islands, Islets and Capes National Reserve System (RNSIIPG)

GEF AGENCIES: World Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Peruvian Trust Fund for National Parks and Protected Areas (PROFONANPE), National Service of Protected Areas (SERNANP)

GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity

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 broadly welcomes the proposed project to strengthen sustainable management of the RNSIIPG complex of islands, islets and capes of Peru, and in particular welcomes the intention to link the project with other GEF investments, notably the regional Chile-Peru project 'Towards ecosystem management of the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem' (GEF ID 3749) and the Peru-focused 'Strengthening Biodiversity Conservation through the National Protected Areas Program' (GEF ID 2693). However, STAP finds the present PIF weak in regard to sustainable fisheries measures (see details below).

STAP notes the intention of the proponents of the project to link baseline work in the three pilot protected areas within Peru cited in the Humboldt Current project 3749 to the present project recognizing also that the linkage between the two marine/coastal projects indicates that transboundary collaboration is essential regarding not only designation but also management of MPAs and associated areas.

STAP welcomes the scientific and technical measures proposed within the PIF to research the interactions between artisanal fishing management and offshore fishing with respect to the biological resource base and its dynamics. As indicated in the PIF, the RNSIIPG sits within a complex biophysical environment and management of the RNSIIPG cannot be considered independently of the surrounding marine and coastal zone along the entire Peruvian coast and, in the case of some species, Chilean coast and areas well out into the Pacific ocean. With this in mind, and referring to the project objective, achievement of the proposed outcomes becomes even more dependent upon effective collaboration and coordination across government and civil society. In this regard STAP notes that the executing agency for the project will be National Service of Protected Areas (SERNANP), however, for the linked regional project (GEF ID 3749) the Peruvian counterpart will be the Institute of the Sea (IMARPE). Although IMARPE is mentioned in the current PIF, the PIF should be clearer about how IMARPE responsibilities for transboundary and sub-regional baseline information will influence implementation of the present project.

The Master Plan referred to in the regional Humboldt Current project would be expected to act as a framework for the present project yet the PIF does not mention the plan at all, therefore STAP asks that the forthcoming full project brief deals with this aspect and also clarifies responsibilities regarding sustainability of monitoring and maintenance of datasets relevant to assessment of impact prior to CEO endorsement.

Regarding Component 1, for items a) and b) STAP suggests that capacity strengthening needs to include a focus on development of data that is policy-relevant and industry-recognized both for land and sea interests, to enable reserve-focused and wider 'master plans' to achieve effective buy-in beyond the immediate constituency of the RNSIIPG. It is also important to show how this work benefits from the data and capacities built from the regional Humboldt Current project, e.g. on seamounts, fisheries and intelligence concerning modelling of the potential protected areas that may be propose to augment the present RNSIIPG.

Within Component 2, STAP has certain concerns over fisheries plans that contain few details or examples. In particular:

- the proponents should examine more closely the sustainable management measures briefly sketched out as a number of these appear weak. For example, fisheries co-management that only relies on self-control of fishing effort and community based surveillance, and some other efforts (e.g., value adding) seem designed more to increase the income of the communities rather than to focus as well on conservation. Whereas income is vital, if the returns on use of the resources increase without effective controls on exploitation, then the result will be over-use, rather than sustainable management. In similar vein, elsewhere the PIF claims that the project "would also help to decrease human pressures and threats to RSNPIIG by demonstrating alternatives to the unsustainable fisheries practices" but it gives no examples of what these alternatives might be.

- the proponents should clarify their assumptions about the relationships of the artisanal and industrial fishing communities within Peru, particularly with respect to the proposal in the linked project to achieve at least one certified fishery in the region. The project brief for the Humboldt Current project mentioned that the Peruvian anchoveta industry was entering MSC pre-assessment, i.e. for this major part of the industrial fishing sector. Progress is not evident on the MSC website, although the International Fishmeal and Fishoil Organization has certified the Peruvian anchoveta fishery and the Friends of the Sea have certified one production company for anchoveta. The anchoveta certification processes are therefore mixed. The PIF for the present project indicates that 'third party verification' (aka certification) would be aimed at local consumption, but it is not clear whether it is intended that external certification agencies would be involved. In addition, the vast majority of the market is in export for fishmeal.

- the proponents should examine relevant fisheries certification schemes to ensure advice on certification explicitly addresses the issue of bycatch reduction to protect marine non-target species from fishing. , Firmer data is available now regarding the quantification of certain bycatch. For example, Alfaro-Shigueto et al (2011), estimated through species-based and locality based sampling that tens of thousands of turtles are caught yearly, mainly on longlines and in gill nets. STAP notes that while the issue of bycatch is raised in the regional project, the present PIF is silent on this important marine biodiversity issue.

STAP welcomes the clear distinctions made in the Component 3 section of the PIF regarding monitoring and evaluation and suggests that the use of the GEF METT could usefully be augmented with information provided by the Humboldt Current project International Waters Tracking Tool regarding the marine and coastal stresses relevant to the RNSIIPG, and updated where possible by the projects associated with the present PIF. STAP would also wish to see in the full project brief details of the way in which SERNANP and IMARPE in particular would be expected to collaborate regarding Component 3. Further, Component 3 should include monitoring of the status of the fisheries resources as well as biodiversity, noting that monitoring both of these is going to be challenging. IMARPE is competent in fisheries resource monitoring but its work may need to be augmented for monitoring biodiversity. Similarly under Component 4, and with a view to fostering long term sustainability for the future management of the extensive Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem and associated protected areas, STAP recommends that this Component clearly indicate how scientific and technical duties may be discharged in the long term.

References

Alfaro-Shigueto, et al. 2011. Small-scale fisheries of Peru: A major sink for marine turtles in the Pacific. Journal of Applied Ecology. Volume 48, Issue 6, Pages 1432-1440.

<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	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

required.	<p>that remain open to STAP include:</p> <ul 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 expert to be appointed to conduct this review <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>
3. Major revision required	<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>