

# 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: October 08, 2011

Screener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: Douglas Taylor; Meryl Williams  
Consultant(s):

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT**    **GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4637

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Brazil

**PROJECT TITLE:** Marine and Coastal Protected Areas (GEF MAR)

**GEF AGENCIES:** World Bank

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Ministry of Environment (MMA), Instituto Chico Mendes de Conservação da Biodiversidade (ICMBio), Fundo Brasileiro para a Biodiversidade (FUNBIO), Petrobras

**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): **Consent**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

1. STAP welcomes this important project by Brazil to establish for the first time a fully evaluated comprehensive system of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas (MCPAs). The project builds onto Brazil's accession not only of the CBD but also of the complementary Ramsar Convention when the first coastal sites were designated in 1993. The project aims to support protection of 5% of Brazil's coastal and marine area of 3.5 million km<sup>2</sup>, although the PIF notes that the policy of CONABIO was that 10% should be protected with an additional 10% within fishing areas. It is not clear from the PIF which of the two targets should prevail. STAP further notes that existing designations by Brazil of coastal and marine areas as Ramsar Sites already amount to 13% of the coastal and marine area (Ramsar Convention Database, accessed September 29, 2011). Therefore the incremental protection afforded by this project is not easy to reconcile with the existing designations and their management plans. The map appended to the PIF appears to indicate that only marine and offshore areas are included, therefore it is unclear whether the onshore wetlands and estuaries are also included within the GEF project area.
2. A strong element of the development of the planned mosaic of protected area comprises ecological assessments of the representativeness of each proposed area; however, the PIF does not mention the intention to establish clear baseline data on biodiversity status which will be necessary amongst many other parameters to contribute to measures of future impact and thus conservation effectiveness.
3. The concept of establishing MPAs for marine and coastal biodiversity conservation is broadly supported but the existing evidence indicates that many MPAs suffer from the following shortcomings: (1) MPAs that by virtue of their small size or poor design are ecologically insufficient; (2) inappropriately planned or managed MPAs; (3) MPAs that fail due to the degradation of the unprotected surrounding ecosystems; (4) MPAs that do more harm than good due to displacement and unintended consequences of management; and (5) MPAs that create an illusion of protection when in fact no protection is occurring (Agardy et al. Marine Policy 35 (2011) 226–232). The above shortcomings might be explored in more detail during project preparation.
4. The PIF suggests a number of actions/policies aimed at establishing appropriate MPA governance structures and interagency coordination, supporting biodiversity monitoring and other measures aimed at integration of multiple management strategies and different categories of protected areas. Because of the existing substantial capacity of Brazil in this area and high complexity of drivers impacting biodiversity in the EEZ of Brazil (both on-land and offshore), STAP recommends that the project proponents explore newer and more innovative models of managing marine space and establishing MPAs through adoption of marine spatial planning framework, tools and practices (<http://www.unesco-ioc-marinesp.be/>).

5. STAP further notes that:

No attention has been paid to the gender dimensions of creating the protected areas.

No attention seems to be given to engaging the NGO community to help define and establish the protected areas and yet there are many working in coastal protection. Petrobas in explicitly engaged, as is appropriate.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. <b>Consent</b>	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. <b>Minor revision required.</b>	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: (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 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.
3. <b>Major revision required</b>	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. 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.