

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: May 14, 2013

Screener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: Jakob Granit
Consultant(s): Stephen Olsen

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 5304

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Regional (Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago)

PROJECT TITLE: Sustainable Management of Bycatch in Latin America and Caribbean Trawl Fisheries (REBYC-II LAC)

GEF AGENCIES: FAO

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Fisheries and Aquaculture, Brazil*

Instituto de Investigaciones Marinas y Costeras (INVEMAR), Autoridad Nacional de Acuicultura y Pesca (AUNAP), Colombia

Instituto Costarricense de Pesca y Acuicultura (INCOPESCA), Costa Rica

Instituto Nacional de Pesca (INAPESCA), SecretarÃ-a de Agricultura, GanaderÃ-a, Desarrollo Rural, Pesca y AlimentaciÃ³n (SAGARPA), Mexico**

Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries, Suriname

Fisheries Division of the Ministry of Food Production, Land and Marine Affairs, Trinidad & Tobago

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

1. STAP welcomes this project, as a response to the major, and often intractable, issue of bycatch in trawl fisheries.
2. The PIF presents a thoughtful and accurate description of the bycatch problem in the area of focus, the barriers to more sustainable fisheries and bycatch management and presents a realistic baseline scenario of likely future conditions. This assessment of current and likely future conditions contrasts dramatically with the heroic objectives for this five year project. These include the implementation of cost effective solutions to managing bycatch on at least 25% of the trawlers in the project areas (outcome 2a) and a 30% reduction in "unsustainable bycatch" in all pilot areas (outcome 2b). Another target is that more selective trawl gear, or alternative fishing practices, will be used by half the trawlers in the pilot areas (output 2.5). Given the governance context in the pilot areas achieving these numerical targets is highly unlikely unless the pilot sites (that are not identified) are small and unusually tractable. Nothing is said about the basis for making these numerical targets. There is no reference to other world regions where such outcomes may have been achieved in contexts similar to those in the focal area of this project. These numerical targets should be reconsidered and either justified or scaled back.
3. Enabling conditions for effective bycatch reductions in this document place the emphasis on legislation and institutional arrangements. Yet throughout the region enforcement of existing fisheries regulations is weak and voluntary compliance is low. This makes it especially important to build other critical enabling conditions. A broad base of constituency is essential that actively supports a bycatch reduction initiative. Greater attention should be given

to the challenges of making co-management operational and in building support within the affected fishing industries and artisanal communities that are the foundation for voluntary compliance with fisheries rules and good practices.

4. The value chain analysis may yield viable options for economically viable uses of bycatch. It should not be assumed, however, that significant marketing opportunities will emerge or that they will be acted upon. Assumptions that studies and consultations will produce actionable solutions should be reconsidered.

5. The risk assessment analysis is unrealistic. Since actions designed to reduce bycatch are in the initial stages of development and testing the barriers to the implementation of bycatch reduction strategies are not yet known. The fact that a diversity of stakeholders have been consulted and are willing to participate in this program should not be interpreted to mean that fishers will change their practices.

6. Component 4 that address project management focus on IW:LEARN and as the key vehicle to disseminate lessons learned from the project. What is lacking is a description of the role of the regional fisheries organizations (OSPESCA, OLDESPESCA, CRFM etc.) currently noted as stakeholders. The involvement of such regional organizations as a key partner (with clear and defined roles) would be strategic to build capacity in one or more of these organizations beyond the project period of five years. Such an approach would supplement the engagement of national governments and the FAO as a UN specialized body as well as WWF and the private sector. Considering the large project area and multiple regional fisheries bodies involved a special purpose vehicle to engage several of them could be considered.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	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. 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.
2. Minor revision required.	STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development. Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency: (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	STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design. Follow-up: (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.