

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	11011
Project Title	Mainstreaming Sustainable Marine Fisheries Value Chains into the Blue Economy of the Canary Current and the Pacific Central American Coastal Large Marine Ecosystems
Date of Screening	7 June 2022
STAP member screener	Blake Ratner
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Concur.</p> <p>This PIF proposes to address the overexploitation of marine resources in Canary Current and Pacific Central American Coastal LMEs – where 50% and 56%, respectively, of fishery stocks are collapsed or overexploited). While there are many reasons for the dire condition of marine resources, the proposed project focuses on incentivizing sustainable fisheries production by targeting both demand and supply, combined with verifiable performance monitoring.</p> <p>The PIF clearly explains the many barriers involved in doing so, and how this project plans to overcome them through targeted efforts aimed at transforming the market in favor of sustainably sourced seafood. Reasoning is clear and plausible, given trends that have shown some signs of improvement (e.g., recovering stocks).</p> <p>This project has significant potential for scaling to different geographies that face similar pressures from international & domestic seafood markets. The KM component envisions worldwide distribution of lessons. However, the opportunities for learning based on the specific contrasts and similarities between the two selected LMEs could be more fully elaborated.</p> <p>Information regarding gender, climate risk, stakeholders and their roles are presently gaps, left to be addressed in the PPG phase.</p>

Part I: Project Information B. Indicative Project Description Summary	What STAP looks for	Response
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	<p>The stated project objective is to “mainstream ecological and social aspects of sustainability to foster sustainable fisheries production and improved wellbeing of coastal communities in support of emerging Blue Economies in the Canary Current and the Pacific Central American Coastal LME.”</p> <p>This objective responds to one main problem identified in the PIF – that is that the demand for seafood as a driver for overexploitation of marine resources is exceeding the harvest of marine seafood, which has reached a plateau.</p> <p>The long-term solution is to increase demand and supply of sustainable seafood products. The proposed project contributes to that goal by refining the Global Marine Commodities (GMC) model to include export-oriented and domestic seafood value chains and apply it in industrial and artisanal fisheries in the CCLME and the PCACLME.</p>
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project’s objectives?	Yes.
Outcomes	<p>A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.</p> <p>Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?</p>	No.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Plausible. The PIF details how many metric tons of globally over-exploited fisheries will be moved to more sustainable levels (1,015,000)

		and provides detailed information on how this figure was derived.
Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project. Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?	Logic is clearly articulated.
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
1. Project description. Briefly describe: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)	Is the problem statement well-defined?	Yes. Ample information is provided regarding the condition of fisheries, trends, etc. – both globally and for these two LMEs.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes. Barriers are very well articulated with well-referenced data and recent scientific analyses to support each.
	For multiple focal area projects: does the problem statement and analysis identify the drivers of environmental degradation which need to be addressed through multiple focal areas; and is the objective well-defined, and can it only be supported by integrating two, or more focal areas objectives or programs?	N/A
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Yes. Exceptional synthesis of very recent scientific analyses and insights from complementary project investments.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Yes.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Yes.
	For multiple focal area projects: are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators;	N/A
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	N/A

	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	N/A
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	<p>A project TOC diagram is not presented. However, the project rationale is based upon a conceptual model established in the science literature and visualized in Figure 7, which argues that certification schemes alone are inadequate to shift market dynamics.</p> <p>Other tools and instruments such as labeling, buyers' roundtables, seafood responsible procurement policies, information/ratings, etc. provide market signals that motivate buyers and sellers of seafood to select sustainably sourced products. The PIF acknowledges the many barriers that may prevent this from happening and this project seeks to address some of them</p>
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	<p>Increased demand for sustainable seafood products from CCLME and PACA + increased supply of sustainable seafood products from CCLME and PACA + KM will lead to reduced pressure on exploited fisheries by support for sustainable alternatives.</p> <p>The alternative scenario suggests that this project will contribute to the global effort to transform the seafood market through increased supply and demand of sustainable marine commodities, thus leading to rebounding fish stocks as well as marine biodiversity in general.</p>
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	<p>For both the demand and supply components as well as Component 3 on KM, many activities and outputs are detailed and connected to one or more of the barriers outlined previously.</p> <p>For example, to address the barrier of limited demand from wholesalers and retailers for sustainably sourced seafood, a set of socially</p>

		responsible seafood standards will be developed, guidance and technical assistance will be provided for sourcing policies, among other activities.
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	<p>The mechanisms are plausible; however, underlying assumptions are not explicitly noted. Many such assumptions may be inferred based upon the detailed rationale for the approach described under each component outcome.</p> <p>A detailed TOC that includes assumptions and various causal pathways would be helpful to develop during PPG phase. See STAP's Theory of Change primer.</p>
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	Again, these may be inferred from the detailed rationale for the approach described under each component outcome. The risks and mitigation measures also suggest potential adaptations to respond to political conditions, implementing capacities, etc.
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing	GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?	Reasoning is clear and plausible, given trends that have shown some signs of improvement (e.g., recovering stocks).
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	N/A
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits, and are they measurable?	Yes.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Yes.
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits	Yes.

	will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Identified as a risk / mitigation task to be completed during PPG stage. Not yet detailed.
7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up	Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?	Related efforts to transform the seafood market have existed for some time. However, efforts to refine the GMC model and to adapt and test it to new conditions has the potential to accelerate market transformation.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Yes. This project has significant potential for scaling to different geographies that face similar pressures from international & domestic seafood markets. The KM component envisions worldwide distribution of lessons. However, the opportunities for learning based on the specific contrasts and similarities between the two selected LMEs could be more fully elaborated.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Incremental as it contributes to the larger, global objective of sustainable seafood market transformation.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Maps of both the CCLME and PACA are included; they lack geo-coordinates.
2. Stakeholders. Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities.	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Good breadth of stakeholders identified, covering government agencies, industry associations and fishers' networks. A useful STAP reference for multi-stakeholder dialogue can be found here .

<p>If none of the above, please explain why.</p> <p>In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.</p>		
	<p>What are the stakeholders' roles, and how will their combined roles contribute to robust project design, to achieving global environmental outcomes, and to lessons learned and knowledge?</p>	<p>For most of the participating countries in each of the LMEs, the main stakeholders are Ministries, as well as fisheries-related associations or organizations. Roles are either direct participation or to be engaged/consulted as project progresses. The PPG phase will involve a stakeholder analysis of the target seafood chains to help refine the list of stakeholders and their respective roles.</p>
<p>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.</p> <p>Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis). Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? Yes/no/tbd.</p> <p>If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality: access to and control over resources;</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Given the wide range of countries involved in this proposed project, gender roles vary considerably. During the PPG, a gender analysis will be prepared to better understand the gender specific conditions related to barriers for women's participation.</p> <p>More importantly, the gender analysis will consider how to improve women's access to benefits that may result from implementation of various aspects of this project.</p>

<p>participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services. Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /td</p>		
	<p>Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?</p>	<p>This will be included in the gender plan.</p>
<p>5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design</p>	<p>Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control? Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project? For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately? • Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed? • Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with? • What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures? 	<p>Yes. Risks are well identified and, importantly, include aspects on gender equality, indigenous peoples and workers' rights. More detail is needed regarding climate risk and this will be prepared during PPG phase.</p>
<p>6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives</p>	<p>Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?</p>	<p>Yes. This PIF displays a very good understanding of previous and ongoing related projects in this area.</p>
	<p>Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?</p>	<p>The PIF recognizes previous and ongoing related projects and it is clear from the detailed analysis of barriers that lessons have been learned regarding sustainable seafood market transformation including the many barriers that exist on both the supply and demand side.</p>

	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Yes.
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	A terminal evaluation for the UNDP global sustainable supply chains for marine commodities (GMC) project found the GMC model to be highly effective and highly replicable and that it be applied to other fishery scenarios, which is proposed under this project.
	Is there an adequate mechanism to feed the lessons learned from earlier projects into this project, and to share lessons learned from it into future projects?	Yes.
8. Knowledge management. Outline the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, and how it will contribute to the project's overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.	What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?	Component 3 is solely focused on knowledge management with aims to enhance existing open-access information platforms and develop new ones, as well as developing guidance and tools, outreach efforts, etc. The high diversity in political systems (noted in the Stakeholders section) merits attention as a focus for comparison and learning.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	Component 3 (platforms, websites, etc.)

Notes

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
<p>1. Concur</p>	<p>STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. 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.</p>
	<p>* In cases where the STAP acknowledges the project has merit on scientific and technical grounds, the STAP will recognize this in the screen by stating that <i>“STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal and encourages the proponent to develop it with same rigor. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design.”</i></p>
<p>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:</p>
	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;</p>
	<p>(ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent 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 issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p>
	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required. 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>