

### STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

|   |   |                 |
|---|---|-----------------|
| <b>Part I: Project Information</b>        | <b>Response</b>   |                 |
| <b>GEF ID</b>                             | 10783   |                 |
| <b>Project Title</b>                      | Pacific Regional Project: Ocean health for Ocean Wealth – the Voyage to a Blue Economy for the Blue Pacific Continent   |                 |
| <b>Date of Screening</b>                  | 22 May 2021   |                 |
| <b>STAP member screener</b>               | Blake Ratner  |                 |
| <b>STAP secretariat screener</b>          | Virginia Gorsevski  |                 |
| <b>STAP Overall Assessment and Rating</b> | <p><b>Concur.</b></p> <p>Very ambitious project building on many other existing GEF and non GEF initiatives, with clear articulation of transformational change sought. Mechanisms of change are plausible but suitably difficult. There is a welcome measure of risk-taking.</p> <p>Includes well-articulated dimensions of innovation. The project has the potential to lead to financial, technological and policy innovations. Much depends on the details to be developed during implementation, and within pilot projects. Regarding innovative financial mechanisms, there is good potential for South-South learning and exchange, for example with proposed project in the Caribbean (GEF ID 10782).</p> <p>Very good articulation of risk mitigation measures. Appropriately high attention to climate change risks. In subsequent design steps, it would be appropriate to further detail climate adaptation aspects of the project design, given the vulnerability of SIDS to climate impacts.</p> <p>Separate COVID-19 risk analysis is exemplary regarding details of adaptive management envisioned during implementation.</p> |                 |
| <b>Part I: Project Information</b>        | <b>What STAP looks for</b>  | <b>Response</b> |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <b>B. Indicative Project Description Summary</b>   |  |   |
| Project Objective  | Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?   | Yes. The objective of this project is “To preserve and safeguard the health of ocean ecosystems while catalyzing the development and growth of sustainable blue economies (SBE) in Pacific Island Countries.”   |
| Project components   | A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project’s objectives?  | Yes.<br><br>Component 1 focuses mainly on “setting the stage” (i.e., undertaking assessments, mapping sectors, developing frameworks, etc.) mainly at the national level though also a regional SBE framework and implementation plan; Component 2 is geared towards developing and implementing SBE pilot projects; Component 3 is focused on a regional knowledge platform; and Component 4 refers to coordination and M&E. |
| Outcomes   | A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.<br><br>Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?     | Yes. Climate risks and adaptation integrated.   |
|  | Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?  | Good prospect, given vast marine resources and opportunities to address some threats.   |
| Outputs  | A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project.<br><br>Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes? | Yes – though core outcome is clearly a longer-term goal, and this is recognized.  |
| <b>Part II: Project justification</b>  | A simple narrative explaining the project’s logic, i.e. a theory of change.  |   |
| <b>1. Project description. Briefly describe:</b><br>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, with good attention to governance barriers.  |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?   | Yes.  |
|  | 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, with detailed reference to prior and ongoing initiatives.  |
|  | Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?   | Some aspects of baseline reference quantified status and trends.  |
|  | Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?  | Yes.  |
|  | For multiple focal area projects:  | N/A   |
|  | 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?  | Well articulated, with "five fundamental and mutually supporting transformations that are required to secure ocean health and enable SBE." Would benefit from visualization of TOC. |
|  | What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?  | Clearly articulated.  |
|  | What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?   | Clearly articulated.  |
|  | Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?   | Plausible but suitably difficult. There is a welcome measure of risk-taking.  |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   | Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?                   | Adaptation is implicit, given flexibility to detail particular activities during implementation. Mitigation measures in risks table support importance of adaptation.  |
| 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?   | Good likelihood.   |
|   | 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 will be measured and monitored during project implementation? | Component 4 focuses on M&E.  |
|   | What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?   | Not specified (implied that SBE projects will increase climate resilience)   |
| 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?                           | Yes, with well-articulated dimensions of innovation. The project has the potential to lead to financial, technological and policy innovations. Much depends on the details to be developed during implementation, and within pilot projects.   |
|   | Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?                            | Yes, though still in broad outline form. PIF notes sustainability will be achieved through "knowledge management, outreach, information exchange, and targeted awareness raising activities under Components 3 and 4 of the Regional Project, including promoting success templates, financing mechanisms, and partnerships that support blue economy growth." |

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
|   | <p>Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?</p>           | <p>This project builds on past investments which is helpful. Long term sustainability will likely require transformational change and a fundamentally new way of approaching economic development in coastal areas that departs from BAU activities.</p> <p>This is explicitly articulated in description of “pressing need to shift from the current ‘business as usual’, ocean economic model, which equates to industrializing the oceans purely for the purposes of economic growth, to a sustainable blue economy (SBE) model, which embraces the protection, restoration and sustainable use of marine and coastal resources through ocean-based economic initiatives that generate social, environmental and economic benefits.”</p> |
| <p><b>1b.</b> Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.</p>   |  | <p>A map of the PICs, including EEZs is included.</p>   |
| <p><b>2. Stakeholders.</b><br/>Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities.<br/>If none of the above, please explain why.<br/>In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and</p> | <p>Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?</p> | <p>Stakeholder section is very preliminary due to limited consultations resulting from COVID 19 restrictions.</p> <p>However, indicative stakeholder categories are provided which include resource users, government/management, civil society, NGOs which will be further developed during PPG phase. Good breadth of industries noted under resource users category, beyond those typically engaged in IW projects.</p>  |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| their respective roles and means of engagement.  |  |   |
|  | 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? | TBD during PPG phase  |
| <p><b>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.</b><br/>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; participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services.</p> <p>Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no/tbd</p> | Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?                                 | Important recognition of extreme rates of domestic violence, and very low rates of women's representation in government. Intention is that gender considerations will be mainstreamed into the project interventions. Project will include gender sensitive indicators. |
|  | Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?  | Yes. Approaches to be developed.  |

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <p><b>5. Risks.</b> 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?<br/> For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?</li> <li>• Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?</li> <li>• What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?</li> </ul> | <p>Very good articulation of risk mitigation measures. Appropriately high attention to climate change risks. In subsequent design steps, it would be appropriate to further detail climate adaptation aspects of the project design, given the vulnerability of SIDS to climate impacts.</p> <p>Separate COVID-19 risk analysis is exemplary regarding details of adaptive management envisioned during implementation.</p>   |
| <p><b>6. Coordination.</b> 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. However, it should be noted that there are 5 projects in the current work program that focus on Pacific SIDs. There is a vague reference in the baseline section to the ADB project in Tuvalu (#10788) that will develop a floating solar power plant. However, there is no reference to the BD,LD project in Niue (10769), the BD, LDCF project in Kiribati (10775), and the BD project in Cook Islands (10780). As many of these issues tend to be integrated – particularly in small islands – it will be important and beneficial to coordinate the execution of these 3 national projects with this regional umbrella program.</p> |
|   | <p>Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?</p>  | <p>Yes.</p>   |
|   | <p>Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?</p>  | <p>Clearly builds upon prior efforts. Additional attention to citing explicit lessons would strengthen the case.</p>  |
|   | <p>How have these lessons informed the project’s formulation?</p>  | <p>Identification of priorities and approaches.</p>   |
|   | <p>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?</p>  | <p>Yes. Good attention to scaling mechanisms.</p>   |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p><b>8. Knowledge management.</b> 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.</p> | <p>What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?</p> | <p>Good attention to KM approach, including intent to build on existing lessons and best practices, “including lessons from other relevant projects, programs, initiatives and evaluations at the national and regional levels.”</p> |
|   | <p>What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?</p>      | <p>Good initial plans.</p>   |

Notes

| STAP advisory response  | Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed  |
|---|---|
| 1. <b>Concur</b>  | 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.  |
|   | * 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 <b><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></b> |
| 2. <b>Minor issues to be considered during project design</b> | 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:  |
|   | (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, and possibly agreeing to 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.  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b></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> |