

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response	
GEF ID	10867	
Project Title	Towards Sustainable and Conversion-Free Aquaculture in Indonesian Seas Large Marine Ecosystem (ISLME)	
Date of Screening	November 5, 2021	
STAP member screener	Blake Ratner	
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski	
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Concur.</p> <p>Highly innovative (and suitably high risk) project with strong understanding of the problems and barriers that takes advantages of national strategies in Indonesia and Timor-Leste related to the shrimp and seaweed industries, respectively. Very good scope to deliver lessons and pilot solutions of global significance.</p> <p>While the main objectives are clear and follow the problem analysis, the PIF would benefit greatly from a clearer storyline and logic, particularly regarding the integration of the two country interventions.</p> <p>Makes a strong case for added value of the GEF (and its relatively small investment in relation to the large ADB country investments in the aquaculture sector) in terms of comparative advantage related to its convening role and ability to provide a platform and a bridge between national governments and the private sector.</p>	
Part I: Project Information	What STAP looks for	Response
B. Indicative Project Description Summary		
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	The objective of this project is “to alter the trajectory towards more sustainable and conversion-free aquaculture production within the Indonesia Seas Large Marine Ecosystem (ISLME).” The objective is clear and related to the problems regarding

		lack of transparency and accountability in the shrimp sector and inadequate markets for seaweed.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	Clearly presented.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Depends significantly upon shifts in private sector investment.
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?	
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. The problems are clearly outlined as are the barriers. For example, in the shrimp industry, the main barriers to greater feed accountability are mainly government policy and oversight as well as lack of transparency and traceability in the supply chain. Conversely, for the seaweed industry, the main barrier is the "...inability to demonstrate and share knowledge on better post-harvest handling of seaweeds and farmers beholden to the traders that purchase product."
	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 in terms of the current situation and market trends related to shrimp seaweed production, with very good visualization of data. This is also true for the many related projects and initiatives.
	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?	The theory of change diagrams presented for both Indonesia (shrimp) and Timor-Leste (seaweed) are less ToCs than a general depiction of the role of different actors and activities and connections among outcomes. More information is needed to articulate the overall objective and how activities support it, what are the barriers addressed, underlying assumptions, causal pathways, etc. See STAP Theory of Change Primer . It is fine to show the country-level ToCs but ideally these should align with a ToC for the overall project investment.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	This is difficult to assess for the project as a whole as there are two separate activities taking place – one related to the shrimp sector in Indonesia and the other related to seaweed production in Timor Leste. The points of integration need further development. Presumably this primarily concerns aspects related to market and value-chain development. There may also be technical scope to consider linkages relating to feed and production systems. See, for example, evaluation studies on seaweed as an ingredient in shrimp feed (Felix et al., 2020 , Elizondo-Gonzalez et al., 2020 , Omont et al., 2018 , etc.) and reports on using integrated multi-trophic aquaculture which includes both shrimp and seaweed farms (Araujo do Amaral Carneiro et al., 2020 , Verdien et al., 2020 , etc.)

	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	Individual outcomes and outputs are well-described, including approaches to scaling.
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	The risk section provides 'counter measures' that will be enacted to mitigate the many (high) risks associated with the project but it is not clear what adaptations may need to occur if these measures are not or only partially effective.
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?	Yes
	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 (vis-à-vis the GEF investment which is leveraging a substantial ADB loan)
	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?	Yes
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Resiliency is described in relation to the potential positive impacts that this project could have if successful – for example preserving mangroves as a natural climate solution. For both Indonesia and Timor Leste, a climate risk screening is provided that demonstrates a solid understanding of how each of the sectors is impacted by climate change and how these projects will respond. For the shrimp farms, water quality is critical and this can be negatively impacted by changing water

		temperatures or other conditions caused by climate variability and long term climate change.
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?	<p>This is a high risk, high potential reward project that his innovative in working along the shrimp production supply chain, which if successful has the potential to alter the BAU trajectory of traditional aquaculture inputs which is associated with widespread negative human and natural consequences.</p> <p>Similarly, for the seaweed production activities in Timor Leste, which if successful could be highly beneficial for local and national stakeholders as well as the global environment and has the potential for replicability in other areas.</p>
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Transformational change will be needed to achieve long term sustainability.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		A map is provided with coordinates for proposed project sites in Indonesia and Timor Leste.
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. If none of the above, please explain why. In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Key stakeholder categories are identified with some detail for each with the exception of local communities, whose role in this project is not well defined.

<p>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>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. 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. 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. Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no/tbd</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>The disadvantaged situation of women in these sectors of these countries is well described, particularly in relation to the power wielded by the 'middlemen.'</p> <p>The proposed solutions (prior to developing a gender plan) are preliminary (increase gender awareness, gender analysis, etc.) and do not directly address the root causes of inequity such as lack of access to financial resources and limited decision-making power.</p> <p>Referencing studies focusing on women's involvement in seaweed farming (Larson et al. 2021, Vipinkumar et al., 2020, Ramirez et al., 2019, etc.), for example, could provide relevant guidance to integrate in gender analysis.</p>

	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	Yes. Through a ‘gender action plan.’
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>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?</p> <p>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>There are numerous risks identified that apply to both sub projects as well as specific to each. Many of them are rated high.</p> <p>A detailed country risk profile for both Indonesia and Timor Leste is provided.</p>
6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives	Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?	Yes. There is strong awareness of past and ongoing projects that are relevant to these two sectors as well as initiatives such as Safe Seaweed Coalition, etc. In particular the GEF-7 Blue Horizon project for seaweed aquaculture.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	There is adequate recognition of other related efforts to improve transparency, including certification projects that failed.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	
	How have these lessons informed the project’s formulation?	
	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	What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?	Knowledge management will be supported under Component 5 of the project.

the project's overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.		
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	

Notes

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
1. Concur	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 <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>
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	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>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>