

STAP SCREEN

GEF ID	11452
Project title	Program for improving sustainable marine fisheries opportunities in SADC – The Case of the Mozambique Channel
Date of screen	18 January 2024
STAP Panel Member	Susanne Schmeier
STAP Secretariat	Virginia Gorsevski

1. Summary of STAP's views of the project

The objective of this project is to improve sustainable marine fisheries in the Mozambique Channel by strengthening collaborative governance, resource management, and resilience to climate shocks. The project's primary focus is on enhancing fisheries productivity through improving aquatic health and marine ecosystem management – essentially focusing on the 'supply' side (fisheries) to complement the AfDB's corollary project to address the 'demand' side. The focus on marine protected areas (MPAs) is noteworthy but receives less attention making it difficult to assess the potential GEBs. This should be strengthened.

Overall, STAP finds the project logical and compelling and is pleased to see that the ToC diagram is accompanied by a narrative, as suggested in STAP's [Theory of Change primer](#). Having said that, the outcomes, outputs and activities are somewhat unclear, especially in regards to the multi-level governance dimension of the project and the actors involved/to be included in activities. This includes highlighting the linkages between the GEF project components, as well as connections to the AfDB project components, which are currently weak.

At 104 pages, this PIF is too long with repetitive information about the many problems facing the region and the details of related projects – all of which could be summarized to provide a more concise picture of the problems, solutions, barriers to solutions and how this project will overcome those barriers. The presentation of an AfDB project alongside the GEF proposal in the same document is confusing as it is not entirely clear where to draw the line between the two.

Note to STAP screeners: a summary of STAP's view of the project (not of the project itself), covering both strengths and weaknesses.

STAP's assessment*

- Concur - STAP acknowledges that the concept has scientific and technical merit
- X** **Minor - STAP has identified some scientific and technical points to be addressed in project design**
- Major - STAP has identified significant concerns to be addressed in project design

Please contact the STAP Secretariat if you would like to discuss.

2. Project rationale, and project description – are they sound?

See annex on STAP's screening guidelines.

The problems facing this region, including for each of the participating countries, are described in detail. In fact, much of the PIF focuses on the many interrelated problems and underlying causes (often intertwined) facing the region. While important, this information could be consolidated significantly with a clearer delineation between problems and underlying/root causes.

The project provides convincing information on how climate change has, and will continue to impact fisheries – mainly through increased water temperature and more frequent extreme weather events. STAP notes that this project shares similarities with the Artisanal Fisheries Resilient Development Project (PROPEIXE) for Mozambique (GEF ID 11419) that is currently being proposed under the LDCF.

This project focuses primarily on fisheries for livelihoods and food security and less on the environmental dimension, which could be strengthened to show the project’s commitment to sustainability and its contribution to durable GEBs. This is true also in terms of the problems relating to overfishing and destructive fishing practices, with their minimal focus on the broader environmental context. Along the same lines, the relevant regional instruments referred to are largely economic growth oriented ones (e.g. the SADC Industrialization Strategy), with no real mention of relevant marine environmental protection instruments, etc.

The barriers are not very clearly defined and only implicitly found in the text, and in the ToC graph where they restate or add to the baseline issues, making it unclear what they are barriers to. Removing the heading ‘baseline issues’ and restating the four issues underneath to truly be goals would improve the logic flow. The barriers relating to governance should be spelled out more clearly in order to ensure that activities and outputs indeed contribute to addressing them, and to achieving the desired outcomes and impacts. This also relates to the multi-level dimension aspect of the barriers (e.g., weak fisheries management systems at the local level, which are either non-existent or are not enforced by national or even regional laws, policies and strategies).

Though well conceived, the project design could be improved – in particular by making a stronger case for how the GEF project is going beyond supporting the AfDB goal of increasing fish stocks. In addition, the multi-level governance focus should be strengthened within the project design, both within and across the different components. In order to address the problems and achieve the objective, multi-level cooperation and coordination from the regional to the local level is necessary. While this is somewhat implied in the project design, it is not always clear how this will be done and how related governance challenges will be addressed (not only at each governance level, but also across levels). For instance, Component 2 requires policing of illegal (not defined clearly, referred to as destructive only) at the local level, but does not really foresee related legal instruments and means for their implementation and enforcement. Component 3, which focuses on policy harmonization, *does* mention a subregional fisheries policy, but not the development of national legal instruments that would allow for policing (and related standards or requirements). Similar issues relate to other elements of multi-level governance.

Greater clarification is needed in terms of the stakeholders that need to be involved and engaged in the various activities and outputs. For instance, with regards to knowledge management and addressing the information gaps, does this require local actors and their knowledge of managing local habitats or does it concern the regional SADC level or the sub-regional level? The information provided now is relatively general, including with regards to civil society involvement, the private sector and gender aspects.

The focus on community-based monitoring and management of marine resources through community participation in the Climate Services Centre described in Component 1 and the monitoring of spawning grounds, etc. through surveillance hubs, has potential to be innovative, as does the PES scheme for mangroves under Component 2, if done well. Though somewhat dated, this [STAP document](#) is a good starting point for PES and the GEF.

With regards to risks, the issue of marine pollution is highlighted under environmental and social risks. Because of its impact on fish and communities, it would be helpful to include this information as part of the ToC – noting that while the activities taking place as part of the proposed project are necessary, they are not sufficient because of the exclusion of marine pollution. Presumably other projects/organizations are addressing this issue which should be mentioned. Also it is surprising that there are no macro-economic risks given the international market for fish, making them highly susceptible to fluctuations in global markets.

Overall, this is a promising project; however, the PIF would benefit greatly from some streamlining and a reduction of redundancies, ensuring a clear focus on the environmental aspects of the project, and keeping to the word limits for each section.

Note: provide a general appraisal, asking whether relevant screening guideline questions have been addressed adequately – not all the questions will be relevant to all proposals; no need to comment on every question, only those needing more attention, noting any done very well, but ensure that all are considered. Comments should be helpful, evaluative, and qualitative, rather than yes/no.

3. Specific points to be addressed, and suggestions

Based on these observations, STAP recommends the following:

1. Clarify the objective to guide the reader of the PIF along with outcomes and outputs to clearly indicate how they support the overall objective.
2. Synthesize information about the AfDB project to clearly indicate how it is related to the proposed GEF project, which should be the main focus of the (shortened) document. Be explicit about the differences between the two, especially in terms of expected outcomes (as noted in point 1).
3. Coordinate activities with the proposed IFAD project (GEF ID 11419) in Mozambique on resilient coastal fisheries (LDCF) to avoid duplication and maximize synergies.

Note: number key points clearly and provide useful information or suggestions, including key literature where relevant. Completed screens should be no more than two or three pages in length.

*categories under review, subject to future revision

ANNEX: STAP'S SCREENING GUIDELINES

1. How well does the proposal explain the problem and issues to be addressed in the context of the **system** within which the problem sits and its drivers (e.g. population growth, economic development, climate change, sociocultural and political factors, and technological changes), including how the various components of the system interact?
2. Does the project indicate how **uncertain futures** could unfold (e.g. using simple **narratives**), based on an understanding of the trends and interactions between the key elements of the system and its drivers?
3. Does the project describe the **baseline** problem and how it may evolve in the future in the absence of the project; and then identify the outcomes that the project seeks to achieve, how these outcomes will change the baseline, and what the key **barriers** and **enablers** are to achieving those outcomes?
4. Are the project's **objectives** well formulated and justified in relation to this system context? Is there a convincing explanation as to **why this particular project** has been selected in preference to other options, in the light of how the future may unfold?
5. How well does the **theory of change** provide an "explicit account of how and why the proposed interventions would achieve their intended outcomes and goal, based on outlining a set of key causal pathways arising from the activities and outputs of the interventions and the assumptions underlying these causal connections".
 - Does the project logic show how the project would ensure that expected outcomes are **enduring** and resilient to possible future changes identified in question 2 above, and to the effects of any conflicting policies (see question 9 below).
 - Is the theory of change grounded on a solid scientific foundation, and is it aligned with current scientific knowledge?
 - Does it explicitly consider how any necessary **institutional and behavioral** changes are to be achieved?
 - Does the theory of change diagram convincingly show the overall project logic, including causal pathways and outcomes?
6. Are the project **components** (interventions and activities) identified in the theory of change each described in sufficient detail to discern the main thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they address the problem, their justification as a robust solution, and the critical assumptions and risks to achieving them?
7. How likely is the project to generate global environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF project (**additionality**)?
8. Does the project convincingly identify the relevant **stakeholders**, and their anticipated roles and responsibilities? is there an adequate explanation of how stakeholders will contribute to the

development and implementation of the project, and how they will benefit from the project to ensure enduring global environmental benefits, e.g. through co-benefits?

9. Does the description adequately explain:

- how the project will build on prior investments and complement current investments, both GEF and non-GEF,
- how the project incorporates **lessons learned** from previous projects in the country and region, and more widely from projects addressing similar issues elsewhere; and
- how country policies that are contradictory to the intended outcomes of the project (identified in section C) will be addressed (**policy coherence**)?

10. How adequate is the project's approach to generating, managing and exchanging **knowledge**, and how will lessons learned be captured for adaptive management and for the benefit of future projects?

11. Innovation and transformation:

- If the project is intended to be **innovative**: to what degree is it innovative, how will this ambition be achieved, how will barriers and enablers be addressed, and how might scaling be achieved?
- If the project is intended to be **transformative**: how well do the project's objectives contribute to transformative change, and are they sufficient to contribute to enduring, transformational change at a sufficient scale to deliver a step improvement in one or more GEBs? Is the proposed logic to achieve the goal credible, addressing necessary changes in institutions, social or cultural norms? Are barriers and enablers to scaling be addressed? And how will enduring scaling be achieved?

12. Have **risks** to the project design and implementation been identified appropriately in the risk table in section B, and have suitable mitigation measures been incorporated? (NB: risks to the durability of project outcomes from future changes in drivers should have been reflected in the theory of change and in project design, not in this table.)