

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response	
GEF ID	10857	
Project Title	Strategies, technologies and social solutions to manage bycatch in tropical Large Marine Ecosystem Fisheries (REBYC-III CLME+)	
Date of Screening	4 November 2021	
STAP member screener	Blake Ratner	
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski	
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Concur.</p> <p>The proposed project is well-articulated and focused (essentially to eliminate unsustainable bycatch while maintaining economic and social viability for fisheries stakeholders) that stems from the SAP for this region.</p> <p>Demonstrates a strong understanding of problems, solutions, barriers to solutions and how this project can build on past and ongoing efforts, including integrating lessons learned and recommendations from past project evaluations. Nuanced approach to coordination with related initiatives.</p> <p>A robust theory of change is presented that is logical and directly responds to barriers. Assumptions are well identified and significant. The narrative detailed in the Theory of Change Annex suggests a very thoughtful consideration of how the assumptions and underlying drivers are expected to influence the achievement of outcomes and longer-term impacts.</p> <p>Further attention is suggested to identifying and articulating actions addressing the lack of incentives and opportunities to convince local fisherfolk and private sector entities to adopt new technologies and practices that minimize bycatch and discards.</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?	Yes. The problem that this project seeks to address is the excessive and unsustainable bycatch and discards, which is one of many issues identified in the CLME+ SAP.
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?	Medium term objectives are clearly articulated in the TOC as 1) increased bycatch and discard reduction measures; 2) strengthened enabling environment and capacity; 3) enhanced sustainable and diverse livelihoods for fisherfolk; 4) increased public and private support; and 5) improved collaboration and evidence, etc. The outcomes and outputs leading into each of these objectives are well defined though some are stronger than others (private sector and alternative livelihoods, for example, lack specifics). In theory, outcomes could include adaptation benefits (if, for example, the project leads to opportunities for diversification of income for fisherfolk); however, this is not articulated in the PIF.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes – in particular Indicator 8 re globally over-exploited fisheries moved to more sustainable levels. Targets related to biodiversity and carbon mitigation are mentioned, but difficult to assess at this stage.
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?	Yes

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.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes. The problems and threats are well defined and supported by data and references. They are well distinguished from the root causes and drivers, and the barriers to overcoming these problems to achieve the goal of sustainable fisheries management are well articulated, with supporting examples.
	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?	The baseline – in terms of prior and ongoing related projects – is well developed. There is a clear understanding of how this project fits with other activities.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	
	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	Yes. This is a major strength of this project proposal whereby recommendations from past completed projects are considered and incorporated into this project.
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	For example, the TE for the REBYC-II LAC project recommended a stronger focus on gender, livelihoods, private sector engagement/co-management,

		incentives, and fishery certification. This project addresses each of those; however, the more details on the specifics for all of them – especially incentives for private sector and local communities to support sustainable fisheries management and reduction in bycatch, etc. – which seems critical but the least well thought out at this stage.
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	<p>The TOC is presented in a separate document that is detailed and logical and which connects the barriers to actions and outputs, which combined should contribute to the overarching objective of sustainable fisheries.</p> <p>The narrative detailed in the Theory of Change Annex suggests a very thoughtful consideration of how the assumptions and underlying drivers are expected to influence the achievement of outcomes and longer-term impacts. There is a helpful distinction made between outcomes within the scope of the project’s accountability versus medium-term outcomes and longer-term impacts.</p> <p>Notably, this objective (and the higher level vision) in the TOC diagram is not the same as the stated objective of the project, which has a more narrow on the reduction of bycatch and discards – only one component of sustainable fisheries management.</p> <p>But essentially the idea is to introduce methods, tools, technologies, etc. to reduce bycatch and discards to the CLME+ countries and increase the likelihood of adoption through improved policies and governance, planning, data, monitoring, enforcement, capacity, knowledge and incentives for adoption by local communities, the private sector and other key actors.</p>
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Well conceived.
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project’s objectives?	Clearly presented.

	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	<p>The assumptions are well articulated in the accompanying narrative of the TOC diagram. These are not insignificant:</p> <p>A1 – Government fisheries agencies, fishing communities and private sector fishery groups are willing to engage in co-management of fisheries and marine resources,</p> <p>A2 – Social and cultural barriers do not prevent women from effectively participating in the sustainable management of fisheries</p> <p>A3 – The private sector is willing (or can be encouraged) to invest in activities to address bycatch and discards and continues to have a supporting enabling environment.</p> <p>In addition to these assumptions, the project lists several preconditions, which if not fulfilled could be detrimental to the project’s operations including COVID-19, political stability, etc. many of which are common to all GEF or other such projects.</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?	Yes.
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.

	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	<p>GEBs are defined using the GEF RBM framework. More work is needed to justify claims that biodiversity will be enhanced.</p> <p>Adaptation benefits are not explicitly defined though there is mention of increased resilience of coastal communities that will occur due to strengthened institutional arrangements with regional fisheries bodies and other groups.</p>
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to 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>The project has the potential to be innovative in terms of the technologies and practices introduced to reduce bycatch and discards.</p> <p>For example, Component 1 discusses innovations for non-trawl gears for more size- and species-selective fishing practices. Other potential innovations include monitoring and data collection approaches using mobile phone/table apps.</p> <p>Another potential innovation has to do with de-risking investments from microloans to fisherfolk which is interesting and could be very effective, but little additional detail is provided on how this will be done.</p>
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Scaling up and sustainability is envisioned to occur as a result of private sector engagement; however, a well-articulated vision is lacking on how this will be accomplished.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project		A map is provided.

<p>interventions will take place.</p>		
<p>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 peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.</p>	<p>Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?</p>	<p>Key relevant stakeholders have been identified and this project will benefit from stakeholder engagement of past and ongoing projects in the CLME+ region.</p> <p>Relevant stakeholders within each participating country as well as regional groups are identified.</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.</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</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>		
	<p>Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?</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?</p> <p>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>The identified risks are valid and comprehensive and great effort is made to describe how the project will handle each.</p> <p>Adverse impacts of climate variability and climate change are included as a risk with ample information about past and ongoing projects that deal specifically with climate risk that this project will make use of.</p> <p>For this specific project, a detailed climate risk screening FAO will be undertaken 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 is a strong point of this project.</p>

	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Yes
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	Yes
	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 4 will develop a KM strategy and plan, linked to the Stakeholder Engagement Strategy and Plan. Numerous activities are listed to be included as part of overall KM including training, remote learning, activities, data collection, etc.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	IW:Learn and a dedicated platform, remote learning, South-South knowledge exchange, etc.

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>