STAP SCREEN

GEF ID	11412
Project title	Climate Change Resilience in the Caribbean Fisheries Sector (CC4FISH-II)
Date of screen	January 18, 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 "catalyze systemic adaptation and resilience of fisheries, ecosystems and communities in the Caribbean to climate change and disasters through an ecosystem-based approach."

Overall, the project rationale and description are sound, though STAP recommends that climate *and* non-climate factors are used to develop two or more plausible, integrated futures that account for different possible trends in these important system drivers as per STAP's Simple future narratives brief and primer.

STAP welcomes the inclusion of the project's theory of change but notes that the logic – particularly the connection between each component and the adaptation benefit it is aiming to achieve – is somewhat weak. In addition, the project would benefit greatly by providing more detail about each intervention (i.e., *which* climate smart technologies and practices?).

Finally, while the ecosystem-based approach in the objective is sensible, it is not clear in the outcomes and outputs how it will be implemented, nor which stakeholders the project intends to work with and how they will be convinced of, or engaged in, such an approach.

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.

Overall, the rationale for this project is sensible and a strong case is made for how future projected climate change (e.g. higher sea surface temperatures, sea level rise, increased frequency of extreme weather events, temperature increases, precipitation variability) can impact the fisheries sector (including post-harvest) in the Caribbean through decreasing abundance of fish and other high value species, and through the deterioration of value chain infrastructure (e.g., facilities for processing and storage, landing sites, etc.).

It is well known and well documented in many other GEF (and non-GEF) projects that several other non-climate factors such as overfishing, pollution, coastal development, etc. are also highly detrimental to the fisheries sector in the Caribbean (see, for example, BE-CLME+ and REBYC-III CLME+). Using a systems approach, STAP recommends that climate *and* non-climate factors are used to develop two or more plausible, integrated

futures that account for a range of possible trends in these important system drivers. See STAP's Simple future narratives brief and primer for more information. Doing so can also help explain how the interventions in this PIF are necessary, but not sufficient to address challenges facing fisherfolk in the Caribbean. It could also help explain whether and why the project is innovative and transformative, which is not yet fully explained. Importantly, this can help streamline sections in the PIF on baseline activities and lessons learned to give a more summarized, but complete picture of the situation in this region.

At 71 pages, this PIF is too long and much of the information is duplicative. Related, the details and overly lengthy text in these two sections make it difficult to follow the logic behind the theory of change. For example, while the project alludes to the adaptation benefits outlined in STAP's typology of climate change adaptation benefits (exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity), none of these are actually reflected in the ToC diagram. In fact, the goal (in the case labeled 'development challenge') in the lower half of the diagram is very general. STAP recommends adding clarity and logic to the project by presenting the ToC as starting with the goal and objectives, followed by the barriers and then the proposed interventions for overcoming the barriers. In this diagram, the core indicators appear to be the goal, which is unusual. See STAP's Theory of Change primer for more detail.

The section marked 'adaptation benefits' is useful in that it clearly articulates the project's view of benefits delivered, but these benefits are not clearly linked to increased adaptive capacity for addressing the impacts of climate change. Moreover, they could be linked to other benefits such as biodiversity conservation, which is briefly mentioned.

With regards to the barriers, it is not clear whether and how they will be addressed, especially those relating to weak enabling environments. Without adequate institutional capacity, and legal and political frameworks, for example, adaptation will not be possible in the long run. In this regard, a clearer differentiation is needed between institutional adaptation in response to institutional challenges and other aspects concerning local communities (e.g., retrofitting of building and processing facilities is currently under institutional challenges).

While STAP is pleased to see the inclusion of assumptions in the project description, it is not clear that all eleven belong in this category. That is to say that some of them are not so much assumptions as they are what the project intends to do (e.g., assumption 8: The project's interventions will generate multiple environmental benefits… or assumption 11: The project's interventions will be innovative and transformative) and are not possible to test (assumption 6: Marine and coastal ecosystems are able to adapt to changing climate conditions). Some assumptions are also inherently dependent on the project itself (e.g. assumption 11), creating a somewhat circular reasoning.

STAP is pleased to see that a dedicated KM platform will be developed for this project; however, it is unclear why a new platform is needed for a follow-on project. Lessons learned from other GEF projects and programs indicate that KM platforms will likely be more sustainable if they are embedded in regional organizations, of which there are many options in the Caribbean.

Regarding lessons learned, one of the most informative pieces of this PIF is found in section vi. Selection of project in preference to other potential options, where many lessons from CC4FISH and the CC4FISH Trust Fund terminal report are described in detail and categorized. While it seems that several of these lessons have informed the current project, it would be very helpful to draw a direct line from these lessons to the proposed interventions in this project to show how, specifically, they informed the development of the ToC.

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 the issues noted, STAP recommends that project proponents revise the theory of change, considering the points made above paying close attention to:

1. Goals that begin with adaptation benefits, not core indicators.

2. Consideration of non-climate factors affecting Caribbean fisheries and their interaction, using several possible future narratives, and then allowing for multiple benefits, potentially in a transformative manner.

3. How, specifically, lessons learned from the CC4FISH project are feeding into the proposed components/ interventions of this project.

4. How the different stakeholders will be included as part of the ecosystem-based approach; how gender aspects are being addressed beyond carrying out relevant assessments.

5. How lessons learned from the CC4FISH project and the CC4FISH Trust Fund have informed the proposed components of this project.

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.)