

Part I: Project Information		Response
GEF ID		10190
Project Title		Brazil Sustaining Healthy Coastal and Marine Ecosystems Project
Date of Screening		17-May-19
STAP member Screener		Rosie Cooney
STAP secretariat screener		Virginia Gorsevski
STAP Overall Assessment		Minor
		<p>STAP welcomes the project entitled "Brazil Sustaining Healthy Coastal and Marine Ecosystems Project" from the World Bank. This project has two major objectives: to strengthen management of existing marine protected areas (MPAs) to ensure a robust resource base; and to work with various sectors (e.g. tourism, fisheries) to facilitate Brazil's transition to a Blue Economy. Overall the MPA component of this is good, but the transition to a blue economy component is poorly specified. Overall comments: First, the project characterizes itself as the 'extra push' needed to bolster existing ongoing activities (e.g. the Caribbean and Northern Shelf Large Marine Ecosystem) which gives the reader a sense that this project in and of itself is not new or innovative; rather a means of providing additional support to further capitalize the Brazilian Marine Fund, as stated under Component 1. Perhaps the activities related to technological innovation such as remote monitoring and surveillance of illegal fishing in the Marine and Coastal Protected Area (MCPA) are what make this project more than just an 'extra push' but necessary to ensure that existing efforts are not reversed. These elements should be emphasized and expanded upon. Second, it speaks of "blue economy principles" or the "blue economy agenda" without ever clarifying exactly what these are, or how implementing them will help achieve GEBs (rather than just boost economic growth). Third, a clear theory of change (TOC) that clarifies the logical steps from each of the sets of activities to the overall impact is missing. A clear TOC would help identify critical assumptions and risks, which are also missing. Fourth, it may potentially be risky to pursue a 'blue economy' approach in a few select areas along the coast as opposed to a larger, more comprehensive project that encompasses the entire coastal economy. Is there not a risk of leakage and cheating if some areas are included and others are not? See for example the quote from Winder and Le Heron (2017) below. Fifth, in order to ensure that the blue economy promotes conservation in the long term, a strategy of enhancing public-private partnerships is recommended that includes improved data collection for fisheries, seabed mining, shipping and transportation, etc. which can be integrated with existing open access data sets such as Ocean Biodiversity Information System (OBIS), remote sensing data by the GEOBON, and the emerging Marine Biodiversity Monitoring Network (MBON). See Golden et al (2017) Making sure the blue economy is green. Nature Ecology & Evolution 1: 16-17. Finally, this project presents a broad overview of the main elements. It is less clear what specific activities will be undertaken to offer incentives for fisherfolk, tourism operators, local communities, etc. to engage in a green "blue economy" as opposed to business as usual.</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 “strengthen governance and management of the MCPA system and build Brazil’s capacity to transition to a blue economy in targeted areas.” The objective is clearly defined and related to problems along Brazil’s coast. But how can blue economy be targeted to just a few select places? Shouldn’t it by definition include the economy as a whole to prevent disincentives and leakage? See for example Winder, G.M. and R. Le Heron (2017). Assembling a Blue Economy moment? Geographic engagement with globalizing biological-economic relations in multi-use marine environments. Dialogues in Human Geography 7(1): 3 – 26, which states (p. 20) “The Blue Economy is an opportunity for assembling separate marine projects in multi-use and multi-user spaces. Organized as expert systems, each project will be assessed separately and with limited participation. Despite their many geographical attributes, the separate projects are promoted without regard to an overall geography or temporality of projects For these reasons, Blue Economy projects may arguably comprise an extension of the ‘new’ extractivism into ocean and coastal zones, where fragmented jurisdictions, ad hoc planning authorities, poorly developed planning practices and overlapping and missing jurisdictions compromise prospects for good governance in the name of sustainable oceans management.”
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project’s objectives?	Component 1 seeks to improve MCPA management and capitalize the Brazilian Marine Fund. This is clearly linked to objectives, although how this will affect threats beyond overfishing (it is stated this will reduce pollution and habitat degradation too) is unclear. Component 2 is about "developing a pathway for a Blue Economy" and includes policy and regulatory reform, technological innovation related to monitoring. It is not clear what "mainstreaming Blue Economy principles" into policy actually means, and how this will reduce/reverse threats to this environment. Component 3 KM and CB; while there is much emphasis on capacity building it is unclear as to what specific capacities are being increased and why - this comes back to the lack of a clear TOC. Component 4 is project management.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.	This project is intended to provide the "extra push" to fully strengthen management capacity. Therefore it is intended primarily to bolster existing efforts.
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	Outcomes are 1) MCPAs under improved management for conservation and sustainable use; 2) number of public policies/strategies incorporating blue economy principles; 3) monitoring system for targeted marine and coastal areas operational. While the MPCA work is clearly linked to GEBs, this is not clear for the blue economy work.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	As this project is an "extra push" for existing activities, whether or not GEBs are generated are likely largely dependent on the success of these earlier programs for which there is no information.
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?	Specific outputs are not listed
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?	Currently, economic activities and population pressures are seriously threatening coastal areas through overfishing, pollution (aquaculture, sewage etc), and coastal development, with climate change another threat. Threats set to escalate as e.g. shrimp aquaculture set to expand substantially. Presumably potential threats from oil/gas also. The problem statement spends considerable time making a case for economic growth in Brazil, rather than articulating how this projected growth as (without intervention) will be likely to significantly intensify negative impacts on the coastal/marine areas, which would seem to be in line with experience.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Threats are described.
	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?	This project builds on existing World Bank projects and GEF financed Marine Protected Areas Project (GEF MAR1) as well as CLME+ and other projects.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	No
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	The entire project is premised on its value added to existing efforts and contributing to the transition to a "Blue Economy"
	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	no lessons learned
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	The TOC includes the following "building blocks": 1) sound management and sustainable financing of PAs to secure and protect natural capital for a blue economy; 2) fostering the adoption of technological innovation at the local level and strengthening capacity for better management of marine resources including MSP. But there is no explicit TOC i.e. a logical linked sequence of steps that takes us from activities to the final desired impact. What are the incentives to promote sustainable use and conservation? How are these incentives different for different locations and sectors? Further, a clear TOC would enable identification of assumptions and risks in progressing through the outputs to outcomes - this has not been done.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Not clear what "transitioning to a blue economy in targeted areas" actually means (para 19). Is this component ii i.e. "fostering the adoption of technological innovations at the local level and strengthening institutional capacity for better management of marine resources, including the use of Marine Spatial Plan (MSP)"?

	· What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	The outcome indicators include "Number of public policies/strategies incorporating blue economy principles". But the project does not say what these blue economy principles are anywhere, or how they relate to achievement of global environmental benefits. This looks like this will simply involve development benefits for the country.
	· 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?	No
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?	It is not clear that the "blue economy" component of the work will contribute to GEBs. Currently this is not convincing - if indeed this work does contribute, it needs to be further explained exactly how.
	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, and are they measurable?	GEBs are listed as number of hectares of MPAs under improved management. Not clear that there are measurable GEBs linked explicitly to the transition to a Blue Economy.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	See above
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	A monitoring system is described as part of the project but no details on what this would look like and what it will measure (illegal fishing perhaps)
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Policies, strategies and spatial planning will incorporate climate analysis scenarios. Also the establishment of 'governance systems' but not clear what this means.
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?	not described
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	no
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	not clear
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Map is provided by no geo-coordinates

<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>Several executing partners listed (MMA, ICMBio, FUNBIO) and States). No detail regarding communities, sectors, etc. for each of the different geographical areas. In terms of the private sector, the blue economy is intended to 'de-risk' the ocean economic sectors and increase investor confidence to drive economic development. Not clear at all that this development will be conservation-oriented. If it will be, how?</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>Beneficiaries disaggregated by gender and the assessment of social impacts and benefits will incorporate a 'gender-sensitive lens' to the extent possible.</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>Risks are not described</p>
	<p>Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?</p>	
	<p>For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p>	
	<p>· 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?</p>	

	· 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?	
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?	The entire project builds on existing efforts as an 'extra push'
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	
	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?	
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 3 seeks to strengthen knowledge and enhance Brazilian stakeholders' capacity to recognize the value and effectively manage the natural capital which sustains the blue economy (workshops, training, etc)
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	
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>	

<p>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>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:</p>	
	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;</p>	
	<p>(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.</p>	
	<p>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>	
<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>	