

Part I: Project Information		Response
GEF ID	10211	
Project Title	"BE-CLME+": Promoting National Blue Economy Priorities Through Marine Spatial Planning in the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Plus	
Date of Screening	8-Dec-19	
STAP member Screener	Blake Ratner	
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski	
STAP Overall Assessment		<p><b>Minor issues to be considered during project design:</b> STAP welcomes the BE-CLME+ project from CAF and FAO. The project targets a region of important fisheries and marine biodiversity with strong rationale for a regional approach. STAP feels that the theory of change would benefit from a succinct articulation with better identification of underlying assumptions regarding change pathways. There are good learning opportunities related to delivering measurable gains from the Blue Economy policy thrust, which can be meaningful or empty, depending on the readiness to question and reverse environmentally harmful economic trends. Much depends on successful implementation of policy measures and redirection of financing towards restoration efforts. Description of risk mitigation measures on these aspects is not yet convincing.</p> <p>Other aspects requiring attention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Inadequate attention evident to the extreme sensitivity of coral reefs to climate impacts. [See, for example: Spalding, M.D. and Brown, B.E., 2015. Warm-water coral reefs and climate change. Science, 350(6262), pp.769-771.]</li> <li>-Identification of civil society and private sector appears underdeveloped -- beyond fishers associations, particularly given ambitions to influence value chains.</li> <li>-Targeting of beneficiaries with 10:1 ratio of men : women appears to vastly underestimate benefits for value chain participants beyond fishers; this merits a rethink.</li> </ul>
<b>Part I: Project Information</b>		
<b>B. Indicative Project Description Summary</b>		
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes, well structured
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.	Clear structure, with some outcome targets well specified
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	Yes, with highly important fisheries and biodiversity
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Plausible, with examples of successful rehabilitation elsewhere
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?	Reasonably described; regional approach well justified
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
<b>1. Project description. Briefly describe:</b>		

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, building upon prior SAP
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes, with good recognition of historic efforts and trends
	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?	Yes, IW and BD goals well integrated
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Yes, with benefit of SAP project concluding
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Yes (described elsewhere, not in baseline section)
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Yes, with thorough description of related investments
	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;	Yes
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	Yes
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	Project designed as clear progression on past projects, including policy progress
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	PIF lacks a succinct statement of theory of change, though elements are detailed. Implied approach: Combination of marine spatial planning, improvement of seafood value chains, and enhanced regional cooperation will support scaling of marine conservation and sustainable fisheries under the rubric of Blue Economy investment.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	
	· What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	Reasonable description of linkages
	· Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Good recognition of scientific studies, including frequent low performance of MPAs regarding social / economic benefits.
	· Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	Risks in terms of capacity and commitment recognized
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?	Plausible, with examples of successful rehabilitation elsewhere, and apparently strong national ownership
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?	Yes

	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Reasonable
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	Yes
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Partially
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Several measures specified, building upon prior Climate Change Adaptation in the Eastern Caribbean Fisheries Sector (CC4FISH) project
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?	Aims to develop new business models and financing for fisheries value chains. Good learning opportunities related to delivering measurable gains from Blue Economy policy thrust, which can be meaningful or empty, depending on the readiness to question and reverse environmentally harmful economic trends.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Scaling beyond region described in initial terms.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Transformation, given intense economic pressures and current overexploitation
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		
<b>2. Stakeholders.</b> 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.	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Thorough identification of government stakeholders; civil society and private sector appears underdeveloped -- beyond fishers associations.
	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?	Described initially, though strategic emphasis is not yet apparent.
<b>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.</b> 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	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	Risks not explicitly identified. Specific opportunities for women and youth included in component 3. Targeting of beneficiaries with 10:1 ratio of men:women appears to vastly underestimate benefits for value chain participants beyond fishers. Merits a rethink.

	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	Not yet clearly addressed.
<b>5. Risks.</b> 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	Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?	Reasonable start but needs further work. Much depends on successful implementation of policy measures and redirection of financing towards restoration efforts. Description of risk mitigation measures on these aspects is not yet convincing.
	Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?	Yes
	For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:	
	· 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?	Risks are mentioned but it's not yet clear that the medium-term future climate scenario has been thoroughly integrated into project planning.
	· Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?	Inadequate attention evident to the extreme sensitivity of coral reefs to climate impacts. See, for example: Spalding, M.D. and Brown, B.E., 2015. Warm-water coral reefs and climate change. Science, 350(6262), pp.769-771.
	· Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?	Referenced but needs further development.
	· What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?	Reference made to marine spatial planning measures, but required adaptations are likely to be more comprehensive.
<b>6. Coordination.</b> 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?	Inadequate. Makes reference to other FAO and WB financed projects, but not to the many science and implementation efforts launched by large NGOs, foundations, and research bodies.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Not yet.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Initially but requires further work.
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	Not yet adequately
	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?	Not yet well developed
<b>8. Knowledge management.</b> 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?	Very generic description in this section; Component 3 contains detail on approach.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	Integrated in IW:Learn
<b>STAP advisory response</b>	<b>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</b>	
<b>1. Concur</b>	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.	

	<p>* 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 <b><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></b></p>	
<b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	<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>	
<b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b>	<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>	