

**STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects**

<b>Part I: Project Information</b>	<b>Response</b>	
<b>GEF ID</b>	10540	
<b>Project Title</b>	From bait to plate: strengthening sustainable fisheries to safeguard marine biodiversity and food security (Mexico)	
<b>Date of Screening</b>	17 May 2020	
<b>STAP member screener</b>	Blake Ratner	
<b>STAP secretariat screener</b>	Virginia Gorsevski	
<b>STAP Overall Assessment and Rating</b>	<p><b>Minor</b></p> <p>STAP welcomes this project from FAO to strengthen sustainable fisheries in Mexico. Overall, STAP finds that the project structure is clear; however, the design lacks an explicit theory of change.</p> <p>The project design integrates multiple pathways to change, including technology, regulation, enforcement capacity and community engagement, with appropriate intent to apply principles of FAO Voluntary Guidelines for Small-Scale Fisheries.</p> <p>Claims regarding innovation are very preliminary. This project would benefit from a specific articulation of innovative dimensions with regards to policy, (community-based) business models, governance and incentives for sustainable fishing. This presents a good opportunity to test principles of collaborative governance, with lessons relevant beyond fisheries.</p> <p>There is not adequate attention given to risks concerning governance and incentives for enforcement of regulations at multiple (community, local / state / national government) levels. Given broader concerns regarding rule of law, and documented links between drug cartels and fishing operators involving human rights abuses, there should be explicit attention to the political economy dimensions of reform.</p>	
<b>Part I: Project Information</b> <b>B. Indicative Project Description Summary</b>	<b>What STAP looks for</b>	<b>Response</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.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	Good, specific quantitative indicators of outcomes included in project summary.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Plausible.
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?	Plausible; logic of design is clear.
<b>Part II: Project justification</b>	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
<b>1. Project description.</b> <b>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, with good integration of data and differentiation across the project sites.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes. Barrier analysis groups together implementation of existing policies; capacities for EBFM; and availability of reliable data. These would be easier to understand as distinct aspects, though related.
	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?	
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Yes, with focus on institutional context.

	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Adequate, taking into account data on resource status described above.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Yes.
	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;	
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	
	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?	Project structure is clear but design lacks an explicit theory of change.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Design integrates multiple pathways to change, including technology, regulation, enforcement capacity and community engagement.
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Yes, with appropriate intent to apply principles of FAO Voluntary Guidelines for Small-Scale Fisheries.
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	
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?	Good likelihood, though magnitude of benefits uncertain.

	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/adaptation benefits, and are they measurable?	Yes, with clear identification of biodiversity values in targeted areas in relation to various global assessments.
	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?	Yes.
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Yes.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Integrated as a key risk factor.
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?	Claims regarding innovation are very preliminary. would benefit from specific articulation of innovative dimensions with regards to policy, (community-based) business models, governance and incentives for sustainable fishing. Good opportunity to test principles of collaborative governance, with lessons relevant beyond fisheries.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Yes, including international aspects.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	While many of the approaches have found local success in other places, achieving change at the scale targeted requires transformational change.
<b>1b.</b> Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project		

<p>interventions will take place.</p>		
<p><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.</p>	<p>Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?</p>	<p>Brief but adequate identification of stakeholders.</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>Roles indicated in preliminary fashion.</p>
<p><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</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Good, initial indication of plans for gender analysis. Consider research on women's empowerment, collective action in Mexican fisheries: <a href="#">Torre, J., Hernandez-Velasco, A., Rivera-Melo, F.F. et al. (2019). Women's empowerment, collective actions, and sustainable fisheries: lessons from Mexico. Maritime Studies 18, 373–384 (2019).</a></p>

<p>empowerment? Yes/no/tbd.</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>Yes, recognizing dimensions related to livelihoods, local organizations, and distribution of economic benefits.</p>
<p><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</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"> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?</li> <li>• Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?</li> <li>• What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?</li> </ul>	<p>Reasonable mitigation measures noted to address four identified risks, including climate change. However, there is not adequate attention to risks concerning governance and incentives for enforcement of regulations at multiple (community, local / state / national government) levels. Given broader concerns regarding rule of law, and documented links between drug cartels and fishing operators involving human rights abuses, there should be explicit attention to the political economy dimensions of reform.</p>
<p><b>6. Coordination.</b> Outline the coordination with other</p>	<p>Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives		
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Appropriate links with related initiatives are noted, including opportunities for exchange of lessons. Would be good to also include consideration of programs supported by the Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) on fisheries management.
	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?	
<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?	Knowledge management well integrated into design. Would benefit from detailing metrics to measure progress.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	Plans are described in a preliminary fashion.

Notes

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
<p><b>1. Concur</b></p>	<p>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>
	<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>
<p><b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b></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><b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b></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>

(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.