

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response	
GEF ID	10560	
Project Title	Fisheries and Ecosystem Based Management for the Blue Economy of the Mediterranean - (FishEBM MED)	
Date of Screening	20 May 2020	
STAP member screener	Blake Ratner	
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski	
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Concur</p> <p>STAP welcomes the project from FAO entitled “Fisheries and Ecosystem Based Management for the Blue Economy of the Mediterranean - (FishEBM MED).” The project design provides a sound assessment of the relative lack of priority to fisheries within “blue economy” investment in the region, and to small-scale fisheries in particular, building upon extensive prior initiatives. The project design clearly links capacity, technology for monitoring IUU, ecosystem-based management, and piloting of innovations. Knowledge management and scaling is well integrated.</p> <p>The design also reflects a strong focus on the lack of capacity at country level, poor coordination and overexploitation of fishery resources. Additional emphasis should be focused on incentives for enforcement. Capacity is necessary but not sufficient to strengthen enforcement. It will be important to ensure that monitoring and lesson-learning during implementation include deep analysis of the barriers to effective enforcement of standards and regulations.</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.
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?	Yes, well structured.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Good basis for progress given substantial prior efforts within the region.
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, well aligned.
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, with sound assessment of the relative lack of priority to fisheries within "blue economy" investment in the region, and to small-scale fisheries in particular. Excellent use of data, and charts to illustrate the trends, and useful reference to related, prior initiatives to set the stage.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes, clear and succinct.
	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, with good reference to climate change, biodiversity and pollution linkages.
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Yes.

	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Yes, with good references to peer-reviewed studies.
	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;	Yes. Project outcomes include useful, preliminary targets for proposed indicators, which include biodiversity linkages.
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	Description of related projects primarily focuses on objectives, but there is some preliminary indication of lessons.
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	Incorporation of data and institutional analysis from prior efforts. Theory of Change specifically references incorporation of lessons learned from the MedProgramme.
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	Explicit theory of change diagram provided, which indicates careful design.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Strong focus on lack of capacity at country level, poor coordination and overexploitation of fishery resources. Additional emphasis should be focused on incentives for enforcement. Capacity is necessary but not sufficient to strengthen enforcement.
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	Design clearly links capacity, technology for monitoring IUU, ecosystem-based management, and piloting of innovations. Knowledge management and scaling is well integrated.
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Yes, but explicit identification of assumptions would strengthen the design.

	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	Indication of preliminary outcome indicators and suggestion of flexibility in identification of pilot investments suggests flexibility. But would be good to note approach to adaptive learning planned for implementation.
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 of achieving significant benefits, if incentives are clearly addressed.
	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.
	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?	Good mapping to SDG 14 indicators is provided (table 2).
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Adaptation strategies to climate change addressed in component 3.
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?	Demonstration of emerging technologies for IUU monitoring and enforcement has innovative potential. Achieving strengthened regional governance of shared fisheries could also offer important lessons for other regions. Given the importance of European and other urban markets in trade of fish sourced from the Mediterranean, there should also be opportunity

		to experiment with demand-side innovations, building upon certification and traceability.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Initial plans indicated. Please refer to new STAP Guidance Note on multi-stakeholder dialogue, addressing regional-scale collaboration (to be posted prior to June 2020 Council meeting).
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	PIF refers explicitly to need for “transformational change to resilient, productive and sustainable fisheries”
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		
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.	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Good narrative description of consultation processes undertaken.
	What are the stakeholders’ roles, and how will their combined roles contribute to robust project design, to	Table 3 provides an exemplary approach to summarizing anticipated stakeholder roles,

	achieving global environmental outcomes, and to lessons learned and knowledge?	including areas of expertise, substantive indication of specific contributions, and relevant outputs.
<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>	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	<p>Good indication of plans for coordination with MedProgramme re gender mainstreaming strategy, based on gender analysis.</p> <p>Good reference to relevant standards of the European Institute for Gender Equality. May consider outreach to KIT (Netherlands), with expertise in gender analysis of aquaculture and fisheries value chains.</p>
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	Significant obstacles to gender equality in processing and trade aspects of fish value chains merit attention.
5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and	Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?	Good indication of risks external to the project, including political stability, pollution and disease outbreaks.

<p>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 there social and environmental risks which could affect the project? 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>Good indication that risk levels and responses will be deliberated through stakeholder engagement prior to CEO endorsement stage. Climate risks are integrated.</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.</p>
	<p>Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?</p>	<p>Strong evidence of project design building upon prior projects.</p>
	<p>Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?</p>	<p>Would be helpful to detail specific lessons and how these influence the design, prior to CEO endorsement stage.</p>
	<p>How have these lessons informed the project’s formulation?</p>	
	<p>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?</p>	
<p>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</p>	<p>What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?</p>	<p>Good integration indicated with MedProgramme KM strategy, including science-policy interface. Will be important to ensure that monitoring and lesson-learning during implementation include deep analysis of the barriers to effective enforcement of standards and regulations.</p>

projects, initiatives and evaluations.		
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	

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.

3. Major issues to be considered during project design	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:
	(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.