

Part I: Project Information

GEF ID	10076
Project Title	EBM of PACA LME
Date of Screening	2-Dec-18
Screeener	B Ratner
Panel Member	B Ratner
STAP Overall Assessment	Concur

Part I: Project Information**B. Indicative Project Description**

	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, clearly structured
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits?	yes, but described qualitatively; quantification would strengthen where feasible yes
Outputs	Are the global environmental benefits likely to be generated? 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?	depends primarily upon socio-political and economic factors influencing policy design and well organized
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	Is the problem statement well-defined?	well defined and substantiated with prior research findings from scientific sources
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	yes

	<p>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?</p>	n/a
<p>2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects</p>	<p>Is the baseline identified clearly? Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?</p> <p>Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?</p> <p>Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?</p> <p>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?</p>	<p>yes, well described</p> <p>for certain measures of ecosystem status, there is a wide range of estimation from different sources, and many sources describe only sub-units of the PACA</p> <p>adequate</p> <p>n/a</p>
<p>3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project</p>	<p>What is the theory of change?</p>	<p>A regional cooperation framework for EBM will motivate and sustain coordinated action at regional level and governance arrangements to address the key threats to coastal and marine biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p>

	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Well structured, in relation to key barriers identified.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives? 	well structured
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions? 	yes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes? 	implied through emphasis on cross-country dialogue and coordination with neighboring LMEs
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?	plausibly
	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, with measures provided for some dimensions
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	yes
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	Good identification of targeted contributions to Aichi Biodiversity Targets and SDG Goal 14.
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	adequate

7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	core activities are consistent with climate adaptation goals
	Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?	aims for "new approaches to build collaborative management at the LME scale" -- key focus in full project preparation will need to be to delineate these innovations and methods for testing their effectiveness
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	objective for scaling is clear, but measures will need to be implemented to track this during implementation
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	ambition for innovation in regional governance for collaborative management implies a transformational change

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?

information is preliminary and summarized but appears adequate

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? information is preliminary and summarized but appears adequate

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

Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences? No particular risks identified here, but addressed briefly in risks table; measures identified are appropriate.

Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed? Addressed in risks table

<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? yes</p> <p>Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?</p>
	<p>Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project? yes</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? yes</p>
	<p>· Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed? yes</p>
	<p>· Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with? not clear, but may be assumed</p> <p>· What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures? addressed</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? list of relevant projects identified appears thorough</p> <p>Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them? apparently included in section 1</p> <p>Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited? some in section 1 regarding data and challenges;</p> <p>How have these lessons informed the project's formulation? not clear with regards to lessons / elements for success</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?	not described
<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 projects, initiatives and evaluations.</p>	<p>What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?</p>	<p>no indicators and metrics identified</p>
	<p>What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?</p>	<p>plans for knowledge management would benefit from an elaboration of mechanisms to promote exchange of lessons beyond documentation and online distribution of lessons, particularly with regard to the function of the proposed “working groups” at regional scale. If done well, these could potentially provide an additional track for transboundary cooperation beyond the more formal intergovernmental links</p>

STAP Notes

The PIF provides a thorough and well-documented presentation of baseline information drawn from a wide variety of sources and clearly identifies the diversity of threats to marine ecosystems and the need for a transboundary approach. The project proposes that a regional cooperation framework for EBM will motivate and sustain coordinated action at regional level and governance arrangements to address the key threats to coastal and marine biodiversity and ecosystem services.

For certain measures of ecosystem status, there is a wide range of estimation from different sources, and many sources describe only sub-units of the Pacific Central America LME (PACA). This is to be expected given the state of prior analysis at the LME scale, and underlines the value of the proposed transboundary diagnostic analysis (TDA).

The PIF provides good identification of targeted contributions to Aichi Biodiversity Targets and SDG Goal 14, in addition to the core GEF-7 targets. Among targeted innovations, it aims for "new approaches to build collaborative management at the LME scale." In addition to additional work to provide quantitative measures of the full set of project targets, a key focus in full project preparation should be to delineate the planned innovations and methods for testing their effectiveness.

Other elements, including stakeholder identification, gender equality and risks are addressed briefly but adequately for this stage; the STAP recommends a fuller treatment before CEO endorsement stage. Likewise, it will be important to develop a fuller treatment of lessons from earlier projects (within the region and in other LMEs) and how these have informed the project theory of change and activities.

Additionally, the plans for knowledge management would benefit from an elaboration of mechanisms to promote exchange of lessons beyond documentation and online distribution of lessons, particularly with regard to the function of the proposed “working groups” at regional scale. If done well, these could potentially provide an additional track for transboundary cooperation beyond the more formal intergovernmental links.

Note: the initial PIF made available for review had key subsections of the Project Justification omitted; this screen was completed with the full PIF document (dated 19 Nov 2018).

Minor note: Duration is mis-stated in project summary (5 years, not months)