

| Part I: Project Information | | Response |
|--|--|--|
| GEF ID | 10375 | |
| Project Title | Blue Nature Alliance to expand and improve conservation of 1.25 billion hectares of ocean ecosystems | |
| Date of Screening | 5-Dec-19 | |
| STAP member Screener | Blake Ratner | |
| STAP secretariat screener | Virginia Gorsevski | |
| STAP Overall Assessment | | Concur: STAP welcomes the project entitled "Blue Nature Alliance to expand and improve conservation of 1.25 billion ha of ocean ecosystems" from Conservation International. This is a highly ambitious, clearly presented, and thoughtfully designed project. Good use of quantitative targets at outcome and output levels. In addition, STAP believes that it has potential for high innovation and scaling, with a broad coalition of investors and actors. Actual GEBs depend critically upon moving from legal status to sustained shifts in management actions and measures to address proximate and underlying drivers of change. |
| Part I: Project Information | | |
| B. Indicative Project Description Summary | | |
| 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. | Clearly identified, with indicators |
| | Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits? | Yes, with specific quantitative targets |
| | Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated? | Contingent upon implementation / improved management of protected areas in practice |
| 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? | Well specified |
| 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 good reference to scientific studies |
| | Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references? | Yes, appropriately distinguishing proximate drivers of degradation vs institutional barriers to progress |
| | 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? | yes |
| | Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits? | yes |
| | Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project? | yes |
| | For multiple focal area projects: | n/a |
| | 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? | Includes useful visualisations |
| | What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes? | Clearly identified and visualised |
| | · What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives? | well specified |
| | · Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well informed identification of the underlying assumptions? | yes |
| | · Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes? | Acknowledges needs for science, capacity building and networking |
| 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? | Rationale well stated |
| | 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? | yes -- highly ambitious with at least 8x target co-investment |
| | 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? | yes |
| | What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change? | Climate aspects well integrated |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 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? | Yes, innovative in partnership approach, business plans, financing, science integration |
| | Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors? | yes |
| | Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability? | transformational, with clear link to 30% marine protection goal |
| 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? | Very strong coverage of foundations, with appropriate plans for site-specific engagement |
| | 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? | well specified |
| 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? | Gender-transformative approach well stated and justified |
| | Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed? | well specified |
| 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 | Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control? | Good coverage of risks in global context as well as stakeholder engagement |
| | Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project? | yes, noted |
| | 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? | Well integrated |
| | · Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed? | well recognized |
| | · Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with? | yes |
| | · What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures? | Includes science for mitigation and adaptation links |
| 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? | yes, well specified |
| | Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them? | yes |
| | 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? | yes, strong emphasis, including IW:Learn links |
| 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? | well specified |
| | What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience? | strong emphasis, well specified |
| 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. | |