

Part I: Project Information		Response
GEF ID	10394	
Project Title	Mainstreaming climate change and ecosystem-based approaches into the sustainable management of the living marine resources of the WCPFC	
Date of Screening	5-Dec-19	
STAP member Screener	Blake Ratner	
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski	
STAP Overall Assessment		Minor issues to be considered during project design: STAP welcomes the project on mainstreaming climate change and ecosystem-based approaches into the sustainable management of the living marine resources of the WCPFC submitted by UNDP. The project builds upon significant prior analysis and investment, with some indication of innovative efforts. Outcome targeting, stakeholder analysis, cross-regional scaling, and knowledge management plans remain quite preliminary and should be further specified at CEO project endorsement stage.
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, including technology and KM dimensions
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.	Note error in Core Indicator 5.1: lists "number of fisheries... that meet certification" as 3.6 million.
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	Yes, Pacific fisheries both highly biodiverse and economically important
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Targets are well quantified and ambitious but 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?	Reasonable
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?	Adequate
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Adequate
	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?	Good description of prior investments and policy initiatives

	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Yes, with good quantification of tuna status
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Yes, with good specification of proximate drivers
	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?	Coordinated efforts to address weaknesses in fisheries management and compliance, climate impacts and ecosystem health, and ecosystem-based management approaches will yield sustained recovery of key fisheries.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Reasonably specified, though outcomes are primarily descriptive without targets; plans for further specification of targets are noted
	· What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	Includes useful 'causal chain analysis'
	· Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Assumptions not explicit
	· Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	Climate risks well noted
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 given prior TDA and SAP; includes appropriate recognition of multiple partnerships to develop
	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
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	yes, though anticipated biodiversity benefits could be better specified
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Yes, at level of IW targets; plans for further specification of targets are noted
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Acknowledged as a prime risk and focus
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?	Includes innovative technology, monitoring and management measures

	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Within region scaling is clear; plans for cross-region exchange are noted but vague
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Some management improvements may be incremental, but securing enduring impacts beyond the period of investment will require 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?	Good coverage of governmental agencies. NGO engagement appears very initial. Private sector may need to consider others in value chain beyond fisheries association.
	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?	Description of roles remains very tentative
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?	Past efforts and programmatic importance of gender equality noted but specific actions not yet defined for this initiative.
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	Yes, particularly in decision making. Response not yet defined.
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?	Reasonable coverage of risks
	Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?	Not well considered
	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?	Includes adaptive management responses to climate impact

	· Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?	Yes, with reference to prior studies
	· Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?	Yes; connectivity between land-based, coastal and offshore activities indicated
	· What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?	Integrated in project activities
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?	Linkages to SPC, FFA, WWF, ISSF and other initiatives noted
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Yes
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	Clear progression on past efforts, with some innovations identified
	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?	Preliminary plans noted
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?	KM plans remain very general
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	
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.	
	<i>* 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 "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.	