

### STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response	
GEF ID	10558	
Project Title	Fisheries and Ecosystem Based Management for the Black Sea - (FishEBM BS)	
Date of Screening	16 May 2020	
STAP member screener	Blake Ratner	
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski	
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p><b>Minor</b></p> <p>STAP welcomes this project from FAO to enhance the capacity of Black Sea countries to manage fisheries. The case for a regional approach is clear, though extensive development and high pollution in the basin, plus recent volatility in commercial fish catches, underline the difficulty of restoring the fishery.</p> <p>A significant point of caution is limited progress despite long-standing recognition of the key issues, including GEF involvement from the 1990s. Ambitions are good, but achieving these requires critical examination of the reasons why past efforts have not succeeded and the learning processes required to adapt. Building a solid, shared understanding of the barriers to change is essential to subsequently cultivate interest and demand for any new lessons / insights generated.</p> <p>Descriptions of innovations are generic, which makes it difficult to identify truly innovative elements at this stage. Passing reference is made to political instability and major pollution incidents, but mitigation regarding political context only addresses security risks, not the difficulties of influencing change when governments have varying levels of commitment and divergent incentives. No mitigation measures are listed for pollution.</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?	Reasonable structure of components.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Plausible, though extensive development and high pollution in the basin, plus recent volatility in commercial fish catches, underline difficulty of restoring the fishery.
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, though serious attention is needed to the shortcomings of past investments in the fishery.
<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.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes, including good use of charts to illustrate trends.
	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 reasonable summary of data and identification of related projects. However, a significant point of caution is limited progress despite long-standing recognition of the key issues: "Since the late 90's the littoral States have worked together thanks to past GEF interventions aimed at setting priorities related to national and transboundary environmental concerns. Arguably,

		the TDA as well as the SAP, despite calling for concerted actions to address fisheries related challenges, have not been able to prompt adequate responses in the region in this respect.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Additional quantification of baseline is required with reference to key dimensions of anticipated change.
	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?	Theory of Change diagram is provided. Would benefit from more explicit linkages made between outcomes, transitional states, and "impact drivers." In what respect, for example, is "sustainability" a driver of reversing exploitation of marine resources, and how does that relate to the management interventions envisioned?
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Description of components makes useful reference to barriers addressed.
	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?	More attention to assumptions is required, even if these are preliminary and will be queried during PPG stage as noted.
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	Ambitions are good but achieving these requires critical examination of the reasons why past efforts have not succeeded and learning processes required to adapt. For example:

		<p>“A participatory approach will create an environment conducive of learning where fishers will be directly involved so as to reduce the risk of conflicts over fish stocks.”</p>
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?	Difficult to judge likelihood of success; the approach recognizes considerable risk. The reasoning entails an aspect of linking existing efforts and system disruption: “in the absence of such a GEF intervention the status quo would not be adequately challenged and that under the business as usual scenario...”
	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, with recognition of considerable barriers as noted.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Useful mapping to SDG14 targets provided.
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Will require further specification.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project’s resilience to climate change?	Climate adaptation strategies integrated 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?	Descriptions of innovations are generic, which makes it difficult to identify truly innovative elements at this stage.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Transformational change is required, given longstanding political and institutional barriers.

<p><b>1b. Project Map and Coordinates.</b> Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project 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>Stakeholder roles are described in broad categories, with useful reference to relevant outputs (table 3), but additional specification of examples of key actors would be helpful. This includes key civil society organizations and private sector actors.</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><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</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Appropriate mention is made of gendered roles in fisheries value chains. Gender mainstreaming is, however, discussed in mainly abstract terms, which makes it difficult to assess the distinctiveness of the proposed approach.</p>

<p>measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women 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><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>Passing reference is made to political instability and major pollution incidents, but mitigation regarding political context only addresses security risks, not the difficulties of influencing change when governments have varying levels of commitment and divergent incentives. No mitigation measures are listed for pollution.</p> <p>Climate risks have not been assessed specifically; this is noted as part of plans for PPG stage.</p>

<b>6. Coordination.</b> 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?	Relevant initiatives and agencies are identified and plans suggest that these will be well consulted during project preparation.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Difficult to assess learning from prior projects; explicit identification of lessons is needed.
	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 activities are integrated into the design, but there is minimal indication of the approach envisioned. In particular, given the depth of prior experience and apparently durable barriers to change, the KM approach needs to enable authentic spaces for probing what has not worked and what can be done differently. Building a solid, shared understanding of these barriers to change is essential to subsequently cultivate interest and demand for any new lessons / insights generated. A preliminary indication of KM metrics would be helpful.
	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
<b>1. Concur</b>	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 <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>
<b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	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.
<b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b>	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.
--	---