Part I: Project Information		Response
GEF ID		10181
Project Title		IKAN Adapt: Strengthening the adaptive capacity, resilience and biodiversity conservation ability of fisheries and aquaculture-dependent livelihoods in Timor-Leste
Date of Screening		21-May-19
STAP member Screener		Toth, F.
STAP secretariat screener		Zommers, Z.
STAP Overall Assessment		Minor issues
		STAP welcomes the proposed approach to tackle climate change adaptation, biodiversity and food security together and to manage them in an integrated manner. The Global Environment Outlook (GEO-6) report notes the importance of harvesting food more efficiently and sustainably from oceans and coasts since both capture fisheries and aquaculture are expected to expand. Overexploitation of fisheries globally is leading to population declines in marine fisheries with the percentage of global stocks fished at biologically unsustainable levels increasing from 10% in 1975 to 33% in 2015. Aquaculture can reduce the pressures of overexploitation for some wild species, but can also lead to invasive species, inter-species breeding, eutrophication and disease spread. Hence an integrated approach that considers climate change, biodiversity and food security trade-offs is necessary. . The problem statement identifies severe problems and worsening trends both in the natural resource base (degradation) and in the socio-economic domain in Timor-Leste. Reversing these trends is the first key step but a lot more is needed because of the projected negative impacts of climate change. A range of efforts, national and internationally-supported, are underway to address this situation, which provide a useful basis on which to build this project. The project is well-conceived, comprising an internally consistent set of efforts to produce tools, build human and institutional capacities, and demonstrate promising practices that, taken together, have the promise of achieving multiple objectives such as improving food security, biodiversity protection, reducing exposure to current vagaries of weather, and improving adaptive capacity to future climate change. Minor improvements are suggested in the table below. STAP recommends that the proposers consider implementing improvements in the following items: theory of change and contingency plan, innovation, risk assessment and management, knowledge management.
Part I: Project Information	**What STAP looks for**	**Response**
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
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.	Clearly presented
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	Yes
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Resonable likelihood

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?	Intended outputs are reasonable.
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	No formal theory of change; see below.
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
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes
	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
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?	Baseline involves many valuable activities to build on but little in terms of quantified benefits.
	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
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	Yes
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	Direct involvement in or interviews during preparations.
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	Regrettably, no explicit theory of change is presented. Yet each of the three components intends to produce an outcome, emerging from 3-4 outputs produced in corresponding activities. This logical framework is expected to lead to generating the intended results. • Properly described.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	
	· 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?	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?	No such concerns are presented. They should be considered and proper fallbacks developed. Tying the specified sequence of actions and events together in a theory of change would also enable this kind of contingency planning
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?	The baseline scenario includes respectable efforts, but complementary investments are needed to make them really effective. No attempt is made at preparing an incremental cost reasoning.
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	Yes
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?	Although the quantified core indicators appear to be modest, but the biodiversity value of the region is high.
	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, indicators
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Improving resilience is one of the main objectives
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?	Linking climate change adaptation and biodiversity to food security and managing them in an integrated manner is a novel approach. A declared objective is to develop innovative tools and adaptation technologies and transfer them to farmers, fishers and communities
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	There is indication of plans for scaling up but they are somewhat vague. More specific action plans would be useful
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	The plan is to work within the current structures and programs and to gradually scale up through integration with national development programs. Clear and determined actions will be needed to pursue truly transformative changes beyond the current boundaries.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Provided

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?	Yes
	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?	Key stakeholders are the local communities, but many other government agencies, private sector, NGOs and scientific institutes have participated or at least have been consulted in the PIF preparation. The project focus is on small scale operators. To encourage long term expansion of aquaculture in the country, it may be worthwhile examining opportunities for encouraging commercial private sector organizations to participate and strengthening value chains.
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 issues have been considered but no specific response measures are presented.
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	Such hindrances are not mentioned.
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?	The identified risks are valid but their scope is rather limited, most are outside the project's control.
	Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?	A social risk is the cultural barrier concerning the role of women in fisheries and aquaculture that may hinder reaching gender related objectives
	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?	A range of risks associated with current climate variability and extreme events as well as future climate change are mentioned but not assessed in detail.

	· Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?	In general, a more systematic, broader scope social and environmental risk assessment would be needed. Climate risks will need to be assessed for the baseline and the alternative scenario so that proper measures can be designed and implemented to enhance climate resilience, reduce climate vulnerability and thus improve adaptive capacity. Evidence is emerging that the growth of aquaculture may increase greenhouse gas emissions (see for example Yuan et al. 2019). Risks of increased GHG emissions from aquaculture should be evaluated during the project preparation phase and mitigation measures (e.g. aerated systems) identified. Further attempts should be made to minimize any risks of eutrophication and disease from aquaculture.
	· 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?	
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
	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?	
	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
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?	The knowledge management plan is very weak and needs a major improvement. No KM mechanism is specified in the PIF but the intention is there. Developing practical guidelines and a few other ideas are mentioned about KM. STAP recommends that the project team prepare a more detailed KM plan, including KM indicators and metrics. The related STAP document Managing knowledge for a sustainable future https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/publications/STAP%20Report%20on%20KM.pdf is a good source of guidance
	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.	

	* 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."***	
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.	