



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5667		
Country/Region:	Regional (Antigua And Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, St. Vincent and Grenadines)		
Project Title:	Climate Change Adaptation in the Eastern Caribbean Fisheries Sector		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$5,460,000
Co-financing:	\$37,542,000	Total Project Cost:	\$43,002,000
PIF Approval:	February 05, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	March 21, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Fareeha Iqbal	Agency Contact Person:	Raymon Van Amrooy

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	YES. The countries proposed for this regional project (Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, St. Vincent and Grenadines) are non- Annex I Parties to the UNFCCC.	YES. See comments at PIF.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	NO. The operational focal point from St. Vincent and Grenadines endorsed the project on October 11, 2013. However, letters from OFPs of Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, and Trinidad and Tobago, should also be included with submission of PIF.	YES. See comments at PIF.

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please include a signed LoE from the OFPs of Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, and Trinidad and Tobago.</p> <p>CL - 01/28/14 -- YES. The revised PIF now includes all LoEs.</p>	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the STAR allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	YES. The proposed grant amount of \$5.46 million is available under the SCCF adaptation program.	YES. See comments at PIF.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund • focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	YES, the project is well aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework and strategic objectives.	YES. See comments at PIF.
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national	YES. The PIF adequately describes country national strategies and plans to	YES. See comments at PIF.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	which the projects are aligned. In particular, the document refers to the importance of marine ecosystems and the fisheries sector in the various National Communication documents in each project country.	
Project Design	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>NOT CLEAR. While the project adequately describes the baseline scenario and the specific vulnerabilities of the Eastern Caribbean region, information on the specific baseline interventions (to which the project will build) remains unclear. Specifically:</p> <p>1) On pg. 11, the PIF describes that "FAO is supporting project development activities" in line with the Strategy and Action Plan for DRM and CCA in fisheries and aquaculture, but does not provide examples of the strategies laid out in the Plan, and the specific interventions being implemented by FAO in project countries.</p> <p>2) The PIF mentions that "the Regular Programmes of the Fisheries Divisions provide the baseline for the 5 project components" (pg. 14), but does not adequately describe (for each component) the ongoing baseline activities being implemented by the Fisheries administrations in project countries.</p> <p>3) Additional information on the following baseline projects (as mentioned on pages 11 and 12) should be provided: the CERMES developed methodology for</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR.</p> <p>As noted in the ProDoc, baseline initiatives are being led by the CARIBSAVE partnership, FAO's Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission (WECAFC), Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism (CRFM), the University of West Indies (UWI), the Caribbean Network of Fisher folk Organizations (CNFO), and the Nature Conservancy (TNC). However, clarity on the following is requested:</p> <p>1) Given some differences in baseline projects across the seven countries, it is difficult to discern the key activities taking place in each country. Therefore, in addition to the information provided in Table 5 of the ProDoc, kindly provide a brief description of the various project initiatives and priorities being addressed in each country.</p> <p>2) From Table 5, it is not clear how the baseline projects align with the three project components, as well as the approximate amount (\$USD) for these initiatives.</p> <p>3) Also, some partners (such as UNEP, IUCN, Caribbean Public Health Agency</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) (Component 1), the Marine Resource and Space-Use Information System (MARSIS) (Component 1), the Programmes for "Safety at Sea" (Component 2), the Caribbean Network of Fisherfolk Organizations (CNFO) (Component 3), and the Fisheries for Fishers' Initiative (GCFI) (Component 3), the Aquaculture Network for the Americas (Component 5).</p> <p>4) For all projects described, the associated financing, respective time-frames, and coverage across project countries, should be provided.</p> <p>5) The PIF could briefly describe the baseline scenario related mobile phone use and ICTs, as they relate to Component 3.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify/provide information on: (i) how the baseline investments described relate to the indicative co-financing figures provided in Table B, (ii) FAO projects being implemented in line with the Strategy and Plan, (ii) activities under the Fisheries Administrations, (iii) activities under interventions mentioned on pages 11 and 12, (iv) associated financing, time-frames and coverage, for all projects described, and (v) the baseline scenario related to mobile phone use and ICTs.</p> <p>CL -- 01/28/14: YES. The existing baseline projects under each component</p>	<p>etc.) are not listed as co-financiers (Table C) but are included in Table 5 - kindly clarify if these agencies would be contributing any co-financing to the project.</p> <p>Recommended action: 1) clarify baseline activities in each of the 7 countries, 2) which project components align with baselines, and 3) clarify if other external partners are contributing to project as co-financiers.</p> <p>FI, 10/15/15: Yes. Agency has clarified that Table 5 represents relevant initiatives that are not considered as co-financing for the project. As requested, it has provided details by country and identified external partners as well as the project components that such initiatives relate to or align with.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>have been adequately described, including a full list of baseline project descriptions in Annex II of the revised PIF.</p> <p>NOT CLEAR. Please address comments in section 6 above.</p> <p>In addition, some outputs described in Table B are not mentioned in component descriptions. For example, the PIF cites that support will be provided towards "Early warning needs assessment and basic training provided in line with IMO convention for safety at sea" (Output 2.1) and "exchange programmes on adaptive technologies" (Output 3.2.), but no such activities are mentioned in the component descriptions on pgs. 11 and 12.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under section 6, please ensure that output descriptions in Table B are consistent with component descriptions.</p> <p>CL -- 01/28/14: YES. The project addresses initial comments in section 6. In addition, outputs in project framework (Table B) are consistent with component descriptions.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Kindly address comments in 6, and adjust co-financing numbers if needed.</p> <p>Also:</p> <p>1) Under Outcome 1.1. (Indicator 5), please clarify (if possible) which of the 5 countries will be selected for vulnerability assessments (and describe reasons for this selection in the outcome description)? Also, will the same countries be selected under Outcome 3.1. (Indicators 10 and 12)?</p> <p>2) Under Outcome 3.1. please clarify if mainstreaming activities will also include budgeting and allocation of resources for adaptation activities? This is not clear from Outputs 3.1.1. and 3.1.2.</p> <p>Recommended action: Kindly 1) address comments in 6, 2) clarify which of the 5 countries will be selected for vulnerability assessments, and 3) please clarify if mainstreaming activities also include budgeting and allocation of resources?</p> <p>FI, 10/15/15: Further information is requested. Please: 1) Change "Type of Trust Fund" on p.1 of the Request from GEF Trust Fund to</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>"SCCF".</p> <p>2) Please identify INV components in Table B (currently, all are TA).</p> <p>Agency has provided adequate responses to comments from earlier review, i.e.: (1) countries have been clarified for the assessments (Grenada, St. Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines and Trinidad and Tobago); (2) the SCCF resources will provide additional financing to enable mainstreaming of adaptation activities in budgeted fisheries plans in each country.</p> <p>FI, 12/8/15: Agency has been asked to identify INV components of the project.</p> <p>FI, 01/07/2016: Cleared.</p>
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please address comments in section 6 and 7 above. In the absence of a clear description of the baseline initiatives, the additional cost reasoning cannot be assessed.</p> <p>In addition, the additional cost reasoning for each component (including how activities will build on the existing baseline projects) should be adequately described.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 7, please ensure that the document includes information on the</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please address comments in 6, before additional cost reasoning is assessed.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please address comments in 6.</p> <p>FI, 10/15/15: Further information is requested. The additional cost reasoning has been provided in general terms. However, Agency is requested to provide details on concrete, on-the-ground adaptation investments that will be made, e.g.: What are the various specific adaptation technologies that will be provided? How</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>additional cost for each component.</p> <p>CL -- 01/28/14: YES. The revised PIF address all initial comments, and outlines, for each component, the adaptation alternatives to be implemented by the SCCF project.</p>	<p>will rehabilitation of existing aquaculture centers, and creation of new ones, be done in a way that promotes adaptation to climate change (thereby qualifying for SCCF support)?</p> <p>FI, 12/8/2015: Yes, Agency has satisfactorily addressed the comments of 10/15. Additional information has been provided in the CEO Endorsement Request and the ProDoc.</p>
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		<p>YES. The project aims to better the livelihoods of local communities in the eastern Caribbean (especially women) who are highly dependent on fisheries for food security. The project cites that "at least 20 percent of beneficiaries in component 1, 2, and 3 will be women" -- they will be engaged in various aspects of project design and implementation. The project framework is also disaggregated by gender, for monitoring gender specific impacts.</p>
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. While the PIF identifies key stakeholder on pg. 17 (e.g. regional and local NGOs, CBOs and fisherfolk associations), the document does not adequately describe their level of engagement during the lifecycle of the project.</p> <p>CL -- 01/28/14: YES. All relevant stakeholders have been identified in the revised PIF, specifically, the PPG phase will also allow for improved analysis and strengthening of stakeholder involvement across the project life cycle.</p>	<p>YES. The project is engaging with a wide-range of stakeholders, including, government agencies, research institutes, private sector groups, CSOs and international agencies. This information is detailed in Table 7 of the ProDoc.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	YES. The project adequately identifies and ranks risks, and includes sound mitigation measures to be incorporated into the project concept.	YES. Risks and their associated mitigation measures are included in Table 8 and Appendix 4 (ProDoc).
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	YES. The project is consistent with several projects across the region, including GEF-funded projects such as the Caribbean Large marine Ecosystem (CLME) Project and the Sustainable Management of bycatch in LAC trawl fisheries (REBYC-II LAC). The document also describes (on pg. 14 and 18) other relevant ongoing regional projects to which the project is aligned.	YES. See comments at PIF. Also, a comprehensive list of initiatives of both direct and indirect relevance to the project are listed on pg. 29 and 30 of the ProDoc.
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	NOT CLEAR. The innovative aspects of the project cannot be fully assessed at this time. Please refer to sections 6, 7 and 8 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please refer to sections 6, 7 and 8. CL -- 01/28/14: YES. The project's innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling-up are adequately described on pgs. 24-25 of the revised PIF. Specifically: INNOVATION: The project is innovative in its integration of Information Communication Technologies (ICTs) to fisheries management, allowing farmers to have access to real-time data and information from reliable weather forecasting	NOT CLEAR. The innovative aspects of the project cannot be fully assessed at this time. Please refer to sections 6, 7 and 8 above. Recommended action: Please refer to sections 6, 7 and 8. FI, 10/15/15: Yes, provision of real-time meteorological and early warning data to fisherfolk, and mainstreaming climate change adaptation in fisheries-sector policies and planning, and innovative in the context of the Eastern Caribbean.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>agencies and institutions. The project is also innovative in its application of the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) to promote the integration of climate change adaptation measures and strategies into fisheries planning.</p> <p>SUSTAINABILITY: Currently, the project cites that "none of the participating countries currently has climate change adaptation strategies and measures mainstreamed in their national fisheries policies, fisheries strategies and fisheries management plans". Therefore, the introduction of this regional project will increase capacity of governments at both regional and national levels to embed climate change adaptation measures into fisheries management, ensure the sustainable development of the sector, and continue to promote project activities beyond project termination.</p> <p>SCALE-UP: The project is aligned with several ongoing baselines projects (Annex II) and other initiatives (including relevant GEF projects), allowing for best practices, knowledge and lessons to be shared between farming communities and governments. Through these partnerships, the project aims to ensure the replication and scaling-up of outputs through the effective harmonization of methods and approaches.</p>	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		YES. Changes to the project framework are adequately described in section A.5. of the CEO Endorsement Request

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		<p>YES. Cost-effectiveness of the project is adequately described in section B.3. of the CEO Endorsement Request.</p> <p>While they have high upfront costs, the project describes the long-term cost-effectiveness of using regional and down-scaled climate models to assess climate change impacts in the fisheries sector. Also, data sharing through the use of mobile applications can equip farmers with the information to quickly secure their assets during storms and hurricanes, therefore mitigating potential human/economic losses.</p>
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6, 7 and 8.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing recommendations under 6, 7, and 8, please adjust indicative grant and co-financing amounts per component.</p> <p>CL 01/28/14: YES. Co-financing figures in Table B are appropriate and adequate.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR.</p> <p>Please refer to sections 6, 7 and 8 above.</p> <p>Recommended action: Upon addressing recommendations under 6, 7, and 8, please adjust indicative grant and co-financing amounts as appropriate.</p> <p>FI, 10/15/15: Yes, Agency has responded to comments for items 6, 7 and 8. No changes in SCCF grant or co-financing have been proposed.</p>
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6, 7, 8 and 16.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing recommendations under 6, 7, 8 and 16, please adjust indicative grant and co-financing amounts per component.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR.</p> <p>Please refer to sections 6, 7 and 8 above.</p> <p>Recommended action: Upon addressing recommendations under 6, 7, and 8, please adjust indicative grant and co-financing amounts as appropriate.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		CL 01/28/14: YES.	FI, 10/15/15: Yes, letters confirming co-financing have been provided. (Please note that while overall co-financing shown for SVG in Table C is the same as in the co-financing letter, the split across cash/in-kind amounts do not match).
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	YES.	YES.
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	YES. A PPG of \$150,000 is being requested.	NOT CLEAR. It is not clear from current CEO Endorsement Request, how PPG resources were utilized. The document information on changes to the results framework and project implementation arrangements (pg.2 and pg. 10-11), but does not specifically describe use of PPG resources, and activities carried out during the project preparation. Recommended action: Kindly include section reporting on how PPG resources were utilized. FI, 10/15/15: Yes, Agency has reported on use of PPG.
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	N/A
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		NOT CLEAR. Please include tracking tool with submission. See updated tool here: https://www.thegef.org/gef/tracking_tool

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>I_LDCF_SCCF</p> <p>Recommended action: Please include tracking tool with submission.</p> <p>FI, 10/15/15: Yes, the SCCF tracking tool has been provided.</p>
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		YES. This is included in the ProDoc.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		Yes.
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>NOT YET. Please refer to sections 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 16, 17.</p> <p>CL “ 01/28/14: YES. This project is being recommended for clearance.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>NOT YET.</p> <p>Please refer to sections 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 16, 17, 19 and 21.</p> <p>FI, 10/15/15: Not yet. Agency is requested to address comments for items 7 and 8.</p> <p>FI, 12/21/15: See comments at bottom of screen.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			FI, 01/07/2016: Yes, cleared.
	First review*	January 10, 2014	August 25, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 28, 2014	October 15, 2015
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		January 07, 2016

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**