



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

GEF ID:	5271		
Country/Region:	Global (Costa Rica, Ecuador, Indonesia, Philippines)		
Project Title:	Global Sustainable Supply Chains for Marine Commodities		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4754 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-2; IW-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$5,500,000
Co-financing:	\$34,590,000	Total Project Cost:	\$40,240,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	April 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ivan Zavadsky	Agency Contact Person:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): yes the countries are eligible	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes the countries have endorsed the project.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, funds are available under the IW focal area.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		

	Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <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>	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the project is aligned with the IW strategy, objective 2.	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the suggested activities are fully aligned with the countries strategies and will support these, towards creating a sustainable global seafood supply chain.	
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?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the project framework clearly lays out the proposed outcomes and outputs. Please do at CEO Endorsement work towards more quantifiable output indicators. Further, please do also specify that the budget for the IWLEARN activities will	

	8. Are global environmental benefits adequately identified, and the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, this project is targetting among others a number of globally important species and in geenral will due to its proposed activites effect a lowering of the overall pressures to the resources.	
	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?		
	10. Is public participation , including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, due to the nature of the proposed activites within the seafood supply chain, inclusion of the CSO and local communities will be a nessecity. However, please do be more specific on this interaction at the time of CEo Endorsement.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks , including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the project list a number of risks including mitigation measures, among which Climate Change is one of them, which can have a large potential impact on the global fisheries	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes a number of potential regional and national projects that coordination will happen with, have been identified	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. - Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. - Assess the proiect's	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): This project has huge potential for upscaling due to its innovative partnership with large supply chain partners. When this project will have successfully reached its objective it will have transformed the supply chain and have had a major impact on making the global fish	

	<p>likelihood project outcomes will be sustained or not based on the evidence in the literature.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are there measures to secure the institutional and financial stability of the project? - Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention strategy and critique the plan for scaling up. 		
	14. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing per component appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes the funding levels seem to be adequate.	
	17. At PIF: Is the amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role? Any comment on the indicated amount and composition of cofinancing ? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes	
	19. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		

Project Monitoring and Evaluation	20. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	21. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	22. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	23. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	7th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, PIF is being recommended for approval.	
	24. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	25. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested and approved? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?	Yes, PPG is requested and is recommended for approval.	
	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **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.**