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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| GEF ID: | **6955** | | |
| Country/Region: | **Chile** | | |
| Project Title: | **Strengthening the Adaptive Capacity to Climate Change in the Fisheries and Aquaculture 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): | | | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | **$100,000** | Project Grant: | **$2,500,000** |
| Co-financing: | **$15,600,000** | Total Project Cost: | **$18,200,000** |
| PIF Approval: | | Council Approval/Expected: | **October 01, 2014** |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | **Saliha Dobardzic** | Agency Contact Person: | **Doris Soto** |

| 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**? | DS, August 14, 2014:<br>Yes. Chile is a non-Annex I country Party to the UNFCCC. | |
| | 2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project? | DS, August 14, 2014:<br>Not yet. Letter of endorsement by focal point is missing.<br><br>Update Aug 28, 2014:<br>The letter of endorsement has been provided, which endorses project costs of $2.5 million. However, the funding sought from the SCCF, inclusive of the agency fee, would exceed $2.5 million. | |

*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.

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1] | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Recommended action:<br>Please submit a revised letter of endorsement or revise the project so as to fit the envelope endorsed by the Country's Operational Focal Point.<br><br>Update 8/29/2014:<br>A revised letter of endorsement from Chile's Operational Focal Point has been provided. | |
| 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? | | |
| | • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access | | |
| | • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? | DS, August 14, 2014:<br>Yes. the proposed grant amount is available under the SCCF. | |
| | • the Nagoya Protocol Investment 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**?<br>*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).* | DS, August 14, 2014:<br>Yes. Project alignes with CCA-1 and CCA-2 objectives. | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1] | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 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? | DS, August 14, 2014:<br>Yes. The project is consistent with Chile's second National Communication. | |
| 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? | DS, August 14, 2014:<br>Not clear. Listed baseline initiatives include a vulnerability assessment by the Fisheries and Agriculture Undersecretariat and ongoing efforts to develop the National Plan for Adaptation to Climate Change in Fisheries and Aquaculture Sector (NAP-FAS) by the Ministry of the Environment, among other national initiatives. It is clearly elaborated that the proposed SCCF project would facilitate trial implementation of some of the measures identified in the NAP-FAS in pilot sites. However, the initiatives that are identified as baseline initiatives seem insufficient vis-a-vis SCCF principles, since SCCF resources should complement non-adaptation related baseline initiatives and ensure that adaptation to climate change is integrated throughout these baseline initiatives.<br><br>Recommended action:<br>Please identify baseline projects that do not already address adaptation matters and elaborate how the SCCF resources would help integrate adaptation to climate change into these baseline initiatives.<br><br>Update August 28, 2014: | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1] | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | The project identifies the fisheries and aquaculture baseline program of the Fisheries and Aquaculture Undersecretariat (FAU) as the co-financing, specifically the aquaculture research fund and programme (FIP). | |
| | 7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed? | DS, August 14, 2014:<br>Partly. Component 1 is clear and sound. However, Outcome 2.1 under Component 2 lists "new type fishing gear and onboard equipment" as an adaptive measure to climate change. It seems insufficiently clear as to how these investments link to reducing vulnerability to climate change.<br><br>In addition, Outcome 2.2 includes aspects related to Technical Assistance. While these aspects are in line with SCCF objectives, Technical Assistance should be identified as such. Currently, however, this outcome has been categorized as an investment component as opposed to Technical Assistance.<br><br>Recommended action:<br><br>(i) Please elaborate as to how "new type fishing gear and onboard equipment" as part of Outcome 2.1 under Component 2 contributes to reducing vulnerability to climate change. Please further provide more detail on the other proposed investments under Outcome 2.1 and how they relate to climate change adaptation.<br><br>(ii) Please split Outcome 2.2 in two | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1] | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | individual outcomes, so as to disentangle Technical Assistance aspects from concrete investment. This would create two componennts, one related to Technical Assistance (in this case, training) and one related to Investment. Please then adjust the project framework accordingly.<br><br>Update August 28, 2014:<br>Component 2 has been separated, and the components describe more clearly the adaptation elements and their outcomes. | |
| | 8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate? | DS, August 14, 2014:<br>Partly. Please address comments under Questions 6 and 7.<br><br>Update August 28, 2014:<br>This has been done. | |
| | 9. Is there a clear description of:<br>a) the **socio-economic benefits**, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and<br>b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits? | | |
| | 10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained? | DS, August 14, 2014:<br>Yes. Public participation, including civil society has been identified as part of the project design and implementation. | |
| | 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 | DS, August 14, 2014:<br>Yes. The proposal identifies potential major risks and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures. | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1] | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | resilience) | | |
| | 12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region? | DS, August 14, 2014:<br>Yes. The project will be coordinated with and complement other relevant initiatives in the country, including the following two GEF-financed projects: (i) Towards Ecosystem Management of the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem; and (ii) National Biodiversity Planning to Support the Implementation of the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan.<br><br>Recommended action by CEO Endorsement:<br>Please specify in more detail how the proposed SCCF project would seek synergies and coordinate with other national, as well as bilaterally and multilaterally financed or implemented initiatives in Chile. | |
| | 13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**.<br>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.<br>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.<br>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's | DS, August 14, 2014:<br>Unclear. Please address comments under Questions 6 and 7.<br><br>Update August 28, 2014:<br>The project is innovative in that it addresses in Chile a sector that is quite important for the economy and has so far not benefited from a deliberate focus on the climate change vulnearabilities and identification of adaptation measures. By investing in capacity and information/knowledge base on adaptation, the basis for sustainability of the fisheries sector will be greatly | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1] | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | intervention. | strengthened. The project's focus on capacity building means that there will be further scope for building resilience in the fisheries sector further, and the project component on pilot sites will be scaleable as well. By CEO endorsement, as the activities are being defined, the expectation is that these aspects will be further strengthened. | |
| | 14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes? | | |
| | 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? | | |
| 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? | DS, August 14, 2014:<br>Yes. | |
| | 17. At PIF: 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?<br>At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed? | DS, August 14, 2014:<br>Yes. At $15.60 million, the indicative co-financing is adequate. | |
| | 18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate? | DS, August 14, 2014:<br>Yes. PMC equals 5% of the sub-total of individual project components. | |
| | 19. At PIF, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from | DS, August 14, 2014:<br>Yes. The proposed PPG of $100,000 is in | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1] | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs?<br>At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund? | line with the norm. | |
| | 20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included? | NA | |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable? | | |
| | 22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? | | |
| Agency Responses | 23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from: | | |
| | • STAP? | | |
| | • Convention Secretariat? | | |
| | • The Council? | | |
| | • Other GEF Agencies? | | |
| Secretariat Recommendation | | | |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage | **24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?** | DS, August 14, 2014:<br>Not yet. Please address comments on Questions 2, 6, 7, 8 and 13.<br><br>Update August 28, 2014:<br>Not yet. Please address the pending comments under Question 2.<br><br>Update August 29, 2014:<br>The project is ready to be recommended. | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1] | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval. | Please specify in more detail how the proposed SCCF project would seek synergies and coordinate with other national, as well as bilaterally and multilaterally financed or implemented initiatives in Chile.<br><br>Please consider the sustainability, scaleability, and innovativeness in the development of the project. | |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval | **26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?** | | |
| | First review* | August 14, 2014 | |
| Review Date (s) | Additional review (as necessary) | | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | August 29, 2014 | |
| | | | |

* **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.**