



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

GEF ID:	5304		
Country/Region:	Regional (Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago)		
Project Title:	Sustainable Management of Bycatch in Latin America and Caribbean Trawl Fisheries (REBYC-II LAC)		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
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;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$5,800,000
Co-financing:	\$17,062,500	Total Project Cost:	\$23,062,500
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	Petri Suuronen

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 ?	11th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, participating countries are eligible.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	11th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, all six countries' focal points 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?	11th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes the funds are available under the IW focal area.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		

*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)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>	<p>11th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the project and its suggested activities are aligned with the IW focal area.</p>	
	<p>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?</p>	<p>11th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the suggested project and its activities are consistent with the national strategies of the six participating countries.</p>	
Project Design	<p>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>	<p>11th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes the baseline projects are based on sound data and assumptions.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>11th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, however, there is scope for improvement and for including stronger indicators, that among others will be easier to quantify. Please do that at the time of CEO endorsement.</p> <p>However, please do include wording to the effect that 1% of the GEF grant will</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>be going towards supporting IWLEARN activities such as creating a website according to IWLEARN guidance, participation in WICs and other regional and global IWLEARN meetings, produce a minimum of two Experience notes etc.</p> <p>12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Addressed</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>11th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the global Environment benefits have been identified.</p> <p>The incremental reasoning included is considered to be appropriate.</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>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>11th of April 2013 (cseverin): This is ok at this stage, however, please do considerable strengthen the description on how the project will be engaging with the CSO communities in the countries as well as in the region. Other stakeholders have been described in more detail and so should the CSO and other relevant stakeholders such as community groups etc.</p>	
	<p>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</p>	<p>11th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, risks have been identified along with potential mitigation measures. It is noted that a couple of risks have been rated Medium to High, please do during project preparation try to address these risks to</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	resilience)	see if the potential risks can be lowered through increased engagement with community and fishermens groups.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	11th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, a number of ongoing regional activities have been identified.	
	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. 	11th of April 2013 (cseverin):The proposed project will facilitate concerted actions of participatory and sustainable approaches to scaling up, replication of more sustainable trawling methods that will limit the bycatch.	
	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?		
	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to	11th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes the GEF funding and in the Indicated Co-financing is considered to be appropriate.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	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?	11th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the amount of Co-financing is adequate and for the Agency, in line with their role.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	11th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the PM budget is in line with the GEF norm	
	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?	11th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes PIF is requested and considered to be in accordance with the GEF norm. PPG is recommended for CEO Approval.	
	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?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? • The Council? • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>11th of April 2013 (cseverin): The PIF is nearly ready for Recommendation for inclusion into WP. However, prior to that please do URGENTLY include wording to the effect that 1% of the GEF grant will be going towards supporting IWLEARN activities such as creating a website according to IWLEARN guidance, participation in WICs and other regional and global IWLEARN meetings, produce a minimum of two Experience notes etc.</p> <p>12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Above point addressed. Yes, the PIF is cleared and can be considered for inclusion in a future work program.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*		
Review Date (s)	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.**