



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW SHEET FOR MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT

GEF ID:	9720		
Country/Region:	Regional (Antigua And Barbuda, Barbados, Belize, Guyana, Jamaica, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Grenadines)		
Project Title:	Developing Organizational Capacity for Ecosystem Stewardship and Livelihoods in Caribbean Small-Scale Fisheries (StewardFish)		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-3 Program 7;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$1,776,484
Co-financing:	\$7,113,000	Total Project Cost:	\$8,889,484
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	Susana Siar

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	18th of January 2017 (cseverin): Yes	
	2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	18th of January 2017 (cseverin):Partly, please address below points: 1) The Project does not mention the SDGs. Please include wording alluding to how the project will help the countries deliver towards a number of the SDGs, in particular SDG 14, but also 5, 2, 8 etc,	

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>and associated targets.</p> <p>2) Under Barrier 1, the gender element seems to be missing, even though the capacity around gender mainstreaming may also be lacking in the regional and national fisherfolk organisations. Please include.</p> <p>3)The Indicators chosen for component 2, addressing habitat degradation and pollution reduction through application of EAF, are all focusing on number of persons trained or reporting that ecosystems have improved. Please add information as to how such improvements will be reported, what values etc.</p> <p>4) The proposed project has a natural focus on Local and national capacity building, however it is not that clear throughout that the increase in local and nation capacity will further the implementation of the regional endorsed SAP. See eg para 33.</p> <p>5) The output indicators included under each component activity, seems to be hovering around 40 FFOs as the maximum. When reading the document, the reader gets the impression that the project will focus on increasing capacity of 40 people and some national agencies. If the project will primarily target training of 40 people the pricetag is simply too high. Please explain and/or</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>expand on deliverables.</p> <p>6) Under Stakeholders, NGOs and Private Sector seems to be missing, please include or explain why they are not relevant.</p> <p>7) Under coordination with other relevant GEF financed projects, please add The Caribbean Regional Ocean Project (Marine Spatial Planning) implemented by the World Bank.</p> <p>8) Please expand on the opportunities that exists for this project to piggy back on project activities undertaken by CLME+, eg regional meetings. Further, it may be opportune for the proposed project to establish some kind of reporting mechanism to the CLME+ PCU, as that project is providing the regional framework that numerous projects are delivering towards.</p> <p>9) Please include wording to the effect that the project will be spending atleast 1% of the GEF grant resources to support IWLEARN activities, establishment of a website, production of atleast one experience and results note and finally participation in IWCs and other relevant IWLEARN hosted activities during project implementation.</p> <p>23rd of March 2017: Most of the comments are addressed. Could you please specify how you will</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		measure the % of reduction of habitat damage by irresponsible fishing practices? Is this a % of area affected, of occurrences...? How will the project monitor the marine area users and their impacts on the habitat? 10th of May 2017: Addressed	
	3. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	18th of January 2017 (cseverin):Yes	
Project Design	4. Does the project sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	18th of January 2017 (cseverin):Yes.	
	5. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	18th of January 2017 (cseverin):Yes	
	6. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	18th of January 2017 (cseverin): Please address above comments and further, please include gender output indicators to Table B. 30th of March 2017: Please address the remaining above comments on the biophysical indicator. 10th of May 2017: Addressed	
	7. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	18th of January 2017 (cseverin):Partly, please address issues raised under question 2.	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		23rd of March 2017: comments addressed	
	8. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	18th of January 2017 (cseverin): Partly, please address issues highlighted in question 2 23rd of March 2017: comments addressed	
	9. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	18th of January 2017 (cseverin): Yes, the project outlines a number of risks and associated mitigation measures.	
	10. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	18th of January 2017 (cseverin): Yes	
	11. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	18th of January 2017 (cseverin): Yes	
	12. <i>Only for Non-grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	13. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	18th of January 2017 (cseverin): Yes, but please address issue identified under question 2 23rd of March 2017: comments addressed	
	14. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	18th of January 2017 (cseverin): Yes	
	15. Does the project have	18th of January 2017 (cseverin): yes	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	description of knowledge management plan?		
Availability of Resources	16. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?		
	• The focal area allocation?	18th of January 2017 (cseverin):yes	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	17. Is the MSP being recommended for approval?	18th of January 2017 (cseverin):No, please address comments and resubmit 23rd of March 2017: No, please address comment and resubmit. 10th of May 2017: Yes the MSP is recommended for approval.	
Review Dates	First Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		