



## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

### 2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



## 1. Basic Project Data

### General Information

<b>Region:</b>	Latin America & the Caribbean (FAO)
<b>Country (ies):</b>	Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Belize, Guyana, Jamaica, Saint Lucia and St. Vincent and the Grenadines
<b>Project Title:</b>	Developing Organizational Capacity for Ecosystem Stewardship and Livelihoods in Caribbean Small-Scale Fisheries (StewardFish) project
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	GCP/SLC/211/GFF
<b>GEF ID:</b>	9720
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	International Waters
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	<p><b>Country level partner organizations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fisheries Division of the Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Fisheries and Barbuda Affairs, Antigua and Barbuda</li> <li>• Fisheries Division of the Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Blue Economy, Barbados</li> <li>• Fisheries Department of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries, The Environment and Sustainable Development, Belize</li> <li>• Fisheries Department of the Ministry of Agriculture, Guyana</li> <li>• Fisheries Division of the Ministry of Industry, Commerce, Agriculture and Fisheries, Jamaica</li> <li>• Department of Fisheries of the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, Physical Planning, Natural Resources and Co-operatives, St. Lucia</li> <li>• Fisheries Division of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries, Rural Transformation, Industry and Labour, St. Vincent and the Grenadines</li> </ul> <p><b>Other partners (regional):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism (CRFM)</li> <li>• Caribbean Network of Fisherfolk Organizations (CNFO)</li> <li>• Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI)</li> <li>• University of the West Indies Centre for Resource Management and Environmental Studies (UWI-CERMES)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission (WECAFC)</li> </ul>
<b>Project Duration:</b>	1 May 2018 - 30 April 2021 (3 years)

#### Milestone Dates:

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	14 July 2017
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :</b>	1 May 2018
<b>Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	30 April 2021
<b>Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) <sup>2</sup></b>	N/A
<b>Actual Implementation End Date<sup>3</sup>:</b>	N/A

#### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	1,776,484
<b>Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc<sup>4</sup>:</b>	7,113,000
<b>Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):</b>	265,690
<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019<sup>5</sup></b>	1,383,480

#### Review and Evaluation

<b>Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:</b>	4 February 2019
<b>Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):</b>	N/A
<b>Mid-term review/evaluation actual:</b>	N/A
<b>Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	No
<b>Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 –</b>	No

<sup>1</sup> as per FPMIS

<sup>2</sup> In case of a project extension.

<sup>3</sup> Actual date at which project implementation ends/closes operationally -- only for projects that have ended.

<sup>4</sup> This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

<sup>5</sup> Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

June 2020).	
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	N/A
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required <sup>6</sup>	No [As a Medium Sized project, this will be required for the final evaluation]

### Ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	S	
Overall implementation progress rating:	S	
Overall risk rating:	Low	

### Status

Implementation Status (1 <sup>st</sup> PIR, 2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR, etc. Final PIR):	1 <sup>st</sup> PIR
--	---------------------

### Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Terrence Phillips Regional Project Coordinator, FAOSLC	<a href="mailto:Terrence.Phillips@fao.org">Terrence.Phillips@fao.org</a>
Lead Technical Officer	Yvette DieiOuadi Fishery Officer, FAOSLC	<a href="mailto:Yvette.DieiOuadi@fao.org">Yvette.DieiOuadi@fao.org</a>
Budget Holder	Renata Clarke FAO Subregional Coordinator for the Caribbean, FAOSLC	<a href="mailto:Renata.Clarke@fao.org">Renata.Clarke@fao.org</a>
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Climate and Environment Division	Valeria Gonzalez Riggio Natural Resources Officer FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, Climate and Environment Division	<a href="mailto:Valeria.GonzalezRiggio@fao.org">Valeria.GonzalezRiggio@fao.org</a>

---

<sup>6</sup> Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<b>Objective(s):</b>						
<b>Outcome 1.1: Fisherfolk have improved their organization capacity to meet objectives that enhance well-being</b>	Number of NFOs that participate in leadership capacity development	3 NFO. Currently some NFOs participate in leadership development activities	5 NFO	7 NFOs	Prior to, and at the Inception Workshop in September 2018, national fisheries authorities, national fisherfolk organisations (NFOs), lead primary fisherfolk organisations (PFOs) and regional executing partners verified the issues affecting the effective functioning of fisherfolk organizations (FFOs).	S
	Number of participating NFOs that report positive change due to training	3 NFO. Those that have participated have reported positive change.	5 NFO	7 NFOs	Project activities to address these issues were also discussed, including the utilization of ICT to support NFO participation in governance.	S

<sup>7</sup> This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

<sup>8</sup> Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

<sup>9</sup> Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory** (HS), **Satisfactory** (S), **Marginally Satisfactory** (MS), **Marginally Unsatisfactory** (MU), **Unsatisfactory** (U), and **Highly Unsatisfactory** (HU).

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					<p>Suitable approaches were identified to evaluate and determine priority training needs, and develop/ deliver suitable training packages.</p> <p>CANARI, UWI-CERMES and UWI-CIRP were identified as the lead regional executing partners to conduct the activities under this outcome.</p>	
<b>Outcome 1.2: Fisheries-related state agencies have capacity to support fishing industry stewardship</b>	Number of fisheries-related state agencies that participate in FFO support capacity development activities	3 fisheries related state agencies	5 agencies	7 agencies	Prior to and during the Inception Workshop, national and regional executing partners verified issues affecting the support of fisheries-related agencies towards FFOs and their role in stewardship.	S
	Number of participating fisheries-related state agencies that report positive change due to FFO support capacity development activities	0 fisheries related state agencies	5 agencies	7 agencies	Appropriate participatory instruments were also identified to undertake the institutional and organizational evaluations (including desk research and	S

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					<p>stakeholder engagement), and make priority recommendations for project pilot activities.</p> <p>CANARI and CRFM Secretariat were identified as the lead regional executing partners to conduct the activities under this outcome.</p>	
<b>Outcome 2.1</b> <b>Increased participatory Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) application with focus on healthier habitats and pollution reduction</b>	<p>Number of FFO leaders who engage in stewardship activities</p> <p>Number of FFO leaders who report positive change due to engagement</p>	<p>5 FFO leaders (4 men, 1 woman).</p> <p>0 FFO leaders. No good data on participation rates or positive outcomes</p>	<p>20 FFO leaders (15 men, 5 women) for participation and change</p>	<p>40 FFO leaders (25 men, 15 women) for participation and change</p>	<p>During the Inception Workshop, the lead regional executing partners, in collaboration with the national partners, determined the most appropriate arrangements to improve NFO/PFO leadership participation in the management of marine protected areas and other coastal uses. Mentoring and implementation of pilot activities were also determined to support fisherfolk engagement.</p> <p>Appropriate means to train fisherfolk in EAF</p>	S

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					and stewardship were discussed. Moreover, synergies with other GEF funded projects like CC4FISH and the CLME+ Project were identified.  CANARI and UWI-CERMES were identified as the lead regional executing partners to conduct the activities under this outcome.	
<b>Outcome 3.1: Livelihoods throughout fisheries value chains balance development with conservation for food and nutrition security</b>	<p>Number of FFO leaders who engage in livelihood enhancement activities</p> <p>Number of FFO leaders who report positive change due to engagement</p>	<p>5 FFO leaders (4 men, 1 woman)</p> <p>0 not applicable to pre-StewardFish</p>	<p>20 FFO leaders (15 men, 5 women) for participation and change</p>	<p>40 FFO leaders (25 men, 15 women)</p>	<p>During the Inception Workshop, the lead regional executing partner, in collaboration with the national partners, determined the most appropriate means to achieve the outputs and outcome of livelihoods throughout fisheries value chains balance development with conservation for food and nutrition security. These means included developing a methodological framework for analysis and conducting a desk study and interviews to analyse data and</p>	S

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					<p>information from past and current fisheries-related livelihoods and socio-economic projects in the Caribbean.</p> <p>The most suitable means of communicating best practices from the analysis were discussed. Also, creating profiles for fisheries livelihoods to integrate into training for fisherfolk implementation of EAF was part of the discussion.</p> <p>The most appropriate means to identify and analyse fisheries value chains and opportunities for new marketing and distribution of seafood products that improve nutrition were also examined.</p> <p>CANARI was identified as the lead regional executing partner to conduct the activities under this outcome.</p>	



## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<b>Outcome 4.1: Good governance and learning for adaptation institutionalized among fisherfolk organisations</b>	Number of NFO participating in PM&E arrangements	0 NFO	5 NFO	7 NFO	During the Inception Workshop, participants reviewed the StewardFish project (components, outcomes, outputs, budget and results matrix). Moreover, appropriate means to facilitate participatory project implementation and monitoring and evaluation were discussed, including having StewardFish placed on the agenda in each country and NFO/PFO participation in national level stakeholder engagement mechanisms (e.g. Fishery Advisory Committees, National Inter-sectoral Coordination Mechanisms).  UWI-CERMES was identified as the lead	S
	Number of NFO leaders who report learning due to engagement	0 NFO	5 NFO	7 NFO		S

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					regional executing partner to conduct the activities under this outcome.	

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating <sup>10</sup>

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
N/A, as none of the ratings are below S.			

---

<sup>10</sup> To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

## 2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs <sup>11</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>12</sup>	Achievements at each PIR <sup>13</sup>			Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR		
Output 1.1.1 Leaders with strengthened capacity in management, administration, planning sustainable finance, leadership and other operational skills	Q4 Y2	Following on the Inception Workshop and preparation /approval of the Annual Work Plan (AWP) by the Regional Project Steering Committee (RPSC), in February 2019, LoAs for the implementation of the activities to achieve this output, have been negotiated with CANARI*, UWI-CERMES** and CNFO and submitted for approval.  The LoA with the CNFO has been approved.			20%	
Output 1.1.2 Information and communication	Q3 Y2	Following on the Inception Workshop and preparation and approval of the AWP, an			20%	

<sup>11</sup> Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

<sup>12</sup> As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

<sup>13</sup> Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

<sup>14</sup> Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

technologies (ICT) used for good governance		LoA for the implementation of the activities to achieve this output, has been negotiated with UWI-CIRP. The LoA has been submitted and approved.				
Output 1.1.3: Capacity for policy engagement, and of women as leaders, is strengthened	Q4 Y2	Following on the Inception Workshop and preparation /approval of the AWP, an LoA for the implementation of the activities to achieve this output, has been negotiated with **UWI-CERMES and submitted for approval.			20%	
Output 1.2.1: State agency implementation gaps assessed regarding support for fisherfolk organizations and their role in stewardship	Q2 Y2	Following on the Inception Workshop and preparation /approval of the AWP, an LoA for the implementation of the activities to achieve this output, has been negotiated with *CANARI and submitted for approval.			20%	
Output 1.2.2: State agency prioritization capacity developed to support fisherfolk organizations and roles in stewardship	Q4 Y2	Following on the Inception Workshop and preparation / approval of the AWP, an LoA for the implementation of the activities to achieve this output, has been negotiated with the CRFM Secretariat and approved.			20%	
Output 2.1.1 Fisherfolk engaged in the management of marine protected areas or other coastal uses	Q2 Y3	Following on the Inception Workshop and preparation/ approval of the AWP, an LoA for the implementation of the activities to achieve this output, has been negotiated			20%	

		with *CANARI and submitted for approval.				
Output 2.1.2 Fisherfolks successfully applying EAF - supported by greater general public awareness of EAF	Q4 Y3	Following on the Inception Workshop and preparation and approval of the AWP, an LoA for the implementation of the activities to achieve this output, has been negotiated with **UWI-CERMES and submitted for approval.			20%	
Output 3.1.1 Schemes for sustainable fisheries livelihoods reviewed in order to learn from them and adapt future activities	Q4 Y3	Following on the Inception Workshop and preparation and approval of the AWP, an LoA for the implementation of the activities to achieve this output, has been negotiated with *CANARI and submitted for approval.			20%	
Output 3.1.2. Use of local fish in healthy diets promoted through public policies and private enterprises	Q2 Y3	Following on the Inception Workshop and preparation and approval of the AWP, an LoA for the implementation of the activities to achieve this output, has been negotiated with *CANARI and submitted for approval.			20%	
Output 4.1.1 Improved results and learning through fisherfolk participatory monitoring and evaluation	Q4 Y3	Following on the Inception Workshop and preparation and approval of the AWP, an LoA for the implementation of the activities to achieve this output, has been negotiated with **UWI-CERMES and submitted for approval.			20%	

Output 4.1.2 Annual project participant conferences, web site outputs and best practice guidelines for fisherfolk-centred PM&E based on learning-by-doing	Q4 Y3	Following on the Inception Workshop and preparation /approval of the AWP, an LoA for the implementation of the activities to achieve this output, has been negotiated with **UWI-CERMES and submitted for approval.			20%	
Output 4.1.3 Project Mid-Term Review and Final Evaluation	Q 2 Y2 [MTR]	N/A				

## Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

**Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):**

Max 200 words:

FAO/WECAFC, in partnership with the fisheries authorities and national fisherfolk organizations (NFOs)/lead primary fisherfolk organizations of the seven project countries and four regional partners (CANARI, CNFO, CRFM, UWI-CERMES), is responsible for implementing the StewardFish project. The project started in July 2018.

The StewardFish Project Inception Workshop was organized and convened in September 2018, with the Inception Workshop Report being subsequently prepared, and shared with all project partners and other participants. During the Workshop, it was decided that the regional partners (CANARI, CNFO, CRFM, UWI-CERMES) would take the lead in executing the project activities under the four components, in keeping with their areas of expertise, experience and interest. It was also agreed that The University of the West Indies Caribbean ICT Research Programme (CIRP), based in Trinidad and Tobago, would lead ICT activities under Component 1. LoAs for activities under the four project components were mapped out for implementation by the respective regional executing partners.

Based on feedback at the Inception Workshop, the Annual Work Plan and Budget for 2019 was prepared and endorsed by a Regional Project Steering Committee meeting on 5 February 2019.

Following on negotiations with the respective regional executing partners, LoAs were prepared and submitted for approval.

**What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?**

Max 200 words:

In finalizing the Annual Work Plan and Budget after the RPSC meeting, it was noted that the funds allocated for the Regional Project Coordinator (RPC) and the Capacity Development Specialist (CDS) posts would not be adequate to cover the honoraria and living allowances for the time period for these two positions, respectively. As a result, a budget revision was done which resulted in the merging of the duties of the two positions under that of the RPC, with the understanding that this would not negatively affect the outcomes of the project.



## Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating <sup>15</sup>	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating <sup>16</sup>	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<p><i>Even though there was a delay in project start up, significant progress has been made by the project management team in project implementation. From project start up to the StewardFish Inception Workshop and onwards, project management has been engaging with the project partners and other key stakeholders at the national and regional levels in the development of an appropriate implementation strategy aimed at achieving the various project outcomes.</i></p> <p><i>The selection of five experienced and competent regional executing partners to lead in the delivery of project activities will enhance project management's capacity to achieve the overall project objective.</i></p>

<sup>15</sup> **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

<sup>16</sup> **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

<b>Budget Holder</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<p><i>Taking into consideration the actions taken since project management was put in place in July 2018, including organization and convening of the StewardFish Inception Workshop, ongoing engagement with project partners and other stakeholders at the national and regional levels, refinement of the strategy for project implementation (with regional project partners taking the lead), preparation and approval of the annual work plan and budget, and completion of the LoAs with the regional project partners, project management has made significant progress in project implementation. The project appears to be set for the undertaking of on-the-ground activities in the seven project countries. However, ongoing engagement between the project management team and the regional and national partners will be required to ensure project implementation and monitoring. The management and technical experience of the project management team, including the LTO and PRC, will be of value in these areas.</i></p>
<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>17</sup></b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<p><i>Overall, the project is on track despite a slight delayed inception. The management of the inception phase, engaging the partners and fisherfolks representatives are an asset which secures the needed ownership for this project.</i></p> <p><i>It is important that the active phase of implementation, which has just started with the completion and signature of LoAs be critically monitored in light of the challenge posed by the early spotted flaw in the overall budget. The technical background and the experience of the RPC will be essential in this regard. Given the limited Livelihoods related budget, being proactive in engaging in synergies with ongoing initiatives will add value to delivery in the next PIRs</i></p>

---

<sup>17</sup> The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

<p><b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b></p>	<p><b>S</b></p>	<p><b>S</b></p>	<p><b>Development Objective rating</b>  <i>The start of the project implementation phase was delayed. Nevertheless, the project management team has recently ensured the collaboration with the regional executing partners, through the submission and approval of Letters of Agreement. The achievement of the project environmental objective seems feasible.</i></p> <p><b>Implementation Progress rating</b>  <i>A revised AWP/B in accordance with the experienced delays (and also in line with the discussions during the Inception Workshop) was endorsed in February 2019 during the first RPSC. Activities were initially concentrated within the first two years of implementation, nonetheless, timing and delivery of activities have been revised.</i></p> <p><i>Project outputs will soon start to be delivered in the field since LoAs (which are the main delivery mechanism of this project) have been duly prepared, submitted and approved.</i></p>
---	-----------------	-----------------	--

### 3. Risks

#### Environmental and Social Safeguards (Under the responsibility of the LTO)

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid <sup>18</sup> . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
LOW	Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid

*Please make sure that the below risk table include also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.*

#### Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
<i>The following table summarizes risks identified in the <b>Project Document</b> and reflects also <b>any new risks</b> identified in the course of project implementation. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, <b>as relevant</b>.</i>

---

<sup>18</sup> **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Moderate level of policy support for a project that focuses on fisherfolk organizations as it would change the power dynamics among diverse fisheries stakeholders and also alter gender relations.	Low	Project activities are consistent with national and regional policies. These include strengthening civil society and gender mainstreaming. The project will practically demonstrate how these policy objectives can be achieved. It will also seek to build or establish relationships among coastal and marine stakeholders primarily around their shared interests, thereby minimising conflict.		
2	Insufficient capacity of national fisheries authorities and fisherfolk organizations to engage in the project in addition to their other commitments	Low	The Caribbean project partners and the primary beneficiaries (fisheries authorities and fisherfolk organizations) have actively collaborated in the project design as an extension of several projects and programmes already in progress. The work plan takes these initiatives into account. FAO has extensive experience in working with partners in the region and has FAO representations and/ or national correspondents' offices in each of the countries to assist national level implementation.		

<sup>19</sup> GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

<sup>20</sup> If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period".

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
3	Uncertainty of reliable and sustainable local/national arrangements for training fisherfolk leaders. Training packages for the leadership institute may require more capacity for coordination than the CNFO may initially possess.	Medium	Mentors identified from previous regional projects will be engaged to assist with sustaining initiatives within each participating country in collaboration with project partners. Partnerships will be established between regional and national bodies to support the CNFO in offering leadership and other training packages, and operating a leadership institute.	<p>CANARI, one of the regional executing partners, will be utilising the mentors trained under previous fisheries related projects in the delivery of their LoA, covering such outputs as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Leaders with strengthened capacity in management, administration, planning sustainable finance, leadership and other operational skills</li> <li>- State agency implementation gaps assessed regarding support for fisherfolk organizations and their role in stewardship</li> <li>- Fisherfolk engaged in the management of marine protected areas or other coastal uses.</li> </ul> <p>CANARI and UWI-CERMES will be engaging with the CNFO in offering leadership and other training packages, and operating a leadership institute.</p>	

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
4	Co-funding and active interest by project partners do not materialize as planned, causing the project to develop budget shortfalls.	Low	The project only includes results or activities for which funding has been confirmed in writing. This is in accordance with GEF requirements that all co-funders must confirm their contributions. Regular national participatory monitoring and evaluation of project progress will ensure accountability and allow corrective action to be taken if and as needed.		
5	Limited active interest of fisherfolk organizations in the project and engagement of non-organized fisherfolk is also lower than anticipated	Low	The activities have been designed with fisherfolk leaders to provide incentives through practical and demonstrable benefits that will serve as incentives to draw non-organized fisherfolk into joining collective action. Fisherfolk organization leaders have participated in development of the project at regional and national levels and achieve buy-in. The implementation of activities in the field will provide opportunities for broad engagement. Capacity development will be scheduled to permit maximum participation, especially of women and young people.		

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
6	The number of women interested in formal fisherfolk leadership, stewardship and fisheries policy influence may be relatively small such that targets for participation of women are not met within the relatively short project period.	Low	The project will encourage female fisherfolk organization board members to engage in the leadership training. The project will engage women through training that fits their livelihood and household obligations. Targets for the participation of women will be realistic. The courses will remain for future use so uptake and growth after the project will be facilitated.		



	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
7	Climate change induced extreme weather events, such as hurricanes and storms, coastal erosion and inundation, and invasions such as of sargassum seaweed occur more often than anticipated and distract stakeholders from the project	Medium	The capacity building activities foreseen under the project include climate change adaptation and disaster risk management aspects. The immediacy of issues should increase rather than decrease their relevance to fisherfolk and other stakeholders and help to prepare fisherfolk for uncertainties. Linkages with the CC4FISH project will increase adaptation related measures information exchange and potential uptake by fisherfolk.	<p>The StewardFish project team has been engaging with the CC4Fish project team to create synergies in project delivery. The project is also engaging with the MDF climate change, food security and poverty nexus project and many of the Stewardfish countries will participate in the training Regional NDC Dialogue in the Caribbean - Enhancing post-2020 climate action in agriculture, forestry and fisheries to leverage SDG co-benefits</p> <p>UWI-CERMES, which has been engaged in the delivery of EAF related activities under CC4FISH, will be delivering the EAF and stewardship activities under the StewardFish project, and so seek to create synergies identified in the ProDoc.</p>	

	<b>Risk</b>	<b>Risk rating<sup>19</sup></b>	<b>Mitigation Action</b>	<b>Progress on mitigation actions<sup>20</sup></b>	<b>Notes from the Project Task Force</b>
<b>8</b>	Engaging fisherfolk in use of ICT may be challenging due to inadequate formal education, limited prior knowledge of ICT and lack of resources for personal devices. Performance and use will decline unless leaders adhere to simple ICT standards	Low	CNFO is already aware of the technological constraints of national fisherfolk organizations. Assessments will be conducted on the use and knowledge of ICT among NFO, and NFO will receive equipment on a needs basis. Adequate support will be provided to build competencies in ICTs and to sustain the use of new goods via on-going training and orientation for new leaders		
<b>9</b>	Uptake of new or improved technology by fisherfolk to help support EAF is either low or is abused to fish irresponsibly.	Low	Only proven and properly tested technologies will be introduced to or adapted for the region. To the extent possible the technologies will be simple, low-risk, economically viable, durable and practical in order to facilitate rapid uptake also by persons with limited formal education. Special attention will be paid to ensuring that women have access to technology		
<b>10</b>	The public may show little to no interest in communications aimed at supporting EAF.	Low	The project will develop a well thought out communication plan to raise awareness on EAF. It will use social media as one of its strategies. The integration with fisherfolk organization activities will ensure that communication strategies are maintained in the long-term.		

**Project overall risk rating** (Low, Medium, Substantial or High):

<b>FY2018 rating</b>	<b>FY2019 rating</b>	<b>Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period</b>
<b>Low</b>	Low	The project overall risk ratings remain low, with actions being taken to address the previously identified medium risk ratings.

## 4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months<sup>21</sup>

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes	No	
Project Outputs	No	

### Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, evaluations or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval, please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes. The Budget Holder may decide, in consultation with the PTF, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations providing a sound justification.

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	<p>Original NTE: 31 December 2019                      Revised NTE: 30 April 2021</p> <p>Justification: The project implementation got going from July 2018 with the recruitment of the Regional Project Coordinator from July 11, 2018.</p>

---

<sup>21</sup> Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

## 5. Gender Mainstreaming

**Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)?**

Under the project gender analyses will be done during the implementation of activities 1.1.3.2: Conduct gender analysis to identify the capacity gaps of men and women, especially youth, in relation to fisherfolk leadership, and 1.1.3.3: Develop and offer training on leadership for women and youth informed by gender analysis. These activities will be implemented by regional executing partner UWI-CERMES which have access to gender expertise.

The M&E system have gender-disaggregated data, which will be tracked by way of the relevant reports from the project activities aimed at achieving the project outputs.

## 6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

**Are Indigenous Peoples involved in the project? How? Please briefly explain.**

N/A

## 7. Stakeholders Engagement

**Please report on progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO Endorsement/Approval (when applicable))**

In keeping with the Stakeholder Table in the ProDoc, to date key stakeholders (e.g. Fisheries Authorities, regional, national and lead primary fisherfolk organisations and regional project partners) have been engaged in:

- Overall project design.
- Designing of project implementation strategy to deliver activities such as training, ICT and EAF and stewardship by way of the Project Inception Workshop in September 2018, and the virtual Regional Project Steering Committee Meeting in February 2019.
- Development of LoAs with the lead regional partners.

## 8. Knowledge Management Activities

**Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval**

N/A at this stage.

## 9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing <sup>22</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
Governmental	Antigua and Barbuda	In kind	500, 000	100, 000		500, 000
Governmental	Barbados	In kind	425, 000	85, 000		425, 000
Governmental	Barbados	Cash	75, 000	-		75, 000
Governmental	Belize	In kind	1, 800, 000	360, 000		1, 800, 000
Governmental	Guyana	In kind	870, 000	174, 000		870, 000
Governmental	Jamaica	In kind	200 ,000	40, 000		200, 000
Governmental	Saint Lucia	In kind	322, 400	64, 480		322, 400
Governmental	Saint Lucia	Cash	120, 600	-		120, 600
Governmental	St. Vincent and the Grenadines	In kind	500, 000	100, 000		500, 000
Inter-governmental	CRFM Secretariat	In kind	150, 000	30, 000		150, 000
Non-governmental	CANARI	In kind	300, 000	60, 000		300, 000
Non-	CNFO	In kind	1, 000, 000	200, 000		1, 000 ,000

<sup>22</sup> Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

governmental						
Non-governmental	UWI-CERMES	In kind	350, 000	70, 000		350, 000
Inter-governmental	FAO-WECAFC	In kind	300, 000	60, 000		300, 000
Inter-governmental	FAO-WECAFC	Cash	200, 000	40, 000		200, 000
<b>TOTAL</b>			7, 113, 000	1 ,383 ,480		7, 113 000

**Please explain any significant changes in project co-financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement**



## Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

**Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. **DO Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** - Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”); **Satisfactory (S)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings); **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits); **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** - Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives); **Unsatisfactory (U)** - Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits); **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** - The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

**Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice”. **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action. **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action. **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.