

Conserving Marine Biodiversity by Accelerating Transition to Sustainable and Regenerative Fisheries Management Practices

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
12285
Countries
Pakistan
Project Name
Conserving Marine Biodiversity by Accelerating Transition to Sustainable and Regenerative Fisheries Management Practices
Agencies
FAO
Date received by PM
2/19/2026
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Benjamin Singer
Focal Area
Biodiversity
Project Type
MSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments 2026/04/20 Please remove the information from field 'Project Sector (CCM Only)', which is only for projects in Climate Change Mitigation.

General Project information 			
Project Title:	Conserving Marine Biodiversity by Accelerating Transition to Sustainable and Regenerative Fisheries Management Practices		
Region:	Asia	GEF Project ID:	12285
Country(ies):	Pakistan	Type of Project:	MSP
GEF Agency(ies):	FAO	GEF Agency ID:	753134
Executing Partner:	Ministry of Maritime Affairs	Executing Partner Type:	Government
GEF Focal Area (x):	Biodiversity	Submission Date :	2/19/2026
Project Sector (CCM Only):	A/OLU		

2026/05/22 Thank you. Cleared

Agency's Comments

RE: 04/20

The portal is updated accordingly.

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

2026/04/15 Please add all core indicator figures in the last paragraph.

2026/05/22 Great, thank you. This is cleared

Agency's Comments

RE 04/15:

Core indicator figures included

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments 2026/04/15 cleared

Agency's Comments

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

2026/04/15 Please make sure gender dimensions are visible in the indicative project overview, e.g., by including specific indicators or outputs for women. You can consider the following entry points (either in the indicative project overview or project description sections, as appropriate): for instance, in Component 1, reflect how existing laws and regulatory frameworks may affect women and men differently in the fisheries value chain, acknowledging the important role women play across different segments of the sector. In component 2, while women may have limited access to or ownership of private vessels, please clarify how the project will address these gender-based differences, including how women will be able to access trainings, financial support and incentive schemes, and how women-owned vessels or enterprises will be targeted, as relevant, among other actions.

2026/05/22 Thank you. This is cleared

Agency's Comments

RE 04/15:

Gender dimensions have been made visible in the Indicative Project Overview through specific gender-sensitive indicator and additional text under Output 1.1 clarifying how women will access training, financial literacy, value-chain support, and incentive schemes, particularly in shore-based and informal fisheries value-chain roles.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments 2026/04/15 cleared

Agency's Comments

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

2026/04/15

1. Please explain site selection using basic criteria, noting that many sites, but not all, are Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs). A full account of site selection using clearly laid out criteria will be expected at CEO Endorsement Request stage.

2. Barriers are all expressed in the negative, as if the solutions (the positive) had been identified first, and the baseline/rationale drafted to retrofit the project. Please rephrase accordingly, e.g., Barrier 1: "Existing incentive structures favour unsustainable commercial fishing practices" (or similar phrasing).

2026/05/22 Great, both points are cleared.

Agency's Comments

RE: 04/15

1. A site-selection paragraph has been added explaining the preliminary criteria used at PIF stage and clarifying that many, but not all, indicative sites are KBAs or other recognized high-conservation-value areas. The PIF now states that a full site-selection account will be provided at CEO Endorsement.

2. Three barriers rephrased to identify the existing problem rather than the absence of a solution.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

2026/04/15

1. Please explore synergies with any other GEF-funded projects, e.g., possibly #11656 or #11214, if any.

2. Please provide a more detailed narrative on the fishers/fishing communities targeted. Who are they? How do they break down into different activities along the chain of custody? Do they typically live off fishing/fish exclusively, or do they combine fishing with other sources of income? How many live off subsistence vs commercial fishing? It is important to include more than fishing cooperatives and associations in consultations, decision-making and among beneficiaries and include IPLCs wherever possible. Women, in particular, may play informal land-based roles in the fishing value chain that could easily be made invisible if you only reach out to cooperatives and associations which are dominated and captured by fishermen.

3. On a related topic, please indicate the proportion of small versus large-scale fishing enterprises. Are all of them targeted here, or only a subset? And if only a subset, how can you achieve impact if other fishing enterprises are not targeted/included? Doesn't this create a risk of leakage?

2026/05/22 The proposal is significantly improved thanks to these changes. Thank you for this.
Cleared

Agency's Comments

RE 04/15:

1. A paragraph has been added committing the PPG to review and define synergies with relevant GEF-financed projects, including #11656 and #11214, as requested.

2. Baseline now describes the breakdown of fishers (subsistence vs commercial, women's land-based roles), etc.

3. The PIF now clarifies that both small-scale and larger commercial fishing enterprises will be targeted through differentiated approaches and explains how this reduces leakage risk.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

2026/04/15

1. Apologies, I was unable to locate the theory of change statement, narrative and diagram. Please make sure to insert these in the dedicated space in the PIF template.

2. The expected outcomes from Components 1 and 2 should be more ambitious. In their current state, they give more the impression that this is an enabling project. Please make sure to add activities/outputs/outcomes that achieve impact. For instance, Component 1 should result in sustainable fishery practices being adopted, rather than just incentivized. Component 2 should aim to increase finance for regenerative fisheries rather than just readiness.

3. As part of enhancing the sustainability of fisheries, support for viable alternatives for those transitioning out of the fisheries sector should also be considered.

2026/05/22

1. Thank you, this is cleared, but please see point 2 below and revise the TOC accordingly.

2. Outcomes 1 and 2 are still phrased as enabling rather than achieving impact per se (at least in the way they are phrased in the TOC diagram: in the narrative, outcome 2 is better phrased). Please go one step further, offering "sustainable practices adopted thanks to..."

3. Cleared, thank you

2026/05/29 All points cleared, thank you

Agency's Comments

RE 05/22:

Outcome 1 and Outcome 2 revised in TOC, Project Overview, and narrative emphasize impact.

RE 04/15:

1. TOC statement, narrative, and diagram inserted.
 2. Component 1 and Component 2 outcomes have also been revised to focus on adoption and finance mobilization, rather than only enabling conditions or readiness.
 3. Output 2.3 now references support for viable alternative or supplementary livelihood pathways for fishers and value-chain actors affected by transition measures.
- 5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING**

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments

2026/04/15 I was also unable to locate the incremental/additional cost reasoning. Please indicate where it is located or add it to the next resubmission.

2026/05/22 Thank you. This is cleared

Agency's Comments

RE: 04/15

A dedicated incremental/additional cost reasoning section has been added, distinguishing the baseline scenario from the GEF alternative and explaining how GEF financing will generate additional global biodiversity benefits.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments 2026/04/15 cleared

Agency's Comments

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

2026/04/15

1. Please provide a rough explanation of how the figures were calculated for CI5 and CI8 (including how they break down by project site).

2. Indicator 11: Why does the project aim to benefit 50% more men than women? Men often play more visible roles in the fishing industry, notably as they go out to sea, but women also play key land-based roles that are largely invisible. Please provide a strong justification for the gender imbalance among beneficiaries or provide more balanced numbers by gender AND identify measures that would specifically ensure that women also benefit from the project (e.g., activities targeted at the steps of the value chain where women intervene most prominently).

2026/05/22 Thank you. Both points are cleared.

Agency's Comments

RE: 04/15

1. The Core Indicator methodology has been expanded to explain the basis for the CI5 and CI8 figures and to clarify that site-, fishery-, gear-, and fleet-segment breakdowns will be finalized during PPG and confirmed at CEO Endorsement.

2. Indicator 11 rebalanced to 12,500 women + 12,500 men with four explicit measures targeting women's value-chain roles.

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments 2026/04/15 N/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

2026/04/15

1. Based on prior experience with setting up sustainable businesses, especially MSMEs and cooperatives among local communities, the mortality rate is high due to a variety of factors (lack of financial/commercial literacy and experience, limited access to credit, insufficient market research, etc.). I would therefore recommend (i) elevating risk 5 (financial and business model) to moderate or substantial and (ii) adding mitigants to reduce this risk to the extent possible, with a focus on business model innovation. For now, the only mitigant is related to exchange rates.

2. The rating under the Environmental and Social risk category (currently medium) should be the same as the rating under the key risk table, Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) risk (currently low), as per the GEF risk appetite GEF/C.66/13 (see also comment in box 8.7 below).

3. Please explain how the overall risk was identified.

2025/05/22

1. Two minor corrections required:

- "Assessment: The project's success depends on whether (i) commercially viable sustainable practices can be identified and designed at PPG stage, and (ii) participating fishers, vessel operators, MSMEs, cooperatives, processors, and value-chain actors can adopt these commercially viable sustainable practices."

- "links to public and private finance providers": please explain what links

2-3. Cleared

2026/05/29 All points cleared, thank you

Agency's Comments

RE 05/22:

(i) Minor correction incorporated accordingly

(ii) Mitigation cell expanded to specify links

RE: 04/15

1. Risk 5 has been elevated from Low to Moderate and the mitigation measures have been expanded to address MSME/cooperative business failure risk, financial literacy, access to credit, market analysis, business model innovation, and phased piloting.

2. The Environmental and Social risk rating in the Key Risk Table has been revised to Moderate to align with the FAO E&S Screening Template and the PIF-level safeguards rating.

3. The overall risk rating has been revised to Moderate and an overall risk rationale added.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments 2026/04/15 cleared

Agency's Comments

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments 2026/04/15 cleared

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments 2026/04/15 cleared

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

2026/04/15 Please identify which KMGBF targets the project will help implement.

2026/05/22 Thank you, cleared

Agency's Comments

RE: 04/15

Project mapped to KMGBF Targets

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments 2026/04/15 cleared

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

2026/04/15 Why weren't IPLCs, CSOs or the private sector consulted? They are key to project success. Now is the time they should be included in project design for the project to be effective.

2026/05/22 Thank you for this clarification. Please explain Gwadar Mahigir Itihad and any other stakeholder that might not be obvious to identify in the list provided. Please also (i) explain their input into project design and (ii) confirm that IPLCs will be invited to provide input into project design at PPG stage. This should ideally be done at PIF stage, but given time restraints it is essential to include this among PPG activities and budget for this accordingly.

2026/05/29 This is cleared, thank you

Agency's Comments

RE 05/22:

Stakeholder table updated with expanded details.

Section D attributes specific PIF design elements to inputs from IPLCs, CSOs, and private sector actors (Mahigir Itihad Gwadar, Fishermen's Association of Mekran, Pakistan Fisherfolk Forum, RCDC Gwadar, PAKFEA, Aquahatch, Aquaculture Farmers Association).

Section D confirms that IPLCs, will be invited to provide further input at PPG stage with a dedicated budget line.

RE 04/15:

We consulted WWF, Aquaculture Farmers Association, and Rural Community Development Center, Gwadar (CSO), Gwadar Mahigir Itihad (IPLC) and Pak Fish Exporters Association and Aquahatch International (private sector). For more information, please see the list of participants under the Stakeholder Engagement section.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

2026/04/20 GEF Resources allocated to M&E are 5.2% of the GEF Financing. The recommended threshold for projects up to \$5 million is 5%. Please revise accordingly.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)					
M&E	Technical Assistance	Project monitoring and assessment of global environmental benefits (GEBs)	Project progress and results, including gender-differentiated project impacts, are monitored, evaluated, and disseminated for transparency, organizational learning and adaptive management	GET	142,534.00
					684,619.00
Sub Total (\$)					2,714,939.00
					19,333,335.00

2025/05/22 Thank you, cleared

Agency's Comments

RE: 04/15

The M&E allocation has been reduced from US\$142,534 to US\$135,746, bringing it to 5.0% of the GEF project financing subtotal before PMC. The US\$6,788 difference has been reallocated to Component 1, with no change to total GEF project financing, PMC, or total project cost.

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

2026/04/15 Why were funds from the land degradation focal area allocated to this project?
What is the project impact in terms of land degradation?

2026/05/22 Thank you, cleared

Agency's Comments

RE 04/15:

This has been corrected accordingly.

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments2026/04/15 N/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments2026/04/15 N/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments2026/04/15 N/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments2026/04/15 N/A

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments2026/04/15 cleared

Agency's Comments

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

2026/04/15 Co-financing amounts are surprisingly large for in-kind contributions. Please provide additional detail and explore cash co-financing from any source.

2026/05/22 Thank you. This is cleared

Agency's Comments

RE: 04/15

The co-financing description has been expanded to explain the basis for the in-kind contributions and to confirm that cash co-financing opportunities will be explored and documented during PPG.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country?(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments2026/04/15 cleared

Agency's Comments

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments2026/04/15 cleared

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments2026/04/15 cleared

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments2026/04/15 N/A

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project?s intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

2026/04/15

1. Please provide geo-referenced information on the project sites
2. Please upload a higher resolution map and indicate the project sites on the map.

2026/05/22

1. Cleared
2. Apologies, I was unable to locate a separate document with a map. I see a generic map in the PIF that does not indicate any project sites. Is this the one you were referring to?

2026/05/29 Cleared, thank you

Agency's Comments

RE 05/22:

2. Maps added to PIF Annex C and uploaded as a separate document.

RE 04/15:

1. The coordinates provided are indicative PIF-stage reference points for the main federal, Sindh, and Balochistan target zones.
2. The map and coordinates are uploaded as separate document.

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

2026/04/20

1. Please clarify whether micro, small and medium enterprises (MSME), small scale fisherfolks, ethnic minority groups along the cost were consulted preparing project concept (PIF) stage, and how the results of consultations were integrated into the project concept (PIF) (please also see box 4.2 above).
2. Both FAO's Environmental and Social (E&S) Screening Template and Environmental and Social Safeguards in D. Policy requirements (page 43) indicate E&S risks as Moderate. However, the environmental and social risk in the Key Risks table (page 39) states "low risk". Please make this consistent with the Environmental and Social (E&S) Screening Template.
3. Please consider involving micro, small and medium enterprises (MSME), small scale fisherfolks, ethnic minority groups along the cost as partners of project.

2026/05/22

1. Not sure point 1 above was addressed. Were these stakeholders consulted so far? It seems that they were, at least in part, but detail is lacking as to the level of involvement. Did they provide input into project design? If so, what elements of project design can be attributed to their input? As both beneficiaries and agents of project implementation, their involvement in project design is crucial from the earliest stages. While it is crucial to fully involve them at PPG stage as well, it is not sufficient.

2. This is cleared.

3. This is cleared. At PPG stage, we will expect stakeholder consultations to be documented, and their input in project design identified.

2026/05/29 All points cleared, thank you

Agency's Comments

RE 05/22:

1. These stakeholders were consulted during PIF preparation through the national/provincial consultation process, the 22 May 2025 stakeholder workshop, and written or technical inputs received during concept development. Direct participants included small-scale fisherfolk/community representatives such as Gwadar Mahigir Itihad, CSOs including RCDC Gwadar and WWF-Pakistan, MSME and small-scale private-sector actors including Aquahatch International and the Aquaculture Farmers Association, and fisheries/export-sector representatives including PAKFEA. Relevant government agencies responsible for representing, regulating or supporting these constituencies also participated, including the Balochistan Fisheries and Coastal Development Department, Sindh Fisheries Department / Marine Fisheries Directorate, Marine Fisheries Department / Ministry of Maritime Affairs, Fisheries Development Board, Trade Development Authority of Pakistan, and Korangi Fish Harbour Authority.

Inputs received through the consultative process, stakeholder workshop, and written/technical exchanges informed the overall project concept, including the project's governance, private-sector transition, value-chain, MCS/data, livelihood, and gender-responsive design elements. For example, inputs from small-scale fisherfolk and community representatives informed the differentiated treatment of small-scale and industrial fleet segments and the inclusion of alternative or supplementary livelihood pathways; private-sector and export-sector inputs informed the value-chain and certification focus; and CSO inputs informed the gender-responsive and community-engagement elements.

During PPG, a comprehensive, budgeted consultation process will be carried out with IPLCs, as applicable, MSMEs, small-scale fisherfolk, women/value-chain actors, CSOs, ethnic minority coastal communities, small-scale private-sector stakeholders, and the government institutions responsible for representing and supporting them. Their inputs will be documented and integrated into the final project design, Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Gender Action Plan, ESS instruments, results framework, and implementation arrangements.

RE: 04/20

1. Annex D has been expanded to clarify the Moderate E&S risk rating, identify the relevant stakeholder groups, and confirm that MSMEs, small-scale fisherfolk, ethnic minority groups along the coast, women, CSOs, private sector, and IPLCs, as applicable, will be considered as partners during PPG and implementation.

2. Addressed via revision to the Risks table: E&S aligned with E&S Screening Moderate

3. Commitment added in Annex D to formalize MSMEs, small-scale fisherfolk cooperatives and ethnic minority community organizations as implementing partners during PPG.

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

2026/04/15 No action required at this stage, but at CEO Endorsement the project should confirm at least one indicator or output explicitly measuring an adaptation outcome to substantiate score 1 (significant objective).

2026/05/22 Thank you for confirming. Cleared

Agency's Comments

RE: 04/15

Noted.

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments 2026/04/15 cleared

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments 2026/04/15 N/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

2026/04/15 Given the significant over capacity in the Pakistan marine fisheries sector, there is a clear rationale for this project and need for science and ecosystem-based fisheries management with a strong policy and enabling environment to significantly reduce this over capacity and protect marine fisheries and biodiverse habitats.

There remain some key elements missing or that I was unable to locate, chiefly the theory of change. Please revise accordingly, integrating all comments received, and resubmit.

Kindly note that comments on stakeholder engagement may be forthcoming, in which case I will send them to you by email and would be grateful if you could address them in the resubmission.

Please accept our apologies in reviewing this proposal, largely due to a reallocation of reviewers.

2026/05/22 Thank you very much for turning this around. I note significant improvements and wish to convey my thanks to the FAO team for integrating earlier comments and resubmitting a high-quality proposal.

A handful of minor remarks remain, in addition to one important set of comments relative to the involvement of CSOs, IPLCs and the small-scale private sector in designing this proposal. On this last aspect, it is essential to provide further detail in the PIF. Additional consultations would have been ideal at this early stage, but due to lack of time, we kindly request instead that you (i) detail consultations conducted and inputs received so far and (ii) incorporate a comprehensive set of consultations with these stakeholders into the PPG and budget for this accordingly.

We are now on a tight schedule: the PIF needs to have been cleared by the CEO by 17 June 2026. I will be off the grid 7-14 June, and the GEF Council meeting and Assembly are being held the previous week. Please resubmit at your very earliest convenience, at the very latest by 1 June, and make sure that all outstanding comments are adequately addressed (to minimize the risk of having to send the proposal back to you). I look forward to the next iteration. In case of any doubt or question, please reach out to me directly. Thank you!

2026/05/29 All points are cleared. Many thanks for your reactivity.

Agency's Comments

Noted, thank you.

RE: 04/15

Noted, thank you.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval

Secretariat's Comments

2026/04/20 Once the gender analysis has been conducted and the Gender Action Plan developed, please integrate the findings and identified actions/interventions into the project components, outputs and activities. Please also provide indicative budget information for the Gender Action Plan and related gender-specific activities and outputs.

2026/05/22 Agreed. Cleared

Agency's Comments

RE 04/20:

The gender analysis and the development of the Gender Action Plan will be carried out during PPG and submitted with the CEO Endorsement package.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/20/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/22/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/29/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		