

Mainstreaming Sustainable Marine Fisheries Value Chains into the Blue Economy of the Canary Current and the Pacific Central American Coastal Large Marine Ecosystems

Basic Information

GEF ID

11011

Countries

Global (Guatemala, Ecuador, Mauritania, Morocco, Panama, Senegal)

Project Title

Mainstreaming Sustainable Marine Fisheries Value Chains into the Blue Economy of the Canary Current and the Pacific Central American Coastal Large Marine Ecosystems

GEF Agency(ies)

UNDP

Agency ID

UNDP: 6591

GEF Focal Area(s)

International Waters

Program Manager

Taylor Henshaw

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

18th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Yes.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

18th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Yes. But please address the following:

- (1) Please expand on the Component 3 title "Knowledge Management" to "Knowledge Management for..."
- (2) Please remove cents from the figures in Table B (as well as in other tables throughout the PIF).

(3) Please consider adding a "Component 4: M&E" to Table B to ensure figures in the Annex E budget table and Table B in the CEO Endorsement Document will be harmonized.

11th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP 09/05/2022

(1) Changed from "knowledge management" to "knowledge management to support the transformation of the seafood market". See text highlighted in yellow.

(2) In the GEF portal cents are autogenerated by the system, they cannot be removed from our side.

(3) To add an entire component with a single outcome and a single output does not add to the logic of the proposal. It is better to maintain a component with separate outcomes (and budget allocations) for knowledge management and monitoring and evaluation. It is worth to mention that these two outcomes (3.1 and 3.2) are interlinked, since project monitoring and evaluation will provide inputs (insights, learnings) to feed the knowledge development.

Co-financing

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, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

18th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) All government "grant" entries note "other entities to be defined during PPG". It appears that source of funding will not be identified at this PIF stage. In this case, please remove these "grant" entries. At CEO endorsement submission stage, include the confirmed co-financing.

(2) Sustainable Fisheries Partnership \$5.4M grant (funded by other sources). Please list the original source of the funding next to "Sustainable Fisheries Partnership - XXX, XXX". In the Investment Mobilized description section, please provide more information about (1) the baseline activities financed by the \$5.4M grant; (2) the grant disbursement timeline (which needs to overlap the GEF project implementation phase; and (3) how the baseline activities support the GEF project. At CEO endorsement submission stage, (if feasible) please obtain co-financing letters from the original financiers

please obtain co-financing letters from the original financiers.

11th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

However, in Table B the contribution of GEF funds and co-financing for PMC is no longer proportional. Please revise accordingly.

15th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP 09/05/2022

(1) All “grant” entries have been removed. Total co-financing was reduced to USD36,255,000. It is expected to confirm other contributions during the PPG phase.

(2) The requested explanation has been included in the explanatory section of Table C, see the highlighted text in yellow.

UNDP 12/05/2022

The co-financing figures in Table B have been adjusted (highlighted in yellow).

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 18th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Yes

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 18th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

18th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) Please explain the methodology/calculation for Core Indicator 11 (200,000 women and 300,000 men directly benefiting). How were these figures reached?

(2) The additional explanation field refers to tons rather than metric tons. Please ensure the calculated figures are in metric tons, as required for Core Indicator 8.

(3) Please provide scientific references for the Core Indicator 8 calculations.

(4) Please explain the Indicator 7.4 ratings for CCLME "2" and "PACA "1".

11th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP 09/05/2022

(1) Included, see the text highlighted in yellow.

(2) All figures are in metric tons. The symbol used is "t". The standard international base unit abbreviation for a tonne (1,000 kg also called metric ton) is "t".

(3) These are the references:

Titi shrimp

Canales, C., Ibarra, M., & Chicaiza, D. 2021. Evaluación de la Población de camarón pomada (*Protrachypene precipua*) del Golfo de Guayaquil, Ecuador. Instituto Público de Investigación de Acuicultura y Pesca, Guayaquil, Ecuador.

Shrimp fisheries Panama

FAO. 2019a. Fishery and Aquaculture Statistics. Global Fisheries commodities production and trade 1976-2017 (FishstatJ).

Castrejón, M. & Bucaram, S. 2020. Diagnóstico Integral del Sector Pesca y Acuicultura de la República de Panamá. Nota Técnica IDB-TN-02011. Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo (BID). Washington, USA, 162 pp.

Large pelagic fish

Large pelagic fish

Martínez-Ortiz, J., Aires-da-Silva, A. M., Lennert-Cody, C. E., & Maunder, M. N. 2015. The Ecuadorian artisanal fishery for large pelagics: species composition and spatio-temporal dynamics. PLoS One, 10(8), e0135136.

Ixquiac, M.J., Bocanegra, M., Hernández, J.A. & Marroquin, J. 2016. Informe sobre recopilación de información biológica y de aprovechamiento de tiburón a pequeña escala para la subsistencia de las comunidades pesqueras y Aplicación de la Guía práctica sobre la CITES y los medios de subsistencia. Documento técnico 32-2016. Diciembre 2016. Consejo Nacional de Áreas Protegidas (CONAP), Ciudad de Guatemala, Guatemala, 58 pp.

Castrejón, M. & Bucaram, S. 2020. Diagnóstico Integral del Sector Pesca y Acuicultura de la República de Panamá. Nota Técnica IDB-TN-02011. Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo (BID). Washington, USA, 162 pp.

Siu, S. & Aires-da-Silva, A. 2016. An inventory of sources of data in Central America on shark fisheries operating in the eastern Pacific Ocean. Metadata report. In 7th Meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC).

Octopus

FAO. 2020a. Fishery and Aquaculture Statistics. Global production by production source 1950-2018 (FishstatJ).

FAO. 2020. Report of the FAO/CECAF Working Group on the Assessment of Demersal Resources – Subgroup North Nouakchott, Mauritania, 2–10 December 2019, 597 pp.

Cuttlefish

FAO. 2020a. Fishery and Aquaculture Statistics. Global production by production source 1950-2018 (FishstatJ).

FAO. 2020c. Report of the FAO/CECAF Working Group on the Assessment of Demersal Resources – Subgroup North Nouakchott, Mauritania, 2–10 December 2019, 597 pp.

Small pelagic fish

FAO. 2019. Report of the FAO Working Group on the Assessment of Small Pelagic Fish off Northwest Africa. Banjul, the Gambia, 26 June–1 July 2018, 320 pp.

References are highlighted in yellow in the “bibliography” section of the PIF and in the core indicators annex B.

(4) The rating for core indicator 7.4 has been updated to focus on the GMC2 project. A footnote explaining the scores has been included (highlighted in yellow).

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 18th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Yes

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

18th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Yes.

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

18th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Yes, but please address the following:

(1) An explanation of the GMC Project's model approaches is noted. Please also provide a summary of the GMC Project's results/tools, upon which this project builds. This will be particularly useful, as the alternative scenario notes that tools developed by the GMC project will be used.

11th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP 09/05/2022

As indicated in the PIF (paragraph 36), the four main tools are:

Responsible purchasing policies.
Supply chain roundtables.
Government-led marine commodities platforms.
Industry-led FIPs.

In addition, there are:

Basic Guidelines for a Gender-Responsive Fishery Improvement Project.
Building Equal Opportunities in Fisheries: The Global Marine Commodities Project Gender Strategy
Key Considerations for Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue Spaces for Improved Fisheries Governance.
Lineamientos para un enfoque inclusivo de género en productos de comunicación.
Key considerations for a diagnosis of fisheries issues – generating information for participatory fishery dialogues
Key Considerations for Fishery Improvement Projects
Role of Wholesalers and Retailers in the Sustainable Seafood Movement.
Sustainable Seafood Policy Toolkit for Seafood Suppliers and Buyers.
Updates to the FIP evaluation tool: a standardized method for measuring FIP progress

As indicated in the PIF, all these documents are available from: globalmarinecommodities.org/en/library/

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

18th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Yes, but please address the following:

(1) Please map barriers that need to be addressed to project outcomes. This is done for Outcome 1.1 and 1.2, but not for the other project outcomes.

11th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP 09/05/2022

A new table 3 (highlighted in yellow) was included after paragraph 99 to indicate the relationship between project outcomes and the main barriers. In addition, explanatory text was added to outcomes 1.3 to 3.1 (highlighted in yellow).

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

18th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Yes, but please address the following:

4.1.1. The project is not aligned with the focal area and/or Impact Program strategies.

(1) How will the project help the countries “build back better” from the pandemic (taking guidance from the GEF’s White Paper <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/white-paper-gef-covid-19-response-strategy>)

11th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP 09/05/2022

A new paragraph 117 was introduced to explain the alignment of the project with the White Paper on a GEF COVID-19 Response Strategy (see text highlighted in yellow).

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

18th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Yes

Agency Response

6. Are the project’s/program’s indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

18th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) Please further detail the GEBs this project will contribute to. This information is present throughout the PIF, but please consolidate it in this section. Include the project targets under the GEF Core Indicators.

11th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP 09/05/2022

Paragraphs 123 and 124 were modified to include more detail on the global environmental benefits (see text highlighted in yellow)

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

18th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) Please explain the GMC model refinement and why it is innovative. This is present elsewhere in the PIF, but the information should be consolidated here.

(2) Please further detail the potential for scaling up in this project.

11th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP 09/05/2022

(1) Please see new paragraphs 125-127 (highlighted in yellow).

(2) Paragraph 132 was expanded to provide more detail (highlighted in yellow).

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

18th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) If possible, please include geo-referenced maps of the project intervention

11th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP 09/05/2022

(1) At the moment only overall maps of the large marine ecosystems are available. More detailed maps will be developed during the PPG phase.

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

18th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) Please expand on the stakeholder engagement to date by specifically naming those stakeholders engaged during preparation of this PIF. Please clarify whether the stakeholders listed in the key stakeholder engagement table were engaged in the formulation of the PIF.

11th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP 09/05/2022

(1) Table 4 was modified to indicate the stakeholders that participated in PIF design (highlighted in yellow).

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women. adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

18th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Yes.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

18th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) Please expand on the case for private sector engagement. Why is private sector engagement important to the success of this project?

11th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP 09/05/2022

(1) Private sector engagement is a crucial part of the project taking into account that fishers, fishing vessel owners and operators, processors, traders and retailers are the backbone of the seafood supply chains. However, details on specific groups (e.g., fishers organisations, processing companies) that will be part of the project cannot be provided at the moment. Paragraph 144 was expanded (highlighted in yellow).

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

18th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) Please include a detailed Covid-19 risk and opportunity analysis

11th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP 09/05/2022

(1) The three main COVID-19 related risks were included in the risks table:

- Project implementation delays caused by a number of situations like travel restrictions, increased risk of infection by the emergence of new COVID-19 variants, and increased cost of goods and services.
- Difficulty to materialise co-financing because of financial constraints or changes in public spending priorities due to post-pandemic recovery actions.
- Limitations to stakeholder engagement and participation due to COVID-19 measures or focus on economic recovery.

To prepare a detailed COVID-19 related risk analysis of six countries and the value chains of the target fisheries (which expand along several countries) is beyond the currently available means. This is planned to be done during the PPG phase. However, a preliminary analysis of COVID-19 opportunities and challenges for project implementation is included as Annex D (text highlighted in yellow). The corresponding references were added to the bibliography and are highlighted in yellow.

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

18th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) It is recognized that the detailed institutional arrangements will be developed during PPG. However, please summarize the Figure 11 chart in a few paragraphs (a note on "How to read this diagram")

(2) In Figure 11, please change SFP Programmes Division from Implementing Partner to Executing Agency/Partner

(3) Please explain how the project may coordinate with the GEF projects and other initiatives described.

11th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP 09/05/2022

(1) Paragraph 147 was expanded to provide more detail (see text highlighted in yellow).

(2) The term "implementing partner" is used by UNDP, it is equivalent to the GEF term "Executing agency/partner". Change included.

(3) Basically, through information exchange and coordination meetings. Paragraph 148 was expanded to explain this (see highlighted text in yellow).

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

18th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Partly

(1) Please explain how the project is consistent with each of the national priorities listed.

11th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP 09/05/2022

(1) Paragraph 150 was expanded (highlighted in yellow).

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

18th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) Please better describe the KM Component 3 outputs in this section.

(2) Given that the project will contribute to implement actions from the CLME SAP and will provide inputs for the development of PACA's TDA/SAP process, please include any indicative KM arrangements with the CCLME SAP implementation project and the new PACA LME project.

(3) Please provide information in the KM section about (1) how existing lessons informed the project concept and plan; (2) plans to learn from ongoing relevant projects and initiatives; (3) proposed tools and methods for knowledge exchange, learning and collaboration; (4) proposed knowledge outputs to be produced and shared with stakeholders; (5) a discussion on how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project impact and sustainability; and (6) plans for strategic communications.

11th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) Comment 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5 are addressed. Per comment 3.6, please note in the KM section that plans for strategic communications will be developed during PPG. Please also include indicative plans, if available.

15th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP 09/05/2022

(1) Paragraphs 152 – 154 were modified to expand the descriptions (see text highlighted in yellow).

(2) At the moment there are no arrangements with the two projects. These will be developed during the PPG phase.

(3) A brief paragraph (157) was added (highlighted in yellow). However, the details requested are beyond the scope of the concept phase. The PPG phase will serve to design in detail the knowledge management strategies, tools and products.

UNDP 12/05/2022

(1) New paragraphs 169 and 170 were added (highlighted in yellow).

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

18th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Yes.

Agency Response

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

18th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) LOEs for Panama, Morocco, Mauritania, Ecuador and Senegal are present in the portal.

The LOE for Guatemala is missing in the portal. Please upload or explain the status of securing this LOE.

11th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Not addressed. It is understood that the LOE is in approval process and will be submitted in due course. Please resubmit the project for technical clearance and secure the LOE in parallel.

18th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed. Guatemala is now included in the submission.

Agency Response

UNDP 09/05/2022

The LOE of Guatemala is in the approval process, the letter is expected in the following days. Once received it will be uploaded in the GEF portal

UNDP 12/05/2022

Direct follow up to the LOE will be given to secure it as soon as possible.

UNDP 17/05/2022

LOE from Guatemala could take longer. In order to proceed, the country has been removed from the whole pif. If LOE is signed in the following weeks, the country will be included during ppg. Changes due to this removal are highlighted in light blue.

UNDP 18/05/2022

Guatemala LOE is included in the submission package.

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) 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 in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

22nd of April 2022 (thenshaw). No. Please address above comments and resubmit. Thank you.

11th of May 2022 (thenshaw). No. Please address above comments and resubmit. Thank you.

18th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Yes.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

/iew Dates

PIF Review Agency Response

First Review	4/18/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

This project is designed to expedite seafood market transformation and improve the condition of globally important fishery resources through activities in two LMEs: Canary Current and Pacific Central American Coastal. The project will (1) increase market *demand* for sustainable marine commodities, socially responsible seafood commodities, and seafood commodities from fisheries with reduced bycatch and environmental impact; and (2) increase *supply* of seafood products that demonstrate improved fisheries governance and stock health, improved social responsibility, and reduced bycatch and environmental impact. To these ends, the project will develop novel market transformation tools and methods (with immediate worldwide application); engage major international players in responsible seafood sourcing; connect local fishers and processors to sustainable seafood demand; and facilitate constructive dialogue and practical collaboration among value chain members through governance platforms and Fishery Improvement Projects. The project will move 1,015,000 tons of globally overexploited marine fisheries to more sustainable levels and directly benefit 480,000 people (192,000 women) employed in capture and post-harvest.