

Mainstreaming climate change and ecosystem-based approaches into the sustainable management of the living marine resources of the WCPFC

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10394

Countries

Regional (Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu)

Project Name

Mainstreaming climate change and ecosystem-based approaches into the sustainable management of the living marine resources of the WCPFC

Agenices

UNDP

Date received by PM

10/11/2019

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Christian Severin

Focal Area

International Waters

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

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

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): 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

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Partly,

1) Please include outputs that will catalyse activities around tracking and tracability. On tracking this shodul both be vessel tracking, as well as tuna (eg via blockchain).

2) Please include an output that will catalyse activities on FAD configuration and design, that will mimize entanglement of non targetted species and mammals.

3) GEB section elaborates on the collaboration between RFMOs, Regional Seas and SAP frameworks, please include an output along these lines.

4) Please consider if the results framework, as part of the climate adaptation strategy, should include development of alternative income generation activities within the marine/fisheries space.

5) Component 4, includes baselines for the four target species. Even though the jump on MSC of Bigeye is estimated to increase from 0.2% to 3 % (which will be the biggest percent wise increase). It still is still a very small fraction of the overall catch. Please increase level of estimated impact.

Please make sure these points will also be reflected upon in the component descriptions.

Finally, as part of the PPG process, please work towards quantifying the outputs as much as possible.

4th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed, however, please do ensure to expand on the collaboration between the RFMOs, regional Seas and LMEs during the PPG.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 1 November 2019

Comment 1:

All licensed vessels undertaking legal fisheries within the project system boundary are required to have VMS. If they switch these off they then become ‘illegal’ and are targeted for interdiction/interception. The Surveillance Centre in Honiara (which was supported by GEF through an earlier intervention) is now highly competent at tracking vessels and interpreting their movements as well as responding to vessels that go ‘dark’ (and thus become IUU). The next stage of monitoring and surveillance would be tracking and tracing landings, strengthening the requirement to transship only within PICs ports, and ensuring that the product itself can be traced through to markets. Careful monitoring of transshipment in ports will also prevent the illegal ‘use’ of bycatch entering the market places outside of the region. Any transshipment activities on the high seas can be identified by the Surveillance Centre who have developed this ‘red-flag’ capability through the previous GEF project. and acted upon. In any case, the vessel VMS would identify the vessels. Table B has been modified and additional output added as per:

Component Two - Outcome 2 description modified and expanded in Table B:

Improved monitoring of catch, bycatch and movement of catch (transshipping, landing and marketing), MCS and data analysis to significantly reduce IUU fishing

Additional Output added in Table B.

Output 2.1.3

Develop enhanced mechanisms and improved technology for tracking and traceability of vessels and associated catch products. This will include A. closer vessel tracking using state-of-the-art satellite/remote sensing technologies as well as B. requirements for ‘chain-of-custody’ and tracking of catches and shipments of products through to final markets (e.g. Blockchain technologies)

N.B. GEF is requiring a more expanded effort for tracking and traceability than had been envisaged and this may have funding and budget implications that will be identified at ProDoc development and submission.

Comment 2:

Additional Output added in Table B:

Output 2.2.2

Collaborate with relevant stakeholders (including Private sector) to promote the design, manufacture and marketing/use of FADs that minimize impacts on non-target species (e.g. through avoiding entanglement)

This is further expanded in the main text under Alternative Scenario as:

The activities and outputs from this Outcome will prioritise eliminating bycatch at the FAD through the use of emerging technologies and alternative methodologies such as the use of LED lights on FADs. Generally, this Outcome will aim to enhance collaboration with relevant stakeholders (including Private sector) in order to promote the design, manufacture and marketing/use of FADs that minimize impacts on non-target species (e.g. through avoiding entanglement)

N.B. GEF is requiring a more expanded focus on FAD design and deployment to reduce bycatch than had been envisaged and this may have funding and budget implications that will be identified at ProDoc development and submission.

Comment 3:

It is already the case that a sizeable fraction of the MCS activities is financed by/through the private sector. This PS financing and support will be captured in the final co-financing picture presented at ProDoc Submission. However, there are still areas of collaboration with the private sector which can be enhanced and explored. However, this new, specific Output will also have additional budget implications that will be identified during ProDoc development and at Submission and it is expected that GEF would be willing to allocate additional funding if it feels that there are still significant opportunities for improving PS engagement.

Proposed Output Added in Table B:

Output 2.2.2

Collaborate with relevant stakeholders (including Private sector) to promote the design, manufacture and marketing/use of FADs that minimize impacts on non-target species (e.g. through avoiding entanglement)

Comment 4:

This has now been taken into consideration to reflect the potential long-term logic of including studies into alternative income generation activities to respond to climate change. It should be noted that many of these changes in the overall structure of the tuna fishery resulting from climate change may well be in the long-term (50 years plus). Nevertheless, there are some short-term predictions which support the value of undertaking such assessments of alternative income generation if carefully studied alongside the models being used by FFA and the Oceanic Fisheries Programme of SPC and other regional bodies which are growing more powerful and accurate with time, e.g. SEAPODYM (Spatial Ecosystem and Population Dynamics Model) and ECOPATH/ECOSIM (A software programme that allows for the modelling of entire ecosystems). To address the requirement for such an assessment of short and long-term needs for possible alternative income generation, a new Output has been added in Table B to cover this:

Output 3.2.2

Assessment of alternative income generating activities both within fisheries and other sectors that can identify the need for adaptive responses to climate change and its predicted impacts on the fisheries sector. This would also look at the requirement for appropriate training in new skills and technologies with an emphasis on gender empowerment and youth job creation

As above, this may have some budget implications which will be identified for GEF in the ProDoc submission.

Comment 5:

Level of estimated impact from Baseline to Target for certified fisheries in relation to consumer awareness and ecolabelling has now been significantly increased in Table B:

Albacore Baseline @ 15,392 tons certified @15.5%. Target - 40%

Yellowfin Baseline @250,153 tons @39%. Target – 70%

Skipjack Baseline @ 628,331 tons @ 38%. Target – 70%

Bigeye Baseline @ 862 tons @0.2%. Target – 40%

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

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes, however, please work diligently towards attracting private sector co-financing during the PPG phase.

4th of November 2019 (cseverin): please make sure to list WWF in cofinancing table as NGO, instead of OTHERS

5th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed, WWF, properly tagged as a CSO.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 1 November 2019

This is noted; private sector co-financing will be sought during PPG beyond the amount already reported from PITIA. The section of the revised PIF on Co-financing now includes the sentence **In particular, during the Project Preparation process, strong emphasis will be placed on securing private sector co-financing.**

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 25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 25th of October (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

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

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes

4th of November 2019 (cseverin): A request for additional PPG funding has been included and the rationale has been substantiated.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 1 November 2019

UNDP is requesting an exception from the cap to increase the PPG request to \$300,000 from the \$200,000 indicated in the first submission of the PIF. The primary reasons are the following: a) the number of countries covered which include all the 14 Pacific Island Countries (PICs) eligible to receive GEF financing; b) the need for a national consultant in each of the 14 PICs to facilitate national consultations and to provide inputs in developing the project document to complement the

regional team consisting of 2 consultants; c) the relatively high cost of travel and doing business in the Pacific. Related to travel costs, a regional validation workshop that will bring together representatives from the 14 PICs and partners will be convened to validate the project document.

A detailed PPG initiation plan to be prepared will provide the breakdown of the PPG and the actual utilization will be provided at CEO ER.

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): partly, please add values to core indicator 7 and 11

4th of November 2019 (cseverin): Indicators not included in portal entry, only in attached word doc. Please include in portal

5th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 1 November 2019

Core Indicator 7 now added as 1. Pacific Warm Pool LME with explanatory Note indicated in the PIF.

Core Indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender is added in the PIF.

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 25th of October 2019 (cseverin): 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

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes, however, please consider to include the use of LED lights to eliminate by-catch in relation to FADs and other catch methodologies. There may be a need to include a paragraph that will explain this in more detail some of the product development needed, specifically in relation to the outcome 2.2

Further, considering the estimated climate impacts on the shared tuna stock, please consider if it would make sense to include development of alternative income generation activities, if the tuna fisheries will indeed be shifting geographically.

4th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 1 November 2019

On the use of LED lights:

Output 2.2.1 Amended to read:

Improved FAD management including control of deployment, and tracking and other mechanisms to optimise sustainable target stock catches, reduce bycatch and reduce ecological impacts from loss of FADs. (e.g. Through use of LED lights)

Also text added under Component 2 description:

Emerging technologies for reducing bycatch at FADs include the deployment of green LED lights. Recent studies have provided good evidence that these can deter entanglement by elasmobranchs, turtles and some seabirds. This Component will support research and deployment studies to confirm this and to promote use of such technologies in the fishery.

On the consideration of alternative income-generation activities:

Output 3.2.2 has now been added as noted under GEF Review Comment 2 above and Agency Response 4 to that Comment. This has been included in the Component 3 Description and the following added to the Outcome Description under the Proposed Alternative Scenario:

Outcome 3.2

New strategies in place to respond to socioeconomic changes and food security issues related to climate change (i.e. improving community subsistence and small-scale commercial fisheries). This will include looking at the options for alternative livelihoods to compensate for climate change and the need for adaptation. As part of this support, careful consideration will be given to the occupational and geographic mobility of Pacific Islanders in this context.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

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

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): 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

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): No, please include information on Core indicator 7 as well as core indicator 11.

4th of November 2019 (cseverin): Indicators not captured in the portal entry, please do so

5th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 1 November 2019

Core Indicator Information has been added as per Agency Response to GEF Review Item 6 comment above.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Partly, as it is suggested to be including activities for improving tracking and traceability, innovative tools such as utilizing block chain should be included in the section.

4th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed.

Agency Response**UNDP Response, 1 November 2019**

Refer to response to GEF Review Comment 1, Section 2. Also, additional studies and deployment of innovative technologies associated with FADs to prevent entanglement and bycatch as well as the aforementioned improved vessel and product tracking will further provide a valuable basis for innovative replication and scaling up.

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

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes, map has been included on the pacific region, where the interventions will be undertaken.

Agency Response**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

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes, however, please consider to include fisher families, to the stakeholder table.

4th of November 2019 (cseverin):Partly, addressed. Please tick of which of the stakeholder groups, outlined under heading of Section 2, that have been engaged.

Agency Response**UNDP Response, 1 November 2019**

This is now added to the stakeholder table for the revised PIF. However, please note that main constraint to ensuring full stakeholder engagement at this level will be the limitations of the PPG grant and the need to hold at least one and sometimes two full stakeholder workshops in each of 14 countries. The PICS are very strong on wanting to be involved in project development

STAKEHOLDER	INPUT AT PIF	EXPECTED ENGAGEMENT IN DEVELOPING FULL PROJECT
Fisher Families	Input through FFA and SPC but limited direct interaction at PIF stage	National stakeholder consultations in each country will ensure input from local communities and fisher family representatives

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

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Partly, articulation is okay, however please make sure that the importance of including both gender in the project, is also reflected upon in the Core indicator 11

4th of November 2019 (cseverin):: Core indicator information lacking

5th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 1 November 2019

Core Indicator 11 has now been added and disaggregated by gender

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

Risks

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

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

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

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes, however, please note that as the agency knows, the implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate per policy and guideline. The GEFSEC will analyze any requests for dual role playing by an agency at the time of CEO endorsement and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an “exceptional” basis. We strongly encourage the agency to look at third party options as a preferred way forward. We also strongly encourage the agency to discuss any and all options for execution that do not include the government with the GEFSEC early in the PPG phase. The technical clearance of this PIF in no way endorses any alternative execution arrangement.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 1 November 2019

This is noted. The project will be executed by the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency which will then engage other regional partners and the countries in the execution of the project.

An appropriate sentence to clarify has been added under the section on ‘Coordination’ which reads: **UNDP will not directly execute any components or activities of the project, nor seek direct project costs on any nationally implemented elements.**

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

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

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

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

Part 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

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): Partly, please include the missing endorsement letter for Papua New Guinea

4th of November 2019 (cseverin): Missing letter uploaded, please list all participating countries after the entire REGIONAL, at the entry page of the Portal

5th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 1 November 2019

The LOE from PNG has been earlier provided.

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

Agency Response

GEFSEC 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

25th of October 2019 (cseverin): No, Please address comments

4th of November 2019 (cseverin): No please address comments

5th of November 2019 (cseverin): Project recommended for Technical Clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		