

From bait to plate: strengthening sustainable fisheries to safeguard marine biodiversity and food security

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10540

Countries

Mexico

Project Name

From bait to plate: strengthening sustainable fisheries to safeguard marine biodiversity and food security

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

3/23/2020

Review completed by PM

4/9/2020

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Biodiversity

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

3/23/2020

Yes, fully aligned with GEF-7 BD strategy.

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

3/23/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

3/23/2020

For the most part, yes. GIZ is listed as cofinancer with an "in-kind" amount that is listed as investment mobilized. This appears to be a mistake and should be listed as a grant if it is IM. Please clarify and correct.

4/2/2020

For line 10 in Table C since the designation of the co-financier is civil society organizations, the source should be CSO and not others – hence in the column “Name of co-financier” should include the actual name of the CSOs. If you can not name the CSOs, please enter TBD.

4/9/200

Yes, cleared. Of course, please list all CSO cofinancers by the time of CEO endorsement.

Agency Response

26 March 2020

Noted. GIZ cofinancing has been listed as a grant.

9 April 2020

Point taken, done.

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

3/23/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/23/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/23/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/23/2020

NA.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/23/2020

NA.

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/23/2020

NA.

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/23/2020

NA.

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

3/23/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

3/23/2020

Yes, for the most part. Indicator 8 is listed in the footnote but it is not entered in the portal. Please enter.

4/2/2020

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

26 March 2020

Noted. Relevant data has been inserted under Core Indicator 8 in the portal.

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

3/23/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

3/23/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/23/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

3/23/2020

Yes. Great potential return on investment. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/23/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

3/23/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

3/23/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/23/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

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

3/23/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

3/23/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

3/23/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

4/2/2020

On Environmental and Social Safeguards, Section 5 of the PIF show that some risks screening has taken place. Please provide the completed FAO's Environmental and Social Risk Identification – Screening Checklist. Please indicate more clearly the preliminary overall risk classification of the project as well as the types and risk classification of any identified risks and impacts including any preliminary measures to address identified risks and potential impacts.

By the time of CEO endorsement, please elaborate a more robust climate risk mitigation strategy.

4/14/2020

The project has attached the FAO certification, but it has still not attached complete FAO's Environmental and Social Risk Identification – Screening Checklist. FAO has consistently been able to submit these screening checklists as part of the other PIFs so please submit it for this project as well.

4/15/2020

Full screening checklist has now been included. Cleared.

Agency Response

9 April 2020

FAO's Environmental & Social Risk certification has been uploaded as requested. Preliminary overall risk classification of the project as well as mitigation measures and potential impacts are now detailed in Section 5 Risks.

15 April 2020

Noted, the Environmental and Social Risk Identification - screening checklist has been uploaded under the *Documents* section

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

3/23/2020

Under the project institutional structure, first paragraph, last sentence it appears that in the PPG phase, FAO will be executing activities. Please revise to be consistent with the rest of the document which states that FAO will only serve a GEF agency role in this project.

4/2/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

26 March 2020

Point taken. The paragraph is now corrected - in line with the rest of the PIF.

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

3/23/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

3/23/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

3/23/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

3/23/2020

NA.

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

3/23/2020

No. Please revised the document per comments above and resubmit.

4/2/2020

No. Please address issues above with cofinance and the environmental and social safeguards and resolve this remaining issue:

As presented in Section 6, the main Executing Partner Type is CONANP and CONAPESCA while WWF Mexico will only administer the funds. While it is not possible to have 3 entries under Executing Partner type per Portal's limitations, the selected type must reflect as close as possible the Type of partner that will execute, which in this case is Government instead of Others – please change to Government.

4/14/2020

No. Please address the issue under risks above and included here as well:

The project has attached the FAO certification, but it has still not attached complete FAO's Environmental and Social Risk Identification – Screening Checklist. FAO has consistently been able to submit these screening checklists as part of the other PIFs so please submit it for this project as well.

4/15/2020

Yes. Screening checklist has been included. Thus, PIF is 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)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

The objective of this project is to ensure the conservation of marine ecosystems and biodiversity and secure the sustainable livelihoods of fishing communities through innovative fisheries co-management approaches in three priority seascapes.

The project approach is based on the understanding that in order to be successful, co-management schemes must respond to the diverse needs of fishing communities at specific sites, they must rely on effective institutional arrangements, sufficient information for decision-making, and mechanisms for social participation, and they must be coupled with sustainable livelihoods alternatives in order to keep future fishing effort within sustainable levels. In addition, the project will focus on the co-management of fisheries in seascapes that include various forms of protected status (NPAs and OECMs) and to use ecosystem-based management strategies in order to generate benefits for both biodiversity conservation and local livelihoods and economies.

By managing fisheries in an integrated manner across different protected sites, the project will provide an opportunity to align and integrate the conservation approaches of CONANP and the fisheries production orientation of CONAPESCA, while also piloting ecosystem-based fisheries management at a larger scale than previous programs in Mexico, which will create valuable models and lessons learned and also provide new incentives and justification to make changes in the country's existing fisheries policy and regulatory framework.

The global environmental benefits that will be produced by the proposed project include: (i) 399,114 hectares of terrestrial conservation areas and 1,597,751 hectares of marine conservation areas under improved management, including the conservation of globally relevant biodiversity; (ii) 925,031 hectares of productive seascapes under improved management practices; and (iii) 25,104 metric tones reduced catch of globally over-exploited marine fisheries. In the Nayarit Bahia de Banderas seascape, the habitat of numerous resident and migratory seabirds will be better protected, as will an important breeding area for Humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) and the Olive Ridley Sea Turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*). In the Quintana Roo Caribbean Seascape, significant parts of the Mesoamerican Reef System, which constitutes the largest reef structures of its kind in Mexico, will have enhanced protection that will benefit 778 species identified in the area. Improved management of the Baja California Sur Seascape will help to protect a priority ecoregion for conservation identified in the WWF Global 200 list.