

Facilitating biodiversity conservation by enhancing aquaculture policy, planning, management, and production

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10907

Countries

Palau

Project Name

Facilitating biodiversity conservation by enhancing aquaculture policy, planning, management, and production

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

12/22/2021

Review completed by PM

3/11/2022

Program Manager

Sarah Wyatt

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

MSP

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
3/4/2022

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
3/4/2022

Yes.

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

4/5/2022

Yes.

3/18/2022

No, according to the project info on the baseline projects, gov't of Palau (involving a few different ministries, MAFE & MOJ) will be implementing parallel projects directly and indirectly in support of the GEF project. It includes the development of water quality monitoring regimes. See below for MAFE and MOJ comments.

- MAFE 1M grant: change ?grant? to ?public investment?.

- MOJ 1.5M in-kind: if any portion of this amount is dedicated to support the GEF project (marine surveillance, inspection, enforcement), report the amount as ?public investment? and ?investment mobilized?. The amount for the ministry?s ?regular? operating costs (i.e., staff, office) in support of the GEF project should be reported as ?in-kind? and ?recurrent expenditures?.

- Aquaculture cooperatives and businesses (private sector): change ?in-kind? to ?grant?.

Agency Response

3/29/2021

Yes, the MAFE will assist operation of hatchery facilities with help of staff members from Division of Aquaculture within the Bureau of Fisheries during whole project period. The MOJ will be involved in marine surveillance, inspection and enforcement of the imported marine species. Also, as the primary enforcement authority of environmental laws in Palau, the Division of Fish and Wildlife Protection (DFWP) of MOJ will play a key role in community relations and education, and in encouraging compliance. The staff members from the DFWP of MOJ will assist with community engagement and awareness of other fisheries and aquaculture-related laws and regulations.

As advised, the revisions were made accordingly:

-MAFE 1M Grant: changed to ?Public investment?

-MOJ 1.5M in-kind: Changed to ?Public investment?

-Aquaculture cooperatives and businesses (private sector): Changed to ?Grant?

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

4/5/2022

Yes.

3/18/2022

No, the OFP's LOE included the Focal Area, but misses to include the specific source of funding (BD STAR vs. BD Global/Regional Set-Aside) - In absence of the specific source of funding, the OFP could have included the following statement (highlighted in yellow) given the project is sourced from the country's STAR allocation, but he/she didn't.

Please provide a new LoE or to obtain an email from the OFP clarifying that the source of funding is the STAR allocation ? then append the email to the documents? tab.

- The co-financing contribution to PMC is disproportionate. If the GEF contribution is kept at 10%, for a co-financing of \$8,000,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$800,000 instead of \$400,000 (which is 5.0%). As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please ask the Agency to amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

Agency Response

Response03/11/2022

After submission of PIF was made on Dec. 20, 2021, an updated endorsement letter was issued by OFP and was submitted on Jan. 12, 2022. To be in line with the letter, the total financing requested for this project has been changed into USD 1,664,423 from USD 1,600,000, inclusive of project preparation grant (PPG) and agency fees for project cycle management services associated with the total GEF grant.

3/29/2022

-
A new LOE from OPF was obtained, by clarifying the source of the funding, the STAR allocation as advised.

Thanks for pointing out. The PMC of the co-financing contribution was adjusted to \$763,636 (which is 10%) from \$7,636,364, as advised.

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
3/4/2022

Yes.

Agency Response
The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
3/4/2022

Yes. Palau is fully flexible.

Agency Response
The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response
The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
NA

Agency Response
Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response
Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 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
3/4/2022

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
3/11/2022

Yes.

3/4/2022

No, in order to record PAs in the core indicators there needs to be an increased METT score during the life of the project. It does not appear that the project will do this. It would probably be better to stick to the calculation CI 5 perhaps at 15% instead.

Agency Response
Response03/11/2022

Thanks a lot for pointing out. As advised, the project core indicator 2 was deleted and sticks to the Core Indicator 5 by increasing 15% of areas (25,500 hectares) as a target for area of marine habitat under improved practices.

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
3/4/2022

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
3/4/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
3/4/2022

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
3/4/2022

Yes. During PPG, it will be important to emphasize how this project is shifting the trajectory of aquaculture development in Palau. It could be a tricky distinction between the GEF promoting aquaculture with mixed environmental outcomes and GEF support

being key to mainstream biodiversity in aquaculture acknowledging the very likely development of aquaculture and the importance of getting in front of such a development.

Agency Response

Response03/11/2022

Yes, this project will be carried out to achieve win-win approaches as improved planning, management and production in the aquaculture sector will contribute to improved management of natural resources, food security and sustainable livelihoods in Palau. During PPG, detailed workplan to build an institutional framework for the development of the aquaculture sector by maintaining ecosystem sustainability and strengthening capacity through training, knowledge management, and by putting environmental monitoring systems in place.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/4/2022

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

3/4/2022

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

3/4/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/4/2022

Yes. We believe Palau, with a strong environmental culture, is a good place to work on development models in policy and practice for sustainable aquaculture.

Agency Response

Response03/11/2022

Yes. As a developing island country with a small population, rich marine biodiversity, progressive environmental conservation policies, and a growing tourism economy, Palau provides ideal conditions to implement this project.

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

3/4/2022

Yes.

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

3/4/2022

Yes.

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

3/4/2022

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

3/4/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

3/4/2022

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

3/4/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

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

3/4/2022

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

3/4/2022

Yes. However, it will be important to consider how this project will link larger efforts on sustainable aquaculture not only in the SIDS but more broadly.

Agency Response

Response03/11/2022

Outputs of this project include systems, programs, involvement of the private sector in sustainable aquaculture which will contribute to the success of this project. More importantly, the ecosystem approach to aquaculture developed in Palau, especially with the Best Aquaculture Practices (BAP), a globally and widely in use, can potentially be

replicated in other countries not only in the SIDS but other regions. The proposed project will produce knowledge products to support the implementation process and improvement of its performance. Also, to ensure a robust information exchange to increase awareness and engagement on the topics of aquaculture, the products produced will be disseminated to policy makers as well as relevant stakeholders to share knowledge and ideas among countries in the Pacific and other regions.

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
3/4/2022

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
3/4/2022

Yes.

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
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

4/5/2022

Yes.

3/18/2022

No, please address a few remaining issues.

3/4/2022

No, this is an exciting project but there are a few issues to address.

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

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	3/4/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/11/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/18/2022	

PIF Review

Agency Response

Additional Review (as necessary)

4/5/2022

Additional Review (as necessary)

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval