

Strategies, technologies and social solutions to manage bycatch in tropical Large Marine Ecosystem Fisheries (REBYC-III CLME+)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10857

Countries

Regional (Barbados, Guyana, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago)

Project Name

Strategies, technologies and social solutions to manage bycatch in tropical Large Marine Ecosystem Fisheries (REBYC-III CLME+)

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

2/2/2023

Review completed by PM

2/22/2023

Program Manager

Andrew Hume

Focal Area

International Waters

Project Type

FSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023 (ahume): Yes the project remains aligned with IW Objective 1.1 and 1.2.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 2/15/2023 (ahume): Yes, the project structure since PIF is well-design and appropriate for achieving the expected outcomes and outputs.

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 2/15/2023 (ahume): N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023 (ahume): Please address the following:

1) The majority of the cofinancing partners are the same as EAf4SG (10919) and the FAO Caribbean, Guyana, Suriname, and Trinidad and Tobago offices are suspiciously providing exactly the same cofinancing to both projects. Please confirm the provided cofinancing from all partners is not being double counted with the EAf4SG project.

2) Please also explain why FAO HQ is not providing any cofinancing to this project but is providing it to the EAf4SG project?

3) Please provide a description for how the private sector cofinancing was calculated below the cofinancing table.

4) Please also note the cofinancing letter for Nature Seekers is different than what is listed in the CER.

4/7/2023 (ahume):

1) Addressed.

2) Addressed.

3) Addressed.

4) Addressed.

Agency Response

Response FAO:

1) The consultations with the stakeholders of the REBYC III and EAF4SG took place simultaneously. Consequently, the FAO offices in the Caribbean, Guyana, Suriname, and Trinidad and Tobago decided to split the available co-financing 50-50. This is the reason the commitments appear the same. We do confirm that the letters are valid and can be included as such in the two projects.

2) Kindly note that FAO ? fishery Division sent a co-financing letter for US 3M. FAO Legal Office (LEGN) committed of USD 473K and finally FAO Fishing Technology and Operations Team (NFIFO) committed USD 1,8 M. In addition, strictly speaking, the co-financing from FAO in Barbados, T&T, Suriname, and Guyana are also contribution from FAO?s offices. Therefore, in total, FAO is committing USD 6.5 M. All these commitments are reported in table C with the correspondent letters uploaded.

3) Co-financing from the private sector was calculated on the base of one-to-one meetings with each of them and the consequent letters of co-financing issued by each company. There is no other ?hidden? way to calculate this, but reporting what the private sector companies reported to us. This is explained below the co-financing table in the portal.

4) The letter of Nature Seekers uploaded in the Table C of the submission reports USD 92,322.71 in -in kind co-financing. This was reported as USD 92,323 because the portal does not allow for decimals. The letter clearly mentioned that this is in-kind contribution through the company's regular staff time, and hence it is characterized as recurrent expenditure.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 2/15/2023 (ahume): Yes.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 2/15/2023 (ahume): Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023 (ahume): Yes, the core indicator targets have been updated and remain realistic.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023 (ahume): Yes.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023 (ahume): Yes the description of the baseline is well presented.

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

2/15/2023 (ahume): Yes, the proposed alternative scenario is sound.

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023 (ahume): Yes, alignment with the IW Focal Area is well articulated.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023 (ahume): Yes the incremental cost reasoning is sound.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023 (ahume): Yes the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits is well elaborated.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023 (ahume): Yes the presentation on the project's innovation, sustainability, and potential to scale are well presented.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023 (ahume): Partly. Please provide maps that are specific to this project, not just the CLME. Please also ensure the map is not blurry.

4/7/2023 (ahume): Addressed.

Agency Response

Response FAO

A new map representing the portion of LME only related to the participating countries has been uploaded. The MAP is high resolution and does not look blurry on our end.

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023 (ahume): N/A

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023 (ahume): A detailed report of stakeholders engaged during PPG is provided. A Stakeholder engagement plan is also provided.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023 (ahume): The agency conducted a desk-top gender analysis which led to the development of a Gender Action Plan (GAP) (Appendix R). However, the GAP does not make any references to Core Indicator 11 target of supporting 4,480 woman. The Gender Specialist is identified to provide 80 days of work but is listed as responsible across all the project activities in the GAP Table 1. Please justify why 80 days is sufficient.

Further, on gender equality: In the portal section on gender, the project states that "project activities targeted at women are included in all four Components. In project document only Component 3 and 4 incorporates gender issues. The gender action plans makes some references to ambitions to encouraging and facilitating the participation of women from

government, academia, civil society and the private sector. These seem fairly generic and additional details on specific activities should be incorporated.

4/7/2023 (ahume): Addressed.

Agency Response

Response FAO:

1. Core indicator targets have been included in a revised GAP (page 1)
2. The 80 days allocated to the Gender Specialist was calculated on the basis that: (i) this position is part-time with c. 40% of the Gender Specialist's time being allocated to coordinating the implementation of the project's Gender Action Plan (GAP) including overseeing the project team in undertaking the activities set out in the GAP; (ii) another 35 % of the Gender specialist time is allocated to leading and/or supporting implementation of specific activities in the GAP; and (iii) the remaining 25% of time is allocated to monitoring the implementation of the GAP, including collecting and collating gender-disaggregated data to input into mid-term, annual progress and terminal evaluation reports for the project, as required, and generally ensuring the project is making progress toward meeting the targets set out in the GAP for each project output.
3. Updated REBYC III CLME+ project Document, along with more detail on gender-related activities in the GAP table (Table 1 of GAP).
4. Additional text with more detail on gender specific activities has been included in the GAP (under Outputs 1.1.1; 1.1.2; 1.1.3; 1.2.1; 1.2.2; 1.2.3; 1.3.1; 1.3.2; 1.3.3; 1.3.4; 2.2.1; 2.2.2; 2.2.3; 2.2.4; and 2.3.1) and for Components 1 and 2 under section 3 'Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment' (Page 104) in the main ProDoc text.

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023 (ahume): The private sector is a key aspect of this project strategy and its role as a stakeholder is well elaborated. It is also noted in the Agency response to the German Council member that the project has prioritized support to the Small-Scale Fisheries sector to avoid an overproportioned benefitting of the industrial fishing. Any costs of participation of the industrial fishing sector will be covered through their own (co-financing) contributions.

4/7/2023 (ahume): Addressed.

Agency Response

Response FAO:

The comment on the costs of participation in the industrial fishing is well noted.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023 (ahume): Yes project risks have been well identified and the proposed mitigation measures are sound.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023 (ahume): No. Please take note of the following:

1) The proposed project plans to share some of the PMU with the EAf4SG project that is under review for CEO Endorsement in parallel. However it is unclear which positions are being shared across the two projects. The names of the PMU positions in the budget and TOR for this project do not seem to be the same as the EAf4SG project. For example, this REBYC-III project identifies a KM and Communications officer as one of the four PMU staff but this is not identified by the EAf4SG project. Please provide a new table that clearly shows the overall PMU for both projects, and which positions are shared by both projects and which positions are only for one project. Please also clearly show the costs being allocated from

each project (and total cost) per position. Please include this table in both projects so there is consistency.

2) The TORs for the Technical Coordinator role identifies many project management responsibilities listed under technical tasks. The split of PMC should be at least 50% of this funding for this position. It is also noted that this technical coordinator role has no mention of also managing the staff that are shared with the other GEF project (EAF4SG).

3) There is an alarming number of consultants proposed to implement this project. Please explain why a decision was taken not to merge some of the responsibilities into fewer consultancies. If the PMU finance position is shared between this project and EAF4SG, they will potentially be responsible for 19 consultant agreements for this project as well as all the consultant agreements for the other project. This seems like very high transaction costs.

4/7/2023 (ahume):

1) Addressed.

2) Addressed.

3) Addressed

Agency Response

Response FAO:

1. A table showing the allocation of resources for the PMU that will support the execution of the REBYCIII and EAF4SG projects has been added to the Institutional Arrangements and Coordination sections of the two Project Documents and CEO endorsement requests. The table also indicates the costs being allocated from each project (and the total cost) per position.

The titles of each position have been checked and made consistent in the two projects. These are: 1) Technical and Project Coordinator, 2) Administration and Operations Support Officer, 3) Knowledge Management and Communication Officer, and 4) Part Time M and E Support Officer.

2. ToRs for Technical and Project Coordinator in the two Project Documents (REBYC III and EAF4SG) have been revised to delineate better the technical tasks that will be conducted by this key staff member responsible for overall management of the two projects. The new ToR clearly splits project management and technical tasks, with clearer and more detail descriptions of the technical tasks for the Technical and Project Coordinator.

The rationale for the allocation of costs of the Technical and Project Coordinator is that UWI accepted to execute two highly complex GEF projects with a joint PMU comprised of 4 staff, one of them part-time arrangements (M&E officer). A number of discussions were held with senior UWI staff and it was agreed that this arrangement ? having a joint PMU and a Technical and Project Coordinator with both PMU and technical tasks was the most efficient, cost-effective way to use the limited GEF resources available for project management. UWI were being very generous in their offer to act as executing partner and are providing significant co-financing to support this (combined USD 1,340,000 for the two projects, mostly to support the PMU). This being said, considering the size of the two PMC allocations, there is no room to allocate more costs than what it is presented right now. Nevertheless, looking at the new aggregated table attached in the Institutional Arrangements and Coordination section of the two project documents, we can see that the cost of the Technical and Project Coordinator is allocated 65% on technical task and 35% on PMC. Kindly note that many other IW projects have recently been approved with a higher difference between the technical and PMC costs for their project coordinators (for example, GEF ID 10520 and GEF IS 10712). Finally, we would also like to mention that there is no GEF policy indicating a mandatory 50-50 allocation of costs for technical vs. managerial tasks, as far as the technical tasks of the staff are duly explained in the ToRs attached to the submission (as we have done in Annex Q2 attached both in the agency ProDoc and as standalone annex in the roadmap of the submission).

3. The number of lines associated with consultants in the budget has been reduced to one per project's component. The real number of consultants required during the execution will be assessed case by case and will be further defined as the project proceeds (captured in each year's workplan and PIR). The project, executed by UWI will keep the number of consultants hired to a minimum and only hired in cases where expertise and knowledge is lacking among the project team, to ensure timely and efficient execution of the project activities and support to the countries. Kindly note that Annex Q2: Draft TOR for Main Project Management Unit Staff and key consultants, includes all the possible ToR for experts that we have foreseen that may be needed during the execution. As explained, UWI will eventually aggregate some of them if appropriate.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023 (ahume): Yes alignment with national strategies for each country is provided.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023 (ahume): No. There is no reference made to synergies with the EAF4SG project which is proposed to share a KM and communications staff person. If the justification of the shared position is based on the benefits of the two projects being managed together, then one would expect there to be opportunities to combine, coordinate, and scale up the KM of the two projects in a strategic way.

4/7/2023 (ahume):

1) Addressed.

Agency Response

Response FAO:

New text clarifying synergies and opportunities to combine, coordinate and scale up KM between the REBYC and EAF4SG projects has been added to the KM sections in each Project Document.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023 (ahume): Yes. The Agency has documented its safeguards.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023 (ahume): Yes, a budgeted M&E plan is provided.

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023 (ahume): Yes the the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023 (ahume):

Annex A) Results Framework: See comment below

Annex B) Response to Project Review: See comments below

Annex C) PPG: No Comments

Annex D) Map: Please provide a map that is specific to this project, not just the CLME+ map. The project map should identify the project countries in a useful way for the project.

Annex E) Budget: See Institutional Arrangement comments above on appropriately costing Technical Coordinator to PMC. It is also noted in the budget that only \$30,000 is allocated to [IW:LEARN](#) activities, which is less than the 1% allocation requested by IW projects.

4/7/2023 (ahume):

1) Addressed.

2) Addressed.

3) Addressed.

4) Addressed.

5) Addressed.

Agency Response

Response FAO:

Annex A) Results Framework, comments addressed below.

Annex B) Response to Project Review: comments addressed below.

Annex D) a new high-resolution Map has been provided to address the comment made by the GEF.

Annex E) Budget: Comments on the Institutional Arrangement addressed above.

Comments on costing of the Technical Coordinator to PMC addressed.

The allocation for **IW:LEARN** activities, is USD 53,000 divided into two lines:

Travel to support **IW:LEARN**: USD 23,000; and **IW:LEARN** (Training publications and materials): USD 30,000.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023 (ahume): The project expects to improve practices in 10% of the overall EEZ (529,950 km²). Please add additional detail on how the 10% was determined in the RF footnote under the Core Indicator table. Similarly, please add detail on how the 25% was determined for the fisheries target as a RF footnote and under the Core Indicator table

4/7/2023 (ahume):

1) Addressed for the purposes of this review. The 10% justification would be a more compelling argument if the actual area of target fisheries habitat was provided to show the calculation equaled 10% . The text provided on alignment with SDGs and Aichi Targets is extraneous to this justification and is already well known. Likewise, the 25% fisheries target could still be improved. It is noted this is a complicated calculation, but why is it not 23% or 26%? In other words, what is the calculation to justify 25%? During project inception and drafting of a monitoring plan, please carefully discuss these percentages to provide a strong and defensible rationale throughout implementation.

Agency Response

Response FAO:

Additional text giving clarification of the project targets in relation to Core Indicators 5 and 8 has been added to the relevant section of the Project Document. Further explanation of the process is given below.

Core Indicator 5: Essentially, most of the project target fisheries (except for pelagic longline fisheries) occur in a very limited area of shallow coastal waters of the continental shelves. Most of the countries' EEZ consist of deeper, offshore waters where fishing activities are very limited. Consequently, the expected area of marine habitat under improved practices is calculated as the 10% of the overall EEZ (529,950 km²). It should also be noted that the target of 10% area of marine habitat under improved practices (Core Indicator 5) is in alignment with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, adopted by all United Nations Member States in 2015. Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) Target 14.5 states: by 2020, conserve at least 10% of coastal and marine areas, consistent with national and international law and based on the best available scientific information. Parties have agreed to conserve 10% of marine and coastal areas by 2020. Also, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 states: by 2020, at least 10% of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures and integrated into the wider landscape and seascapes.

Core indicator 8: Based on the characteristics of the fishing sector in the CLME+ (multispecies and multi-gears) and the stock status of the main fisheries resources (including overfishing and overexploitation), sustainable targets were extensively discussed with Fisheries agencies during the PPG. Since the ecological, economic, and social sustainability of fisheries is not only a technical question but also a cultural and capability-building challenge, REBYC-III tries to construct a common vision on how to achieve more sustainable exploitation of the fishery resources of the CLME+, taking into account the complex ecological, social, economic, and political frameworks in the target countries. The expected target of 25% catch reduction is a result of improving sustainability in the CLME+ artisanal and industrial fisheries without causing major social upheaval.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 2/15/2023 (ahume): No GEF Sec comments

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 2/15/2023 (ahume): Response to comments provided to UK and Germany Council members are adequate.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 2/15/2023 (ahume): Responses to STAP comments provided.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 2/15/2023 (ahume): No Convention Sec comments

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 2/15/2023 (ahume): No other GEF Agency comments

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 2/15/2023 (ahume): No CSO comments

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 2/15/2023 (ahume): The PPG is fully committed, with \$14,900 remaining to be spent on four staff that are presumably supporting final revisions.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 2/15/2023 (ahume): See map comments above.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023 (ahume): N/A

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 2/15/2023 (ahume): N/A

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 2/15/2023 (ahume): N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/21/2023 (ahume): The project is being sent back to the agency for further revisions. Please address the comments above and resubmit.

4/7/2023 (ahume): The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat comments**

First Review	2/27/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/11/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations