

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

### Basic Information

**GEF ID**

10857

**Countries**

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

**Project Title**

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

**GEF Agency(ies)**

FAO

**Agency ID**

FAO: 707322

**GEF Focal Area(s)**

International Waters

**Program Manager**

Christian Severin

# 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

23rd of September 2021 (cseverin): Yes. The project aligns with Programming Direction IW 1-2 (*Strengthen blue economy opportunities through catalyzing sustainable fisheries management*). The central problem the proposed project seeks to address is the unsustainable, incidental and unwanted bycatch and discards in target fisheries in Barbados, Guyana, Suriname and Trinidad and Tobago, within the CLME+ region.

#### Agency Response N/A

### 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

23rd of September 2021 (cseverin): [Partly](#).

1) The mandate for IW to finance this investment is the investment's ability to support the implementation of the CLME+ SAP. SAP priorities that the investment will be aligned with need to be clearly identified in the indicative project description summary. Please revise the project

objective to include reference to supporting countries to implement the CLME+ SAP. Please ensure that project outcomes and outputs in Table B are amended accordingly.

- 2) "Output 4.2.1 Project management, communication and oversight structures established and operational, including Project Steering Committee" cannot be a project output and mapped to a project component. Please remove. Project management and oversight must be absorbed by the PMC costs only. Please drop "project coordination" from the Component 4 title. Please consider making the M&E system as Output 4.2.1 and the Midterm review and terminal evaluation as Output 4.2.2.
- 3) Project outcomes are not fully quantified. Please describe how these targets will be identified and quantified during PPG.
- 4) The output level does not sufficiently reflect gender mainstreaming activities. During PPG, please ensure some activities under the project outputs are gender-specific (not gender neutral) and socially inclusive-specific. Please ensure sex-disaggregated and gender-sensitive indicators are developed during PPG.
- 5) Please make sure as a minimum that the quantifiable core indicators that has been included in the Core Indicator table, will be reflected upon in Table B (There needs to a connection between the core indicators and the results framework that should illustrate how these will be delivered).
- 6) There is a general lack of quantifiable output indicators, please work on these so that it is simpler to understand what the project will deliver.

8th of October 2021 (cseverin): Yes, comments addressed

## Agency Response

### FAO on 4 October 2021:

1) As stated in the section "Causes and Drivers", the CLME+ SAP states that 'The problem of the unsustainability of fisheries and fishery practices in the region originates from a multitude of causes including the over-harvesting of target stocks and the direct and indirect impacts of activities on species, size groups or life stages that are not directly targeted by the fishery (e.g. "bycatch", use of destructive or "harmful" practices or gear that leads to habitat degradation or destruction)'. As presented in the 'Baseline scenario and any associated projects' in the main text of the PIF, the proposed project will seek to support the implementation of the regional governance arrangements for sustainable fisheries (Strategy 2), the regional coordination mechanisms for ocean governance with initial focus on shared CLME+ Living Marine Resources (Strategy 3), and efforts to enhance the governance arrangements for implementing an ecosystem approach for pelagic fisheries (Strategy 5). More specifically, the proposed project will support the implementation of both sub-strategies 5A and 5B (flyingfish and large pelagics fisheries, respectively), through improved fishing practices (Component 1), behavioural change (Component 3), and sub-regional governance and management frameworks (Component 2) to better manage bycatch and reduce discards for both small-scale artisanal fisheries (SSFs) and industrial fisheries using an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF). Together these will help meet the Ecosystem Quality Objective of the SAP of 'restoration and maintenance of fish stocks at a sustainable level and adoption of responsible fishing operations and fisheries management practices.

The project helps address the wider vision statement of the CLME+ SAP - 'a healthy marine environment in the CLME+ provides benefits and livelihoods for the well-being of the people of the region', and the SAP's stated Societal Benefits Objective 'Contribution to human well-being, socio-economic development, food security and enhanced livelihoods from goods and services provided by the ecosystems are optimized'. This additional text has been added to the entry in the baseline section addressing the CLME+ SAP within the 'box' that highlights the project's linkage with the CLME+ SAP.

In response to the specific GEFSEC request, the project objective has been reworded to clearly indicate that the project will support the countries in the implementation of the CLME+ SAP. The wording of the project objective in Table B and in the main text have amended accordingly. The project objective now reads 'To manage bycatch and reduce discards in the Caribbean and North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystems (CLME+) thereby promoting sustainable and responsible fisheries that provide economic opportunities while ensuring the conservation of marine living resources, supporting country implementation of the CLME+ SAP, and with successful solutions for potential scale up to other LMEs' However, rather than rewording every single project outcome and output to reference their specific contribution to the implementation of individual CLME+ SAP priorities, reference to SAP strategies is indicated through rewording of relevant project Components as follows, which is now reflected in the text of the PIF:

Component 1: Improving fishing practices to manage bycatch and reduce discards and the negative impacts of fishing gears in CLME+ fisheries, supporting countries implementation of CLME+ SAP priorities

Note: this component will particularly address the SAP priorities through a focus on an ecosystem approach to fisheries (Strategy 5)

Component 2: Strengthening governance and management frameworks and enforcement measures to better manage bycatch and reduce discards in CLME+ fisheries, supporting countries implementation of CLME+ SAP priorities

Note: this component will particularly address the SAP priorities through improving regional governance arrangements for sustainable fisheries (Strategy 2) and the regional policy coordination mechanisms for governance of the marine environment (Strategy 3)

Component 3: Encouraging behavioural change for adoption of effective bycatch mitigation and discard reduction measures in target CLME+ fisheries, supporting the implementation of the CLME+ SAP priorities

Note: this component will particularly address the SAP priorities through actions to encourage responsible fisheries practices (Strategy 2)

Component 4: Knowledge Management and lesson learning, supporting implementation of the CLME+SAP

Note: this component will particularly address the SAP priorities through actions at the regional level (Strategy 3)

2) The term "project coordination" has been removed from the Component 4 title. Output 4.2.1 – 'Project management, communication and oversight structures established and operational, including Project Steering Committee' has been deleted and replaced. Output 4.2.1 now relates only to the project's M&E framework and output 4.2.2 addresses only the Mid-term Review and Terminal Evaluation.

3) At the PIF stage it is not possible to fully quantify outcomes with specific targets as these need further discussion and agreement with partners, but this issue is a priority for the PPG stage. However, the initial set of indicators have been reviewed and revised following

feedback from the GEFSEC reviewer, and some indicators have been merged where they overlap and two additional outcome indicators added.

Below is an explanation of how the indicator targets (by outcome) will be identified and quantified during the PPG:

#### Outcome 1.1

*Indicator 1:* Reduced level of bycatch and discards in target fisheries compared to baseline, estimated to be of around 37,000 ton' is based on most recent and available FAO data. It is expected that bycatch will be reduced by around 37,000 tons, which represents around 25% of the overall catch in the target fisheries (landings: 94,800 tons; discards: 55,800 tons). The target of 25% will be reviewed and revised in PPG as necessary dependent on final discussions with the fisheries officials and fisheries industry in each of the target countries.

*Indicator 2:* Percentage of fleet for each pilot site utilizing updated and sustainable fishing practices and technologies will be determined in the PPG phase once pilot sites are selected and confirmed, and will be based on the relevance to fishing methods employed and the level of technology already employed (the target percentage will differ by fishing method employed and level of existing technology).

#### Outcome 1.2

*Indicator 3:* Either a tonnage or percentage target for bycatch reduction (e.g of ETP species) will be calculated on selected fisheries based on the latest baseline data available during PPG phase.

#### Outcome 1.3

*Indicator 4:* The target percentage of fishers adopting ALDFG mitigation measures in target fisheries will be identified during PPG phase once target fisheries are confirmed and the necessary baseline data collected. Again, this depends on the final choice of the target fisheries, which can only be confirmed during the PPG.

#### Outcome 2.1

*Indicator 5:* The target number of bycatch management and discards reduction recommendations adopted at regional level by the WECAFC will be determined at the PPG stage following full examination of existing measures and in consultations with WECAFC secretariat and key stakeholders

*Indicator 6:* The target number of fisheries legal frameworks at national level in the four countries extended with bycatch, discards and ALDFG regulations will be determined at PPG phase following consultation with national administrations and FAO legal team at HQ (LEGN)

#### Outcome 2.2

*Indicator 7:* The target number of national policy and legislation updated, and MSPs developed which incorporate any relevant spatial-temporal measures addressing bycatch management and discards reduction will be determined at PPG phase following consultation with national administrations, key stakeholders and FAO legal team in HQ (LEGN).

An additional indicator (8) has been added to this outcome to reflect the area covered by strengthened regulations that include improved management for bycatch, discards and ALDFG – 'Area of marine habitat under improved practices (excluding protected areas) expected to be around 10% of the overall EEZ (529,950 km<sup>2</sup>). This reflects GEF Core indicator 5.

### Outcome 2.3

*Indicator 9:* The target number of responsible fishing practices adopted that better manage bycatch and reduce discards through targeted incentives, strategies and measures among fishing communities, will be calculated during the PPG phase once the number of new practices to be developed is better understood and agreed by the key stakeholder groups. The total number will be calculated and broken down by country.

### Outcome 3.1

*Indicator 10:* The target number of income-generating opportunities that address bycatch mitigation provided at selected pilot sites will be identified in the PPG phase once selection of pilots has been confirmed and analysis of data to be collected on the supply/value chains at each site has been completed

*Indicator 11:* The target number of discards reduction and ALDFG good practices adopted by fisherfolk organizations and fish processing/industry organizations in target fisheries will be identified in the PPG phase following an appraisal of existing good practices. Targets will be developed in consultation with key stakeholders including private sector fisheries representatives.

A second additional indicator has been added under this outcome to reflect GEF Core Indicator 11 - Indicator 12: Number of direct beneficiaries working in the harvesting and post-processing sectors benefiting directly and indirectly from the project (target estimated to be of around 6,660 males and 2,670 females)

### Outcome 4.1

The two previous indicators for this outcome - 'Website/webpages created and regularly updated with knowledge materials' and 'Number of webinars/ publications/local events delivered to disseminate knowledge (to be identified during the PPG phase)' have been merged and reformulated as a single indicator – 'Indicator 13: Number of webinars/reports/ publications/local awareness-raising events and other knowledge products delivered to disseminate knowledge from the project (results, good practice and lessons learned)'. Specific knowledge products and associated targets will be identified during the PPG phase and detailed in a preliminary Knowledge Management and Communication Strategy and Plan.

### Outcome 4.2

The two previous indicators for this outcome - Quarterly/biannual reports on status/progress of activities towards the meeting of targets, and Mid-term Review and Terminal evaluation reports delivered - have been replaced with a single indicator - Indicator 14: 'Recommendations from operational M&E system (e.g. Quarterly/biannual reports on status/progress of activities and Mid-term Review and Terminal evaluation reports) fed back into project implementation

**4)** As mentioned in section 3 of the PIF, a project Gender Strategy and Plan will be developed during the project design (PPG) phase. Gender-specific (not gender neutral) and socially inclusive-specific project outputs will be identified under each component, with sex-disaggregated and gender-sensitive indicators and gender targets included within the project's M&E framework at both output and outcome levels, and ring-fenced budgetary provision to cover data collection, monitoring, analysis and reporting as appropriate. A gender specialist will also be included in the project management team. Gender data will be collected and analysed in the proposed project during the PPG stage to

better understand the gender dimensions of bycatch/discards problems and the impacts and sustainability of alternatives along the value-chain and to ensure gender-specific views will be fed into the design and implementation of project components.

**5)** The project seeks to contribute to the delivery of GEF Core Indicators 5, 7, 8 and 11. These are reflected through the following indicators in Table B:

GEF Core Indicator 5 (Area of marine habitat under improved practices) is reflected through an additional indicator added to the Results Framework (Table B) – Outcome Indicator 8: Area of marine habitat under improved practices (excluding protected areas) expected to be around 10% of the overall EEZ (529,950 km<sup>2</sup>)

GEF Core Indicator 7 (Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management) is reflected through the choice of target area of the project – the CLME+ region which combines two LMES, namely the CLME and NBSLME – and is therefore reflected (directly and indirectly) through all 11 Outcome indicators associated with Components 1, 2 and 3. However, Outcome Indicators associated with Component 2, particularly Outcome Indicator 5: Bycatch management and discards reduction recommendations adopted at regional level by the WECAFC, Outcome Indicator 6: Fisheries legal frameworks at national level in the four countries extended with bycatch, discards and ALDFG regulations, and Outcome Indicator 7: National policy and legislation updated, and MSPs developed which incorporate any relevant spatial-temporal measures addressing bycatch management and discards reduction, most directly reflect improvement in ‘cooperative management’ in specific countries within CLME+ region.

GEF Core Indicator 8 (Globally over-exploited marine fisheries moved to more sustainable levels (metric tons) is reflected in Outcome Indicator 1: Reduced level of bycatch and discards compared to baseline estimated to be of around 37,000 tons, which represents 25% of the overall catch in the target fisheries (landings: 94,800 tons; discards: 55,800 tons). If achieved this would indicate a reduction in the total catch of the target fisheries, reducing them down to more sustainable levels, and Outcome Indicator 3: Reduced bycatch (tons or percentage) of vulnerable species (e.g. ETP species) in selected target fisheries compared to baseline data, which reflects an uptake of measures to avoid and eliminate capture of Endangered Threatened and Protected species, e.g. turtles which is one indicator of sustainable fisheries

GEF Core Indicator 11 (Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment) is reflected in a new Outcome indicator in Table B - Outcome Indicator 12: Number of direct beneficiaries working in the harvesting and post-processing sectors benefiting directly and indirectly from the project (target estimated to be of around 6,660 males and 2,670 females). These figures are based on available FAO country profiles, and figures refer to aggregated harvesting and post-processing sectors (Barbados: 6000 harvest, 4000 process; Guyana: 8400 harvest, 5000 process; T&T: 5500 harvest, 1225 process; Suriname: 4800 harvest, 2400 process). To estimate disaggregated values for M/F, for harvesting the figure is 90% are males, 10% females, and for post-processing the figure is 35% males, 65% females.

**6)** Outputs and related activities will be fully developed during the PPG with performance indicators and targets for outputs defined. It is not possible to define these at the PIF stage as additional detailed discussions with the participating countries and key partners are needed to agree on the extent to which different project activities will be undertaken in different countries, which specific fisheries should be targeted in which countries, and which pilot communities will be involved. Although initial discussions with the participating countries have been held on these but final decisions will only be made during the PPG.

## 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** 23rd of September 2021 (cseverin):Partly. The indicative sources of co-finance including ministries of each of the four recipient governments, the GEF Agency and the Executing Agency, is noted. However, the following adjustments are required before clearance:

1) Please provide justification for “investment mobilized” by the “Private Sector”. Please insert description under Table C (How was the \$8.5 million Private Sector co-financing amount reached? What private sector entities are providing this co-financing? In Table C, please provide an indicative co-financing \$ amount for each private sector entity identified.

2) Similarly, please specify which “Academic Institutions” and International Donors” will be co-financiers and attribute an indicative co-financing amount to each in Table C.

3) There is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution to PMC is kept at 4.8% of the total project cost, for a co-financing of \$24,565,884, the expected contribution to PMC must be \$1,179,162 instead of \$1,000,000 (which is 4.1%). As the costs associated with the project management must be covered by the GEF portion and co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the co-financing contribution to PMC should be increased to reach a similar level. Please adjust accordingly.

8th of October 2021 (cseverin): Partly, Please include (or summarize) below description under point 1, on how financing has been mobilized into the section of the PIF named “Describe how any investment mobilized was identified”.

14th of October 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

## Agency Response

**FAO on 4 October 2021:**

1) The figure for co-financing by the private sector in Table C is based on initial discussions with four participating Government fisheries agencies, corresponding FAO Country Offices, and fishing industry sources, including fishing companies involved with the PERVO III AC project. The latter



corresponding FAO country offices, and fishing industry sources, including fishing companies involved with the REBYC II LAC project. The latter include vessel owners, fish processors as well as fishing gear suppliers (particularly important for addressing ALDFG). Specific companies operating in the region, either directly or through daughter companies that offer possibilities for co-financing include: in Suriname, Heiploeg Suriname N.V. (seabob shrimp trawl), SAIL N.V. (seabob shrimp trawl), NISAD N.V. (Penaeus shrimp trawl), Carib Fisheries (Penaeus shrimp trawl),

Marisa Fisheries (demersal fish trawl), Ansu Fisheries (demersal fish trawl), Holsu N.V. (demersal fish trawl), and Deep Sea Atlantic N.V. (demersal fish trawl, which is also engaged in a Fisheries Improvement Project that offers additional opportunity for co-financing)), and and SUVVEB N.V. (pelagic longline); in Guyana, Pritipaul Singh Investments Inc. (seabob shrimp trawl), and Noble House Seafood (seabob shrimp trawl); in T&T 11 processing companies with operations in T&T (e.g. Trinidad Seafoods Limited), and in Barbados the companies Shorelinez and Ocean Fisheries.

In addition, there are SSF associations and/or cooperatives in all four participating countries that may be able to contribute additional in-kind co-financing to project activities depending on the fisheries/gears addressed. These will may include the Barbados National Union of Fisherfolk Organisations (BARNUFO) and the Central Fish Processors association (CFPA); the Guyana Association of Trawler Owners and Seafood Processors (GATSOP), which has within its membership trawling and processing companies (such as Noble House Seafoods in Guyana); and in Trinidad and Tobago, the Trinidad and Tobago Longliners' Association and the Trinidad and Tobago Industrial Fishing Association Limited, are also relevant.

Initial discussions on participation in the REBYC III CLME+ project have been held with several of these companies above but detailed agreements on their level of involvement and level of co-financing will only be confirmed at the PPG stage once project activities have been fully developed. Consequently, it is not possible at the PIF stage to provide an indicative co-financing amount for each private sector entity identified as a potential partner to the REBYC III CLME+ project. However, based on initial discussions and experiences from the REBYC II LAC project overall co-financing of USD 7,500,000 or more is expected. This will be largely, if not entirely, in-kind co-financing, but will include important contributions to the project such as industrial fisheries companies providing vessels and crew (which are expensive) for sea trials to test bycatch mitigation devices and alternative fishing practices.

2) Academic institutions to be involved with the project include: Centre for Resource Management and Environmental Studies (CERMES) of the University of the West Indies (UWI); Department of Life Sciences, UWI, St. Augustine; Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Faculty of Food and Agriculture, UWI, St. Augustine, and the Caribbean Agriculture Research and Development Institute (CARDI). Although several of these were involved in the successful REBYC II LAC project, FAOSLC office has well-established relationships with these bodies, and initial discussions have been held on participation in the follow-up REBYC III CLME+ project, detailed agreements on their level of involvement and level of co-financing can only be confirmed at the PPG stage once project activities have been fully developed. However, initial discussions indicate an overall (in-kind) co-financing in the region of USD 500,000.

Similarly, several international institutions and donors have also been identified as potential co-financiers for the REBYC III CLME+ project. Some, such as the US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), were involved in the previous REBYC II LAC project and have expressed an interest to be involved in the REBYC III project. Other relevant international institutions include WWF and Conservation International that were involved in the REBYC II LAC project in Guyana and Suriname respectively, support other sustainable fisheries management initiatives in the CLME+ region and support the implementation of the CMLE+ SAP strategic objectives and actions.

In addition, FAO will start work on a project in 2022 with the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB) on 'Strengthening the Resilience of the Small-Scale Fisheries Sub-sector through Better Access to Social Protection'. Currently only 3% of fishers have insurance in the region so identifying and promoting the most successful options and providing recommendations for improvements in social protection (e.g. vessel insurance, health insurance, and pension) will support improved livelihoods of fisherfolk. This work can be scaled up in the REBYC 3 countries during the project. Also, FAO is currently working with the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) in coordination and providing technical assistance for six sustainable fisheries projects under IDBs Blue Economy Cluster Call. These 6 Caribbean Cluster Development Plans are spearheaded by private sector firms and aim to improve revenues, foreign exchange earnings, improve employment and conserving the environment. The best practices and lessons learned and the upcoming projects coming out of the Cluster Call can support project activities under REBYC 3.

Detailed agreements on their level of involvement and level of co-financing by these institutions can only be confirmed at the PPG stage once

project activities have been fully developed and agreed. However, initial discussions indicate an overall (in-kind) co-financing of USD 500,000 or more.

3) The co-financing has been redistributed between components and the PMC as requested by the GEFSEC reviewer.

**FAO 10/08/2021:**

The text under point 1 of FAO's responses - on how financing has been mobilized - have been included into the section of the PIF named "Describe how any investment mobilized was identified".

## **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 23rd of September 2021 (cseverin):** Yes

**Agency Response** N/A

## **The STAR allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response** N/A

## **The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response N/A

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response N/A

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response N/A

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response N/A

## Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response N/A

## 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 23rd of September 2021 (cseverin): [Yes. PPG requested is within the allowable cap](#)

Agency Response N/A

## 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

23rd of September 2021 (cseverin): Partly. Considering this is the 3rd phase of an investment, it is expected that IWLEARN engagement would be higher than 1 from the initiation of the investment.

8th of October 2021 (cseverin): Partly, Please change the GEF Core Indicator 7.4 to at least “3”.

14th of October 2021 (cseverin): addressed

### Agency Response

**FAO on 4 October 2021:** A minimum of 1% of the GEF IW grant financing will be ring-fenced to support participation in IW:LEARN activities, which will be identified by a specific budget line within the project budget (to be developed at the PPG stage and included in the Project Document). This clarification text has been added to Knowledge Management section of the PIF.

**FAO 10/08/2021:**

GEF Core Indicator 7.4 has been set to 3.

### 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 23rd of September 2021 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response N/A

### 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**

23rd of September 2021 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response N/A**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

23rd of September 2021 (cseverin): [Partly](#), Please include description/reflection on the following points:

- 1) [Please address why the four countries have been specifically chosen for this project/and why others were not.](#)
- 2) [Please also include baseline for the private sector and examples of existing technologies on which the project will build from.](#)
- 3) [Please make reference to the status of CLME+ SAP implementation and progress made against the areas under the SAP the proposed project seeks to address.](#)

[8th of October 2021 \(cseverin\): Partly, please summarize point made under response 1, to the baseline description in the PIF](#)

[14th of October 2021 \(cseverin\): Addressed](#)

**Agency Response**

**FAO on 4 October 2021:**

1) The four countries were chosen for a number of reasons. Although Suriname and Trinidad and Tobago participated in REBYC II LAC project the project's Terminal Report and Terminal Evaluation and feedback from technical staff involved with the project indicated that further support is required to successfully implement bycatch mitigation measures in both countries trawl fisheries as well for other fishing gears not addressed by REBYC II but proposed under REBYC III. Barbados and Guyana did not participate in the REBYC II LAC project but have significant issues with bycatch and discards (outlined in the PIF). Indeed a recent NOAA (2021) report to the US Congress on Improving International Fisheries Management flagged 41 nations and entities which had inadequate conservation measures to protect from illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) fishing activities and bycatch of protected marine life on the high seas. Barbados, Guyana, and Trinidad and Tobago were listed due to inadequate management measures in place to reduce bycatch of sea turtles in their fisheries that are comparable in effectiveness to those of the

United States. The four countries were also chosen due to commonalities of fisheries (fishing methods employed and target species, such as shrimp fisheries in Guyana, Suriname and T&T, and flyingfish, tuna and dolphin fish between Barbados and T&T) and common bycatch issues, which facilitates the application and up-scaling of bycatch and discard mitigation measures across the CLME+ region, and exchange of good practices. All the selected countries also benefit from the presence of political support at ministerial level for sustainable fisheries, which is vital for project success both in the short term, and also in the longer term after the project has been completed. Other candidate countries such as Colombia, Costa Rica and Venezuela had been a focus for the REBYC II project and were deemed less in need to additional support to address bycatch and discards management, or were considered too great a challenge to deliver the project effectively in the current country context.

2) A section on private sector baseline has been added to the Baseline section of the main text of the PIF. Additional information on examples of existing technologies to manage bycatch and discards and address ALDFG (on which the project will build) have been added to the baseline section under a reworded subsection 'Bycatch, discards and ALDFG mitigation techniques and measures and uptake within the CLME+ region'.

3) Reference to the status of CLME+ SAP implementation and progress made against the areas under the SAP the proposed project seeks to address has been included in the Box in the PIF titled 'REBYC III CLME+ project link to the implementation of the CLME+ SAP' within the baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects section. As mentioned in the Box, progress on achievement of the different SAP Strategies is mixed and those addressed by the REBYC III CLME+ project are still in need of significant support to ensure their completion (hence the REBYC III components are still highly relevant to the CLME+ SAP).

**FAO 10/08/2021:**

A modified version of the text under FAO's response 1) has been included in the baseline description in the PIF

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

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

23rd of September 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address following points:

1) The PIF should read as a standalone document. Much of the information presented in Annex E , which includes the causal logic and relationships between the project's outputs and outcomes, medium and longer-term changes and states, and ultimate desired impact, should be included under the proposed alternative scenario. Please ensure the identified barriers are mapped to project components, outputs and outcomes.

8th of October 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

#### Agency Response

**FAO on 4 October 2021:** The project's Theory of Change is only briefly presented in the main PIF but a detailed description was given as an annex to save space in the main PIF (other information is presented as annexes to the PIF for the same reason). However, responding to CESEFC

to save space in the main PIF (other information is presented as annexes to the PIF for the same reason). However, responding to GEF SLO reviewer's request, the text and graphic in Annex E on the ToC have been integrated into the 'proposed alternative scenario' section of the main text of the PIF.

As mentioned at the beginning of section C 'the proposed alternative scenario', each project component and associated outcomes and outputs addresses a specific identified barrier. This direct linkage has been made clearer with additional text at the beginning of each component. In addition, the graphic presentation of the Theory of Change shows a clear linkage between the barriers and the project components.

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

##### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

23rd of September 2021 (cseverin): Partly,

1) Please describe how the project aligns with the GEF's priority to invest in projects to support SAP implementation.

2) Please describe how the project aligns with the GEF's private sector engagement strategy.

8th of October 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

##### Agency Response

###### FAO on 4 October 2021:

1) Additional text on how the project aligns with the GEF's priority to invest in projects to support SAP implementation are given in PIF section d. Alignment with GEF focal area and/or Impact Program strategies, and more specifically alignment with the CLME+ SAP is presented in Box 3 of the PIF.

2) Additional text describing the project's alignment with GEF's private sector engagement strategy has been included in the main PIF text under the Private Sector Engagement section.

#### 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

23rd of September 2021 (cseverin): Yes at this stage, however, please during ppg elaborate on how, without the GEF increment, the baseline is particularly likely due to /following the pandemic, which has had significant economic and societal impacts on CLME+ countries, and



is particularly likely due to/following the pandemic—which has had significant economic and societal impacts on CLME+ countries—and how the GEF increment can be used to help the countries build back better.

#### **Agency Response**

##### **FAO on 4 October 2021:**

The project recognizes that the Covid pandemic has had significant economic and societal impacts on CLME+ countries, which is briefly reviewed with outline mitigation measures in the Box 1 on Covid in the background section of the PIF.

During the PPG the project will examine how, without the GEF increment, the baseline is likely to develop following the pandemic and how the GEF increment can be used to help the countries build back better.

**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**

23rd of September 2021 (cseverin): yes

**Agency Response N/A**

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

23rd of September 2021 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response N/A**

## 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

23rd of September 2021 (cseverin): Yes, however, please work towards being able to provide more specificity during the preparation phase of the project

### Agency Response

**FAO on 4 October 2021:** During the PPG phase, more specific maps and coordinates will be developed to better identify the project's intended location.

## 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

23rd of September 2021 (cseverin): [Yes, the submission includes an overview of main stakeholders \(government institutions, inter-governmental and external governmental institutions, CSOs and NGOs, academia and the private sector\), along with their roles and responsibilities during the full project design period and expected role during project implementation. Notably, several fisherfolk organizations will be involved in full project development, as it will be essential to ensure local stakeholder buy in.](#)

### Agency Response N/A

## 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

23rd of September 2021 (cseverin): Yes, adequate at this point in time, however, please carefully address following points during PPG:

- 1) Please provide detailed baseline data specific to the four participating countries, what the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed are, and what the specific project-related opportunities for gender equality and empowerment are.
- 2) Please ensure the developed gender strategy and plan will be validated by project stakeholders.
- 3) Please work to ensure that gender equality and empowerment-specific activities are clearly identified (and not all activities are gender neutral) and that the project budget clearly identifies gender mainstreaming activities accordingly. A good target is up to 5% of the total budget specific to gender mainstreaming activities.
- 4) Please incorporate other elements of social inclusion into project design, if possible, including youth (as change agents through awareness creation) and persons with disabilities.

### Agency Response

- 1) The root causes and barriers that need to be addressed of the participating countries will be carefully assessed during the PPG phase.

#### **FAO on 4 October 2021:**

- 1) Specific project-related opportunities for gender equality and empowerment will also be identified and incorporated into project design, with a specific project Gender Strategy and Plan developed during the PPG, with actions to be taken under each component, specific gender targets and gender-specific indicators built into the project's M&E framework and necessary budgetary provision as appropriate.
- 2) The fully-fledged Project Document will include a specific Gender Strategy and Action Plan identifying the specific project-related opportunities and concrete actions for gender equality and empowerment. Specific budget will be allocated to support gender mainstreaming activities across the project's components and include resources to enable full validation by project stakeholders.
- 3) Additional elements of social inclusion will be assessed and included as appropriate during the PPG phase.
- 4) A reference to these groups has been added to the gender section of the PIF ensuring they will be included in the project design during the PPG

## Private Sector Engagement

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

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

23rd of September 2021 (cseverin): Yes. The private sector is well integrated into project design. And the private sector will be instrumental in project delivery, including across all four components. The project will help to stimulate private sector engagement along value and supply chains to manage bycatch and reduce discard impacts, and identify new investment opportunities for responsible fisheries and marine conservation.

Agency Response N/A

## 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

23rd of September 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address following points:

1) Please provide a separate document/matrix that focuses on the specific risks and opportunities associated with Covid-19, both short term and long term).

2) Please expand on gender risks

8th of October 2021 (cseverin): No, Please provide a separate document that focuses on the specific risks and opportunities associated with Covid-19, both short term and long term). and secondly, please add the first paragraph on gender risks as a separate risk/mitigation measure in the risk matrix.

14th of October 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

## Agency Response

### FAO on 4 October 2021:

1) An initial (revised) analysis of the challenges and risks posed by the Covid pandemic on the project's target region and opportunities associated with Covid-19, is presented in the project context section of the PIF. In addition, an initial analysis of the risks to the delivery of project results and suggested mitigation measures to address these are given in the risks matrix (risk section) of the PIF.

2) A principal risk associated with gender is that women may be less able to participate and benefit from the project due to their generally greater child-care and family responsibilities compared with men. Consequently, special attention will be paid to ensuring that social and cultural barriers do not prevent women from effectively participating in the project. The project will focus on promoting participation of women; empowering them to engage in planning and decision-making within the project sphere and encouraging them to do similarly outside of the project; and to improve their productivity, income and living conditions. Project activities targeted specifically at women will be programmed to ensure they are not excluded due to any family commitments. Participation of women, but also of youth, will be promoted through multi-stakeholder workshops, consultation and validation processes used in project activities, and the employment of a gender officer within the project who will particularly focus on supporting women's engagement and enterprise opportunities.

Involvement of women in fisheries tends to be concentrated on post-production activities. Consequently, the project has a focus (notably under Component 3) on supporting development of specific value chains opportunities that target and will particularly benefit women (and minority groups) that should help to encourage women's participation in the project (reduce risk on non- or low participation). For instance, in some developing countries, bycatch and low value discards provide important trade and processing opportunities for women, e.g. as fertilisers (silage) for growing crops for the family consumption or for sale to local farmers. Appropriate opportunities will be identified early in the PPG and comprehensive training workshops and an information campaigns launched early in project implementation to ensure the buy-in necessary for a successful project intervention.

Also, as mentioned in the Gender section of the PIF, the project will support implementation of CRFM's recent gender mainstreaming policy for the fisheries sector, and a regional protocol on securing sustainable small-scale fisheries for Caribbean Community fisherfolk and societies (developed under the CARICOM Common Fisheries Policy).

### FAO 10/08/2021:

1) separate matrix focuses on the specific risks and opportunities associated with Covid-19 (both short-term and long term) has been uploaded as a separate document in the roadmap of the portal submission.

2) The paragraph on gender risks has been added as a separate risk/mitigation measure in the risk matrix.

## 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

23rd of September 2021 (cseverin): Partly,

1) 1. While all LoEs indicate that the project will be “prepared and implemented by the National Authority / Agency involved”, in Portal there is one identified entity: the Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission (WECAFC) Secretariat. Please either:

(i) remove it and leave it blank;

ii) change it for t.b.d (to be determined); or

(iii) get new LoEs including the Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission (WECAFC) Secretariat as the executing agency.

Please note that throughout the preparation of the project, the Executing Entity could be determined accordingly.

Similarly, references to WECAFC in section 6 – Coordination need to be removed (unless new LoEs are obtained).

2) Please describe how the REBYC-II LAC coordination model was successful and why it will likely work for the proposed project.

3) For clarification, please provide a visual/schematic that shows the indicative executing arrangement presented in paragraphs 1-3 of the Coordination section.

4) The project design team has had exchanges with the design teams for the GEF-funded PROCARIBE+, BE-CLME+ and proposed EAF4SF projects to explore possible synergies and collaboration. Please elaborate on what these possible synergies and collaboration are and how they can be realized during PPG.

8th of October 2021 (cseverin): Adequately addressed at this point.

## Agency Response

### FAO on 4 October 2021:

1) The entry in the GEF Portal has been changed to 'to be determined'. Institutions with a mandate coherent with the project's aims and objective will be assessed during the PPG phase together with other potential executing entities proposed by the project stakeholders.

2) The coordination arrangements proposed for the REBYC III CLME+ project are still provisional and will be defined during the PPG phase. Please note that the current version of the PIF does not state that the REBYC III CLME+ project will follow the exact coordination arrangements as the REBYC II project, but will use the experiences and lessons learned in the design of its institutional coordination arrangements.

Even though the REBYC II LAC was a regional project, the coordination promoted ownership of the project in the countries through: a) the selection and establishment of specific national objectives (within the project objectives) that were a particular need for each country; b) Establishment of national coordinators with national knowledge and recognition, who drove the local networks and understood the national needs, challenges and possibilities, and; c) Establishment of specific technical and administrative staff for REBYC II LAC in smaller countries where there would otherwise be no capacity to implement the project. From the beginning, the REBYC II project also sought to create spaces for internal communication between the different parties involved and constant communication was maintained between the regional coordination, national-level coordinators and technical collaborators. Regular communication spaces were opened (monthly calls between the team) and annual face-to-face meetings (in the committees), as well as a constant flow of telephone and electronic communication. In addition, the REBYC II LAC project had a broad vision that encouraged linkage and collaboration with other related initiatives within the region, such as CLME+ or WWF projects and support for collaboration and partnerships with other relevant projects (including other GEF-funded projects).

3) Given that the executing arrangement presented in paragraphs 1-3 of the Coordination section is still to be determined and the national executing arrangements not yet fully developed (national fisheries authorities may be joined by other partners for execution of some project components), it is not yet possible to develop a visual/schematic that shows the indicative executing arrangements for the project at this point.

4) Initial discussions have been held with individuals involved with the development of the GEF-funded PROCARIBE+, BE-CLME+ and proposed EAF4SG projects to explore possible synergies and collaboration. For instance, the idea of the REBYC III project providing data on bycatch and discard 'hotspots' to support the proposed marine spatial planning element of the EAF4SG project has been discussed, along with other possible project measures to build capacity for sustainable fisheries management in the North Brazil Shelf LME region. However, all four projects are still in the development stage (none have delivered their Project Document, and the EAF4SG has yet to fully draft its PIF) so it has been difficult to map out areas for collaboration in detail. At the PPG stage representatives from each of these initiatives will be invited to project development meetings and stakeholder consultation/endorsement workshops including the PPG inception meeting, and communication channels with the various design teams will be formally established. These projects will also be a focus for the project's stakeholder engagement strategy and plan.

## 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

23rd of September 2021 (cseverin): Partly,

1) Please include more detail on how the project aligns with the CLME+ SAP and the three NAPs (noting that the SAP has not been translated into a NAP for Trinidad and Tobago).

2) There is a long list conventions/agreements the four countries are signatories to. Please briefly map out how specific project outcomes align/relate to/contribute to meeting country obligations under each agreement.

8th of October 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

## Agency Response

### FAO on 4 October 2021:

1) The original text on the alignment of the project with the CLME+SAP has been expanded and is detailed in the baseline section of the PIF (in the Box titled 'REBYC III CLME+ project link to the implementation of the CLME+ SAP'). Reference to National Action Plans for the implementation has been deleted as, following submission of the PIF, the CLME+ Interim Coordination Mechanism Secretariat (Patrick Debel pers.comm) confirmed that no NAPs have been developed as the intention is to integrate SAP strategies and actions into existing national-level policy and planning rather than create a separate process in each country.

2) Text has been included in the national priorities section of the PIF to indicate how specific project components/outcomes relate to meeting obligations under each agreement listed.

## 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

23rd of September 2021 (cseverin): No, please address following points:



1) please make sure to insert a budgetline in the budget (and also reference this in the KM section of the PIF) that will allocate a minimum of 1% of the GEF IW grant financing to support participation in IW:LEARN activities, such as the production of a GEF Experience Note/Results Note/Good Practice Brief and participation in IW:LEARN trainings and IWCs (by Project management unit and ministerial representatives from each participating country) that will be taking place during project implementation.

8th of October 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

## Agency Response

### FAO on 4 October 2021:

1) The following additional text has been added to the Knowledge Management section of the PIF: The project will participate in IW:LEARN activities, including trainings, workshops, IWCs (by the project management unit and ministerial representatives from each participating country) as well as contribute to GEF Experience Note/Results Note/Good Practice Brief and other relevant knowledge products during project implementation. A minimum of 1% of the GEF IW grant financing will be ring-fenced to support participation in IW:LEARN activities, which will be identified by a specific budget line within the project budget (to be developed at the PPG stage and included in the Project Document). The project will be able to draw upon the experience and lessons learned from engagement in IW:LEARN by previous FAO-GEF project (e.g by REBYC II LAC project and GEF-5 Common Oceans ABNJ programme) to ensure effective and impactful delivery of knowledge products through IW:LEARN.

## 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

23rd of September 2021 (cseverin): [Yes. The FAO Project Risk Certification is provided and classifies the environmental and social risks as “moderate”.](#)

[However, during PPG, please ensure an environmental and social management plan and a gender analysis and mainstreaming strategy are sufficiently developed and the findings are properly incorporated into the CEO document.](#)

Further, please ensure further environmental and social risk assessment and management plan for disadvantaged or vulnerable individuals or groups including youth and women during PPG stage and early stage of implementation.

## Agency Response

**FAO on 4 October 2021:** The fully-fledged project document will include an environmental and social management plan and a gender analysis and mainstreaming strategy. The environmental and social risk assessment and management plan will also look at disadvantaged or vulnerable individuals or groups, including youth and women.

## 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

23rd of September 2021 (cseverin): [Yes. Each of the four GEF OFPs have endorsed the project.](#)

Agency Response N/A

## 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

N/A

## 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

23rd of September 2021 (cseverin): No, please address above comments

8th of October 2021 (cseverin): No, Please address above comments

14th of October 2021 (cseverin): Yes, 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

/iew Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		10/4/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)		10/8/2021
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 Caribbean and North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystems (jointly referred to as “the CLME+ region”) are bordered by 26 Sovereign States and 18 Overseas Territories and covers an area of 4.4 million km<sup>2</sup>. The CLME+ region is regarded as one of the most geopolitically diverse and complex LMEs in the world. The culturally diverse countries and territories that border these LMEs area range from among the largest (e.g. Brazil, Colombia) to among the smallest (e.g. Barbados, St. Kitts and Nevis) and from some of the most developed to the least developed in the world. It also includes the world’s largest grouping of Small Islands Developing States (SIDS), consisting of 23 independent countries and overseas territories. As a result, there is an extremely wide range in their capacities for living marine resource management.

There are a number of challenges to achieving sustainable fisheries in the CLME+ region, as in many other tropical and sub-tropical LMEs, such as unsustainable bycatch and discards. Bycatch - the capture of unwanted sea life while fishing for different species - is closely tied to overfishing and a serious threat that causes needless loss of fish along with thousands of individuals of vulnerable species such as marine turtles and cetaceans. The REBYC-III CLME+ project largely focuses on the management of bycatch and reduction of discards but also addresses the adverse impacts of fishing gears on marine habitats and biodiversity particularly from Abandoned, Lost and otherwise Discarded Fishing Gears (ALDFG).

Project Objective: To manage bycatch and reduce discards in the Caribbean and North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystems (CLME+) thereby promoting sustainable and responsible fisheries that provide economic opportunities while ensuring the conservation of marine living resources, supporting country implementation of the CLME+ SAP, and with successful solutions for potential scale up to other LMEs

The proposed project responds to the regional and national needs to manage bycatch and reduce discards and adverse effects of fishing on

habitats in the Caribbean and North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystems (CLME+). In doing so the project promotes more responsible fisheries and the conservation of marine living resources (particularly vulnerable species), while at the same time providing economic (particularly blue growth) opportunities for fishers as well as offering successful solutions to other LMEs. By addressing the barriers identified above and fostering local, national, regional and international linkages as well as public-private partnerships, the proposed project will create significant changes above the baseline scenario with respect to long-term solutions for environmentally, economically and socially sustainable utilization of marine resources.