

Strengthening Adaptative Capacities to Climate Change through Capacity Building for Small Scale Enterprises and Communities Dependent on Coastal Fisheries in The Gambia

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

9194

Countries

Gambia

Project Name

Strengthening Adaptative Capacities to Climate Change through Capacity Building for Small Scale Enterprises and Communities Dependent on Coastal Fisheries in The Gambia

Agencies

UNIDO

Date received by PM

5/14/2019

Review completed by PM

5/7/2021

Program Manager

Jason Spensley

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Project Design and Financing

1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

DS:

The newly added output 1.4 on "Strengthened National platform to support resilience across the nexus sectoral policies and support services to fisheries, climate change and gender? seems to be questionable in terms of cost-effectiveness. Please clearly explain the added value of such a platform, including its functioning, and compare the cost-effectiveness vis-?-vis investment activities that would directly support sustainable, climate-resilient fisheries.

Dec 17, 2019:

Cleared

GEFSec 25 February 2021:

We note that a new document has been uploaded for this project via the Portal on February 12, 2021, with document title "CEO Endorsement Letter". However, this file does not include a new CEO Endorsement Letter. **Kindly clarify if this document was titled incorrectly or if a different document was intended to be uploaded, and make any changes as relevant.**

GEFSEC 24April2021:

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Agency Response 14 April 2021:

Please kindly note that at the time of the previous resubmission, namely on 12 Feb 2021 no revised CEO Endorsement Document and/or Letter have been uploaded to the Portal.

UNIDO Response to Secretariat comments DS:

A new Output 1.4 had been strongly recommended by stakeholders, and it is expected that its functioning would have been integrated in the operational plans of the lead national project-executing partner - the Ministry of Fisheries and Water Resources (MoFWR). However, considering the GEF Secretariat comments, it will be ensured that the project grant financing contribution, estimated at USD 200,000 for the entire component will not be utilized to the specified interventions. Accordingly, the output has been deleted from the main project results framework.

- EUD co-financing letter estimates a co-financing allocation of EUR 3.5 million to Component 1 of this project. GEF financing will be utilized to implement the planned capacity building activities for relevant stakeholders, and therefore this intervention will remain embedded at an activity level under the project Output 1.3. To reflect the updated scale of the total project co-financing and logic of interventions, the co-financing information in Table C is updated, and subsequent sections of the CEO project document were updated accordingly.

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

DS:

Please explain how fisheries waste management can become climate resilient, i.e. through Output 1.2 on "Climate resilient business model for fisheries waste management

and processing developed and demonstrated for private/public uptake". The climate adaptation rationale has to be clearly explained, including in the formulation of relevant outputs and outcomes.

Dec 17 2019:

Further comment will be forthcoming on these points, once the Agency resubmits with the other comments addressed.

GEFSEC 13 Jan 2020:

Thank you for the additional text and explanation. However, further information and explanation is still required to strengthen the climate adaptation rationale -or logic- and associated theory of change, particularly as related to how the project intends to enhance adaptation to specified climate hazards and their impacts in the fisheries sector. Suggestions for a basic elements to expand on include (i) strengthening articulation of the specific climate hazards that are impacting quantity of fish stocks and/or resulting in excessive loss post harvest; (ii) how these climate hazards and their impacts are anticipated to increase in different climate scenarios - using any available scenarios information for the country or region; (iii) and how the outcomes and outputs this project will finance are cost-effective solutions to addressing these impacts.

In effort to support this strengthening of the proposal, a few specific examples of ways to improve this climate adaptation rationale/logic include:

- Paragraph 7 briefly points towards climate hazards and impacts in general terms. But this needs to be deepened with more specific information, and structured in a way that shows (in this para and other sections) a clear logic of how the project will really help people adapt to specific climate hazards and impacts: What is meant here by "fisheries ecosystem service". Or is this referring to ecosystem services that are impacted by climate change in a way that is in turn impacting fish stocks? If so, please expand to what specific ecosystem services are being impacted by climate change; including information on the current extent of this impact as well as anticipated future extent (preferably with some figures as available as to future scenarios for the country or greater region). This is important to establish a basis for defining the most cost-effective solutions for addressing the specific impacts. Furthermore, the last sentence in this paragraph mentions a set of climate hazards. Are there figures available to back this up either for the country or for the region? What do futures scenarios have to say about these climate hazards? Importantly, what are the specific impacts of these climate hazards having that this project will address, particularly on fisheries given the focus of the proposal?

- Para 17: Is "variability" meant as something different than climate change here? Or it is meant as a type hazard resulting from climate change?

With regards to Output 1.2 to strengthen climate resilience of fisheries management, thank you for updating activity 1.2.3 and adding 1.2.4 on implementing business models and trainings. Please strengthen this by directly linking and focusing the activities on the specific climate problem articulated as climate hazards and impacts (e.g. sea temperature increase resulting in increase of invasive fish species; sea level rise resulting in habitat loss for spawning resulting in reduced fish stocks; etc). This focus on the climate problems will enable prioritization of business models and trainings to directly address the specified impacts, which is important to ensure greatest impact for the investment made. Please also include a brief explanation on the process and criteria that will be used to select the business models and trials, as well as evaluate the impact of the trials, directly linked to how well they will address the specified climate impacts. Until these aspects are made more clear, there is insufficient climate rationale and theory of change to demonstrate the project will be a cost effective way to strengthen adaptation to the specified climate adaptation problem.

Furthermore, given the stresses and reduction of land-based agricultural productivity resulting directly from climate change hazards and their impacts, is this anticipated to result in a greater reliance on fish resources in the future? If so, it would be useful to be more explicit about this further climate change adaptation rationale and theory of change for the proposed interventions of this project.

Finally, as touched on in the points above, it is also important to articulated of how the proposed project interventions will effectively plan for and adapt to anticipated future impacts from climate change hazards (not just current). To do so, existing information from climate scenarios for the country or region can be used. If localized information cannot be found, existing and best available regional or global data sets or other sources of information about climate projections can be used.

GEFSEC September 2020:

We note with appreciation the additional information provided on current and anticipated climate hazards. We also note much of this additional information is directly related to land based agriculture, although the project focus, proposed outcomes and outputs, as well as the associated budget is directly focused on the fisheries sector. Please provide greater focus on the impacts of current and anticipated climate hazards specifically and directly on the fisheries sector, beyond the indirect impacts of displacement of people active from the land based agriculture sector into artisanal fisheries.

To support a successful resubmission of this CEO Endorsement, please see here several examples of considerations and suggestions to consider that can improve this document:

- We note paragraph 4 generally refers to climate hazards on fisheries being sea level rise, coastal erosion, as well as fluctuating frequency and severity of rainfall and temperatures?, and paragraph 11 mentions ocean warming and acidification. However, limited and only generalized information

is provided on the current and anticipated risks and impacts on fisheries deriving from these climate hazards. It is important to expand on this.

- With regards to future anticipated scenarios of climate hazards and their anticipated impacts, we note that paragraphs 11 and 12 refer to a projected increase at 1.5°C of global warming, and paragraph 12 seems to indicate this level of warming based is projected to be reached by 2050. If the year 2050 is indeed the timeline this projects anticipates for this level of warming, we admire this optimism but note this is a very ambitious scenario. In addition to this optimistic scenario (clarifying the year it is referring to), we strongly suggest also considering a 2nd and higher impact scenario which would result in greater risks, and discuss the differences impacts under both scenarios, as well as how this project will aim to address these climate impacts. Please clarify the years for both the optimistic and higher impact scenario. As example, paragraph 17 contains a brief reference to the NAPA produce in 2007 outlining "that climate forcing would likely contribute to the collapse of some pelagic fish populations", but little more is said on this in this resubmitted CEO Endorsement document. As referred to in the previous round of comments, considering future climate risk and impact levels is important to avoid maladaptation by designing for an unrealistic future state of the climate.

- We note that in discussing climate impacts on fisheries, the main source for paragraphs 11, 12 and 13 appears to be a 2009 study by Alison et al on vulnerability of national economies to the impacts of climate change on fisheries, in Central and Western Africa, as well as South America and Asia. Please strengthen this by also referring to existing further and more recent studies for Western Africa. For example, a quick Google search identified the following existing publications for consideration: "The Socio-economic Impact of Climate Change on Marine and Freshwater Fisheries Resources in the Coastal Zone of the Gambia", Natural Resources and Conservation, 2018; "Climate Change Impacts on Fisheries in West Africa: Implications for Economic, Food and Nutritional Security" in the Africa Journal of Marine Science, 2012; and several others to consider.

- We note the reference in paragraph 14 to industrial scale fishing in the marine waters of The Gambia; that 95% of the industrial fishing vessels are foreign; and that The Gambia not having a port dedicated to industrial fishing operations appears to be a key factor in permitting fish caught in Gambian waters to be landed and processed elsewhere, with corresponding loss of protein and domestic employment opportunity in the country. However, it appears this driver and opportunity is not addressed in any of the outputs of this project. What is the portion of fish caught in the Gambian waters from industrial fishing. Do the climate hazards and their impacts differ between industrial and artisanal fisheries sub-sectors? Is there an opportunity to address the anticipated increased need for employment due to climate impacts on land-based agriculture (and perhaps also make industrial fishing practices more climate resilient) by investing in addressing these issues? If yes, please

consider any relevant adjustments to the outcomes, outputs and budget. If not, please briefly explain why influencing industrial fishing practices which presumably accounts for a large portion of the fish caught in the waters of the Gambia (and associated climate resilience considerations) is not within the scope of this project.

- With regards to Table 1, the column titled 'Potential Climate Change Impacts?' appears to be listing climate hazards (not impacts), while the column titled 'Current adaptation challenges?' appears to be at least partially listing climate impacts of these hazards. Please revise the column headings accordingly. Also, why are the climate hazards on fisheries listed in paragraphs 4 and 11 different from those in both table 1 and 2? Finally, does this table only refer to the artisanal fisheries, or also the industrial fisheries sub-sectors?
- On Table 2:
 - o Why do the climate hazards in Table 1 and Table 2 vary from each other? Please ensure consistency on the climate logic of hazards, associated impacts and how this project will address them, throughout all sections of this document.
 - o Is this table focused fully on climate hazards and impacts on the fisheries sector? If not, please adjust the table to clarify which hazards and their associated impacts are directly related to fisheries, and which are related to land-based agriculture or otherwise with indirect impact on fisheries.
 - o Although this table does list climate hazards, it appears to not list the current or anticipated impacts of these hazards. We strongly suggest to do so.
 - o We note with appreciation the column titled 'Adaptation and resilience building measures?'. These would be sharpened by providing a correlation to the climate impacts they are intended to address. Also, it would be helpful if these measures could reference the specific corresponding project outputs. In doing so, please consider if any of the measures are underserved by the outputs, and make any corresponding revisions and budget adjustments.
- It would be useful to briefly explain if/how the existing climate information and data systems referred to in paragraph 19 relate to climate adaptation and resilient fisheries practices.
 - Paragraph 21 refers to 'policy and regulatory responses for livelihoods proofing including diversification options?'. Please clarify how this will be addressed in the project, including with what outputs.
 - Paragraph 22 briefly mentions a predicted decline of 50% in fisheries off West Africa by 2040 due to climate change, based on a World Bank study from 2013. This is a significant figure that it would be useful to expand on and reference earlier in the document.

Please also note the following suggestions to align the outputs with the climate information on risks of impacts from current and anticipated hazards:

- Output 1.1 (paragraph 45): It is not sufficiently clear how waste management for food and feed fillers is a cost-effective solution to adapt to specific risks of climate impacts. Please indicate information substantiating the analysis that waste management for food and fee fillers is a cost-effective climate adaptation measure for addressing specified climate impacts on the fisheries sector, vis-?-vis other alternative options.
- Output 1.2 (paragraph 46) refers to aquaculture. But it is not clear if this output focused partially or primarily on aquaculture. If so, please clarify, which corresponding linkages to climate hazards and impacts directly related to aquaculture.
- Output 1.3 (paragraph 47-49): Further to comments above on industrial fisheries, does this output include fisheries in this subsector or its scope only related to artisanal fisheries? Please consider.
- Outcome 2: Please indicate the number of businesses that will be supported. Furthermore, please consider how to strengthen impact and innovation of this outcome with an increase focus on activities to attract financing to the business that are supported through training and technical assistance. For example, is there potential to work with the microfinance sector to accessible create lending products for local SMEs to invest in climate resilient business opportunities; partner with the increasing number of equity funds investing in adaptation-oriented SMEs (e.g. see GEF projects "ASAP", "CRAFT", and Landscape Resilience Fund"); create match making opportunities with private investors; etc?

Finally, we strongly suggest the project would be strengthened by including a "Theory of Change" image that outlines how the project will achieve its objective, including overcoming barriers, and what assumptions are considered.

GEFSEC 25Feb2021:

The additional information on the current and anticipated impacts of climate hazards on the fisheries sector and its supply chain are well noted. In particular, the revised information in table 1 better correlates adaptation measures through this project to address specific impacts of climate hazards. The ToC diagram is also noted.

We also note that expansion of the Port of Banjul is included in the National Development Plan for 2018 to 2021, as well as the Agency response to the GEF Secretariat's comment of September 2020 that "infrastructure development priority, and climate resilience considerations in developing linkages with industrial fishing practices" has been "included within scope of the project is updated". However, it is not clear if or how infrastructure development priority and climate resilience considerations in the development linkages within industrial fishing practices is now explicitly reflected by any revisions to the project components, outcomes, outputs and GEF project financing requested. **Please clarify how these specific additions are reflected in**

project design, budget and results framework, and/or make the relevant modifications as needed.

GEFSEC 14 April 2021:

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Agency Response 14 April 2021:

Paragraph 7 reflects the most relevant additions on project design including clarification on "infrastructure development priority, and climate resilience considerations in developing linkages with industrial fishing practices". The results framework for Outputs 1.1 and 1.2 are updated accordingly as well. Though the role of industrial fishing practices for the Gambian marine waters and fish stocks has been highlighted, project interventions focus on domestic fishery sector which is predominately small-scale and artisanal but has an important role on local employment and food security. Improving resilience of small-scale fishery value-chains, will therefore have a direct impact on livelihoods of vulnerable communities in the Gambia. In particular, the deployment of climate proof post-catch handling and processing, seeks to improve profitability and competitiveness of the domestic fishery value-chains. This is expected to create local employment opportunities, improve local livelihoods and therefore further improve resilience of vulnerable communities highly dependent on small-scale fisheries. Nevertheless it is noted that sectoral policies need to evaluate sustainability and contribution to domestic value generation of industrial fishing practices in order to address the sectoral challenges holistically (Please see output 1.1 paragraph 43: *?A sectoral analysis on industrial fishing practices and small-scale fisheries against criteria including sustainability, ability to adapt to expected climate change impacts, and domestic value creation will be developed, in order to ensure the formulation of holistic policy measures. Ultimately, policy plans shall highlight opportunities of mainstreaming climate change adaptation beyond small-scale fisheries into industrial fishing practices?*).

UNIDO Response to Secretariat Comments DS:

The project logic is such that actions that will help people to adopt will be realized at the coastal fish processing and post-harvest enterprise management and value chains level, in addition to the entire focus of component 2 on unlocking viable climate-resilient business and investment models. In this regard, the rationale of Output 1.2 is further clarified as the interventions are aiming to deliver a mechanism for expansion of the

portfolio of climate resilient livelihood options (waste management system practice and models) for coastal communities and enterprises, and to promote the delivered business models for private/public uptake.

UNIDO Response to Secretariat Comments Dec 17, 2020: Noted.

August 2020: UNIDO Response to GEFSEC 13 Jan 2020 (JS) and 30 September 2020 (JS) comments:

Response matrix for review comments on The Gambia CEO Endorsement Request, GEF-Sec September 2020

Section	#	Comment	UNIDO Response	References
		2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		

<p>Climate change hazards, and anticipated current and future impacts on coastal fish processing and post-harvest fisheries management</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p>	<p>Please provide greater focus on the impacts of current and anticipated climate hazards specially and directly on the fisheries sector, beyond the indirect impacts of displacement of people active from the land-based agriculture sector into artisanal fisheries.</p> <p>With regard to current climate hazards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - paragraph 4 generally refers to climate hazards on fisheries being sea level rise, coastal erosion, as well as fluctuating frequency and severity of rainfall and temperatures?, and - paragraph 11 mentions ocean warming and acidification. <p>However, limited and only generalized information is provided on the current and anticipated risks and impacts on fisheries deriving from these climate hazards. It is important to expand on this.</p>	<p>The project description section in the CEO-ER document has been redrafted, with additional information included on: i) observed and projected climate changes in The Gambia; ii) fisheries? vulnerability to climate hazards; and iii) the specific impacts of climate change on the sub-sectors relevant to the project. The sections pertaining to these points in the CEO ER have been restructured to improve logical flow, while integrating the new information and guiding comments provided by the GEF in the review sheet, among other resources, The impacts of current and anticipated climate hazards specially and directly on the fisheries sector are elaborated.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 4 through 11 and overall information on section 2.</p>
--	-------------------	--	---	--

<p>Climate hazards and anticipated direct impacts on fish processing, and resilience of coastal fisheries impacts</p>	<p>3 Then, with regards to future anticipated scenarios of climate hazards and their anticipated impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - paragraphs 11 and 12 refer to a projected increase at 1.5°C of global warming, and paragraph 12 seems to indicate this level of warming based is projected to be reached by 2050. <p>However, if the year 2050 is indeed the timeline this project anticipates the maximum limit level of warming, this optimism is to be emphasized. Yet: this is a very ambitious scenario. In addition to this optimistic scenario (clarifying the year it is referring to),</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o also consider a 2nd and higher impact scenario which would result in greater risks, and o discuss the differences impacts under both scenarios, as well as o how this project will aim to address these climate impacts? <p>4 Please clarify the years for both the optimistic and higher impact scenario.</p> <p>As another example, paragraph 17 contains a brief reference to the NAPA produced in 2007 outlining that climate forcing would likely contribute to the collapse of some pelagic fish populations, but little more is said on this in this resubmitted CEO Endorsement document. As referred to in the previous round of comments, considering future climate risk and impact levels are important to avoid maladaptation by designing for an unrealistic future state of the climate.</p> <p>Then, in discussing climate impacts on fisheries, the main source for paragraphs 11, 12 and 13 appears to be a 2009 study by Alison et al on the vulnerability of national economies to the impacts of climate change on fisheries.</p>	<p>The project relevant information on current and anticipated climate scenarios has been redrafted on the paragraphs 5-16, with minimum or low impact scenarios and maximum or higher impact ranges of temperature increase included (1.1-3.1°C by the 2060s and 1.8-5.0°C by the 2090s). Limited literature is available on the local impacts of climate change on Gambian fisheries under different scenarios. As an alternative approach, more detailed information on impacts on the sector has been included, as per the abovementioned range of temperature increase. The relevant sections have been strengthened by referring to more recent studies. The information regarding the impacts of climate change on pelagic and other fish species has been expanded on, as per revisions mentioned in comment response #1. The climate risks to and vulnerability of local fisheries have also been expanded on, and the main source in discussing the vulnerability analysis changes with the focus on fish processing and post-harvest management systems, therefore the paragraphs are also updated.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 10-15, and the overall section 2.</p>
---	--	--	---

	<p>5 On the value chains specifics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the reference in paragraph 14 to industrial-scale fishing in the marine waters of The Gambia; that 95% of the industrial fishing vessels are foreign; and that - The Gambia not having a port dedicated to industrial fishing operations appears to be a key factor in permitting fish caught in Gambian waters to be landed and processed elsewhere, with the corresponding loss of protein and domestic employment opportunity in the country. <p>However, it appears this driver and opportunity is not addressed in any of the outputs of this project. Consider the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o What is the portion of fish caught in the Gambian waters from industrial fishing? o Do the climate hazards and their impacts differ between industrial and artisanal fisheries sub-sectors? o Is there an opportunity to address the anticipated increased need for employment due to climate impacts on land-based agriculture (and perhaps also make industrial fishing practices more climate-resilient) by investing in addressing these issues? <p>If yes to the above, please consider any relevant adjustments to the outcomes, outputs, and budget. See Comment 3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective? below.</p> <p>If not, please briefly explain why influencing industrial fishing practices which presumably accounts for a large portion of the fish caught in the waters of the Gambia</p>	<p>Noted and the relevant sections are updated. In addition to accounting for direct barriers to climate-proofing of infrastructure for the coastal fisheries value chain enterprises, it is specifically noted that although climate impacts on ocean fish stocks affect artisanal and industrial fishing operations alike, with impacts of increased storm surges worse for small vessels, influencing fishing practices <i>per se</i> is beyond the scope of this project, which focuses on the climate-proofing the portion of the fisheries value chain from post-catch handling to processing. The project does, however, involve work with private sector actors involved in industrial processing (washing, sorting, cleaning, processing, packaging, and freezing) of fresh fish, mainly for export to the European Union (EU), as well traditional smoking and drying processes, mainly for domestic and regional markets (with some smoked fish for international niche markets). It is well noted that 90% of the fishing vessels legally operating in Gambian waters are foreign-owned and land their catch abroad, and it can be assumed that this proportion is reflected in the percentage of total catch as well (UNCTAD, 2014). The country's absence of a dedicated and deep-water fishing port or well-equipped fishing jetty is one of the factors highlighted in the National Development Plan for 2018 to 2021 as continuing to hamper the growth of a thriving and sustainable domestic fisheries sector. The baseline on which the LDCF project builds, includes ongoing state initiatives, in terms of the Plan, to reform the fisheries</p>	<p>Paragraphs 14 and Barriers</p>
--	--	--	-----------------------------------

<p>Climate change and coastal fisheries scenarios</p> <p><i>Table 1: Value chain the Gambia and climate change impacts and adaptation challenges</i></p> <p><i>Table 2: Climate change scenarios and adaptation strategies for The Gambia</i></p>	<p>6</p> <p>With regards to Table 1, the column titled 'Potential Climate Change Impacts' appears to be listing climate hazards (not impacts), while the column titled 'Current adaptation challenges' appears to be at least partially listing the climate impacts of these hazards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please revise the column headings accordingly. - Also, why are the climate hazards on fisheries listed in paragraphs 4 and 11 different from those in both table 1 and 2? 	<p>Table 1 and 2 have been revised into one table (now Table 1). The column headings have been revised and renamed accordingly, with focus placed on the climate change hazards experienced in the artisanal fisheries sector and ensuring consistency with climate impacts outlined in Section 1.3. Please refer to Table 1, Page 12-13.</p> <p>Table 1 and 2 revised into one table (now Table 1). The contents of the table have been adjusted to indicate: i) the relevant climate change hazards which directly impact upon the artisanal fisheries value chain actors/subdivision; ii) the subsequent impacts these hazards have on the associated activities of each of the relevant value chain actors/subdivisions; and iii) the proposed adaptation and resilience measures, which have also been aligned with the corresponding project Outputs. These adjustments lie within the scope of the relevant project Outputs and do not require adjustments to the budget.</p>	<p>Table 1, Page 10-11</p>
	<p>7</p> <p>Moreover, does this table only refer to the artisanal fisheries, or also the industrial fisheries sub-sectors?</p> <p>On Table 2: Why do the climate hazards in Table 1 and Table 2 vary from each other? Please ensure consistency on the climate logic of hazards, associated impacts, and how this project will address them, throughout all sections of this document.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is this table focused fully on climate hazards and impacts on the fisheries sector? If not, please adjust the table to clarify which hazards and their associated impacts are directly related to fisheries, and which are related to land-based agriculture or otherwise with indirect impact on fisheries. b. Although this table does list climate hazards, it appears to not list the current or anticipated impacts of these hazards. We strongly suggest to do so. c. Positively: the column titled is greatly presented focusing on 'Adaptation and resilience building measures?'. These/measures or responses should be sharpened by providing a correlation to the climate 		

<p>Barriers to be addressed by the project</p>	<p>8</p>	<p>Consider other specific suggestions as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - briefly explain if/how the existing climate information and data systems referred to in paragraph 19 relate to climate adaptation and resilient fisheries practices. 	<p>A sentence has now been added as follows: ?In particular, the project will access hydro-meteorological information from the Gambia National Meteorological Services, including weather forecasts of peak temperatures and intense rainfall events that affect post-harvest handling, as well as seasonal and long-range predictions for early warning of disasters, including coastal flooding and storm surges at sea.?</p>	<p>Section 1.1.4, paragraph 11-16.</p>
--	----------	---	---	--

	<p>9 Consider other specific suggestions as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Paragraph 21 refers to ?policy and regulatory responses for livelihoods proofing including diversification options?. Please clarify how this will be addressed in the project, including with what outputs. 	<p>The barrier discussion section clarifies the reference to deficits in relation to ?policy and regulatory responses for livelihoods proofing including diversification options?. This will be addressed in Component 1 ? the text outline of the component explains that this will include ?regulatory support on aquaculture diversification?. This is now further elaborated as follows: ?This could include, for example, new regulations for certified environmentally friendly and fair trade oyster aquaculture, and antibiotic-free shrimp (with unique characteristics in terms of texture and size), with a focus on high-value niche markets?.</p> <p>In addition, project co-financing by fish processing and export companies will provide demonstrations of fish waste valorization and diversification, as part of capacity building efforts aligned with the project?s Outputs 2.2 and 2.3: the National Partnership Enterprise working to build ?diversified waste and by-product based value chains? and the Atlantic Seafood Company (Gambia) Ltd undertaking ?good practices on waste collection, handling and valorization, for instance the investment in trial demonstration of bone separation techniques?.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 21 moved to the policy barrier.</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>10 Consider other specific suggestions as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Paragraph 22 briefly mentions a predicted decline of 50% in fisheries off West Africa by 2040 due to climate change, based on a World Bank study 2013. This is a significant figure that it would be useful to expand on and reference earlier in the document. 	<p>The statement from the World Bank referenced in the CEO ER is based on the study:</p> <p>Lam, V.W., Cheung, W.W., Swartz, W. and Sumaila, U.R., 2012. Climate change impacts on fisheries in West Africa: implications for economic, food and nutritional security. <i>African Journal of Marine Science</i>, 34(1), pp.103-117.</p> <p>The study states that the West African region is projected to suffer substantial reductions in landing tonnages by 2050 when compared to 2000 levels, with the average regional reduction being at 26% (with some countries experiencing substantial reductions of up to 50%). This information has been included earlier in the project document with additional detail along with a reference to the study by Lam et al.</p>	<p>Paragraph 17 -22.</p>
--	---	---	--------------------------

<p>The proposed alternative scenario</p>	<p>11</p>	<p>Please also note the following suggestions to align the outputs with the climate information on risks of impacts from current and anticipated hazards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Output 1.1 (paragraph 45): It is not sufficiently clear how waste management for food and feed fillers are a cost-effective solution to adapt to specific risks of climate impacts. Please indicate information substantiating the analysis that waste management for food and feed fillers is a cost-effective climate adaptation measure for addressing species climate impacts on the fisheries sector, vis-?-vis other alternative options. 	<p>Output 1.1 has been updated to align it with the climate information on risks of impacts from current and anticipated hazards. Specifically, justification has been provided for the introduction of climate-resilient waste management technologies for food and feed fillers, to enhance processing efficiency and reduce wastage through spoilage under conditions of climate change (including hazards such as heat waves and intense rainfall events). As an adaptation measure, this will not only increase processing efficiency under climate change conditions, but will help retain maximum income to communities whose livelihoods are vulnerable to these changing conditions. This adaptation measure is not presented as an alternative to other adaptation strategies, but rather as complementary to such measures - including those within the project, such as promoting sustainable aquaculture, and those in related initiatives, such as climate-proofing landing infrastructure (as envisaged in the Concept Noted synergies with FAO-GCF project in the pre-harvest segments of coastal fisheries adaptation responses to climate change.</p>	<p>Paragraph 41.</p>
--	-----------	---	---	----------------------

12	<p>Please also note the following suggestions to align the outputs with the climate information on risks of impacts from current and anticipated hazards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Output 1.2 (paragraph 46) refers to aquaculture. But it is not clear if this output focused partially or primarily on aquaculture. If so, please clarify, which corresponding linkages to climate hazards and impacts directly related to aquaculture. 	<p>The scenario of increasing ocean temperatures and alterations in aquatic conditions, such as waves and currents is indicated to directly impact aquaculture, as they can create unfavourable conditions for breeding for certain fish species.</p> <p>The information on indicated estuarine to coastal risks of impacts from current and anticipated hazards has been revised to reflect this Output 1.2 partially focuses on aquaculture although not being the primary target value chains.</p>	Paragraph 43.
13	<p>Please also note the following suggestions to align the outputs with the climate information on risks of impacts from current and anticipated hazards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Output 1.3 (paragraph 47-49): Further to comments above on industrial fisheries, does this output include fisheries in this subsector or its scope only related to artisanal fisheries? 	<p>Output 1.3 includes processors of the products of both industrial and artisanal fisheries, as the private sector at all scales is targeted.</p> <p>This has been stated explicitly in the output description, and as per revisions mentioned in comment response #5.</p>	Paragraph 44.

	<p>14 For the Outcome 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - what is the number of businesses that will be supported? - consider how to strengthen impact and innovation of this outcome with an increased focus on activities to attract financing to the business that are supported through <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o training and o technical assistance. <p>For example, is there potential to work with the microfinance sector to accessible create lending products for local SMEs to invest in climate-resilient business opportunities; partner with the increasing number of equity funds investing in adaptation-oriented SMEs (e.g. see GEF projects "ASAP", "CRAFT", and Landscape Resilience Fund"); create matchmaking opportunities with private investors; etc?</p>	<p>For Outcome 2 it is envisaged that the following numbers of small-scale fisheries-dependent enterprises will be supported, as a result of the specific outputs strengthened</p> <p>Component outline for Output 2.3 and Project Results Framework updated to reflect adjustments made to ?strengthen the impact and innovations of this outcome with an increased focus on activities to attract financing to the businesses that are supported through training and technical assistance?. Output 2.3 now includes this text: ?Enterprises and cooperatives/associations with climate-resilient business plans to establish or grow tech solutions for aquaculture, drying, smoking, or processing operations that will be supported to access affordable micro-finance. The project will also explore how to build on the successful experience of women?s revolving loan funds in the Gambia for this purpose, and the potential scope to partner with the increasing number of equity funds investing in adaptation-oriented SMEs (including GEF projects - ASAP, CRAFT, and Landscape Resilience Fund).?</p>	<p>Paragraph 45, 61-63.</p>
--	--	--	-----------------------------

Theory of Change	15	<p>Finally,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the project would be strengthened by including a "Theory of Change" image that outlines how the project will achieve its objective, including overcoming barriers, and what assumptions are considered? 	<p>Please refer to the "Theory of Change" diagram that has been developed and added to the document as Figure 6, Section 1.6. As requested, the diagram outlines the pathways through which the project's objective will be achieved. This includes indicating how each of the identified barriers will be overcome, and what assumptions have been considered.</p>	Figure 6, Section 1.6.
------------------	----	---	---	------------------------

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

DS:

Please see above regarding platform support, and potentially consider removing this component in light of more concrete on-the-ground support to vulnerable communities.

GEFSEC 17 Dec 2019:

Cleared

GEFSEC September 2020:

We note the equipment cost for output 1.2 in year 2 appears to be quite somewhat high (\$20,000). Please explain.

We also note the very significant cost of \$800,000 for equipment in output 2.1. Please explain specifically what this equipment is, why it is needed, how this cost estimate has been derived, what efforts will be made to ensure lowest reasonable cost; and if more cost effective options are available.

GEFSEC 25Feb2021:

Cleared. We note the breakdown and thank you for the images. Further comments on the budget may be forthcoming as needed pending subsequent resubmission.

GEFSEC20April2021:

On the M&E Budget: Please note that for a project of \$2,200,000 the recommended threshold is 5%. The stipulated amount represent 6.8% of the total budget ? please consider to reduce this amount to 5% of the total budget.

Also on the budget: All components include National and International Expertise. We could not find details of what this entails and it would be good to get these to see if none of those expenses should be charge to the PMC. In addition kindly note that Miscellaneous general operating expenses usually should be charged to PMC but not to project components. In this case they have been charged to every component ? please either remove it or to charge it to co-financing.

GEFSEC 7May2021:

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Agency Response 4 May 2021

- M&E Budget corrected to 5% of the total budget, with costs of regular monitoring and part of the Mid-Term Review activities to be covered through co-financing contributions to the project. Table B: GEF grant and co-financing budgets for component 3 and the M&E, and the project description sections adjusted, accordingly.

- Costs of short-term national and international technical expertise apply to all components as budgeted for national execution and sub contracted technical service providers. None of these expenses are relating to the PMC. Please refer to details provided on the budget breakdown, last column. Please kindly note that the budget breakdown, in accordance with UNIDO budget lines, is intended to specify the inputs that shall be eligible for the Project Executing Agencies to plan and deliver the expected results.

- This comment is noted and duly addressed by applying the project Miscellaneous costs to be charged to the PMC.

Response to Secretariat comments DS:

The GEF-Secretariat review comment and recommendation has been taken into consideration and Output 1.4 has been deleted from the main project results framework. It should be furthermore noted that the most relevant and value adding relating activities as planned at project formulation include capacity the building of relevant stakeholders and there are retained and integrated to activities of the same component.

Please refer to UNIDO response to Question 1 above for more clarification.

Table 2. UNIDO Response matrix for review comments on The Gambia CEO
Endorsement Request GEFSEC September 30

Budget	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We note the equipment cost for output 1.2 in year 2 appears to be quite somewhat high (\$20,000). Please explain. - We also note the very significant cost of \$800,000 for equipment in output 2.1. Please explain specifically what this equipment is, why it is needed, how this cost estimate has been derived, what efforts will be made to ensure lowest reasonable cost; and if more cost-effective options are available. 	<p>As part of Component outline for Output 2.1, the equipment cost for Output 1.2 in year 2 of project implementation (\$20,000) will be used for the equipping of one of the three CFCs to demonstrate 2-3 alternative uses of fish waste, such as the production of constituted food for the filleting off cuts, animal feed for the waste, biodiesel/biogas and soil fertiliser business models. The output would inform policy actions and potential feasibility of handling increased landing of the industrial catch as projected for the planned - Banjul commercial fish landing and processing port.</p> <p>The budget of \$800,000 for Equipment (\$500,000 in Year 2 and \$300,000 in Year 3) is for Activity 2.1.3 ?Implement the demonstration projects in the 3 selected CFCs?. This is broken down as follows, and the specific demonstration technologies are now outlined in the text for Output 2.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 x fuel-efficient fish smoking kiln building incl. scale up to the GEF-UNIDO clean cooking stoves alliance and related start up financing and tech support models 3 x solar-powered fish drying cabinets (e.g. SEED) 3 x solar powered walk-in coldroom (e.g. ColdHubs) 3 x solar-powered ice-makers (e.g. ISAAC) <p>Fuel-efficient fish smoking kiln (e.g. FTT-Thiaroye)</p>  <p>Solar-powered fish drying cabinets (e.g. SEED)</p>  <p>Solar-powered walk-in coldroom (e.g. ColdHub)</p>  <p>Solar-powered ice-maker (e.g. ISAAC)</p>  <p>Fuel-efficient fish smoking kiln (e.g. FTT-Thiaroye)</p> 
--------	----	--	--

4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

DS:

Yes.

GEFSEC September 2020:

Given the current and potentially worsening context of the COVID-19 pandemic in The Gambia, please provide a more complete explanation of the associated risks to project implementation, and the set of specific strategies that will be undertaken to address these risks.

Related, paragraph 24 mentions that "UNIDO guidelines that provide a value proposition for partnering with the business sector in the different phase of the COVID 19 crisis: which advocates sectors to prepare for, respond to and recover from and will be used as a tool for undertaking the project inception assessment." Are there some words missing or punctuation misplaced in this sentence to improve its clarity? In any case, please provide more information about these guidelines.

Furthermore, as relevant, please outline in the section or sections you deem most relevant, how the project will contribute to addressing the root causes of this pandemic, and or contribute to economic recovery from the pandemic.

GEFSEC 25Feb2021:

We note the Agency response below that information has been updated on risks in the context of the COVID-19 Pandemic and the projects contribution to The Gambia's green recovery approach, with paragraphs 19, 3, 5, 39, 42, 43, 73, and 88. Among these paragraphs however, only 43 explicitly mentions COVID-19 or green recovery, and paragraph 88 seems to be missing entirely. Was there a change in the paragraph numbering? **Please clarify this Agency response, and ensure are few sentences are included directly focused on each of the following points: (i) the COVID-19 associated risks to project implementation and the set of specific strategies that will be undertaken to address these risks; and (ii) how the project will contribute to addressing the root causes of this pandemic, and/or to economic recovery from the pandemic.**

GEFSEC 14April2021:

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Agency Response 14 April 2021:

Numbering of the paragraphs referenced on the Agency response is corrected as follows:

- (i) Clarification of the Agency response on the project risk analysis in context of the COVID-19 pandemic ? please refer to paragraph 8 and Table 1;
- (ii) How the project will contribute to addressing the root causes of this pandemic, and/or to economic recovery from the pandemic - paragraph 43 (now revised paragraph 44) has been complemented with specific strategies that will be taken in support of project implementation and for addressing recovery from the pandemic (please refer to paragraphs 45 and 60 and 78; and specific targets under outputs 1.1, 2.1 and 2.3 now presented in Annex A: Project results Framework.

Table 3. UNIDO Response matrix for review comments on The Gambia CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Agency Response 29 March 2021:

LDCF Core Indicator SECTION F aligned to Core Indicators Matrix	
Core Indicators	
Covid-19 Recovery Approach	Strengthening the narrative around the project's contribution to The Gambia's green recovery approach. The risks in the context of the Covid-19 pandemic are updated in relevance to the project, including the information on baselines and risks assessment and mitigation measures, and related recovery and building better ? actions results are updated. Specific Paragraphs 19, 35, 39, 42, 43, 73, 88, results frameworks 1.2, 2.2 - to be evaluated in detail at the project inception phase as a key consideration for defining the modalities for national execution and support to project management and coordination.

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

DS:

Yes, however, please double check that all sources of co-financing in Table C in GEF Portal are categorized by the correct type (i.e., in-kind vs. grant vs. loan), in line with the co-financing letters.

GEFSEC 17 Dec 2019:

Please respond to the comment from the GEF Secretariat above. It appears there was a typo so the previous Agency response is not visible.

GEFSEC 14 Jan 2020:

Cleared.

GEFSEC 25 Sept 2020:

We note with appreciation the increase of total co-finance from \$5.5 million to \$9,621,062.

GEFSEC 20 April 2021:

Co-financing from EU should be labeled as "donor agency", rather than "other".

Additionally, it appears the co-financing annex in the gender section. Please ask UNIDO to correct and upload the gender analysis as intended.

GEFSEC 11May2021:

Further to the comment above, please note the co-financing annex is still uploaded in the gender section. Please delete this from the gender section, and upload it in the co-financing section, as we believe was intended.

GEFSEC 14May2021:

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Agency Response 14 May 2021:

With the support from ITSOP GEF Portal technical team the comment has been addressed. Additionally, kindly note that since the co-financing letters have been already uploaded under the correct section in the Portal, we did not see a need to re-upload them again.

GEF Agency Response 4 May 2021

- Co-financing from EU is now labeled as "donor agency".

- Please note that the gender analysis report that was delivered during PPG will not yet be uploaded with the final submissions - as it does not fully reflect the final version of the CEO document. This takes into account the series of revisions to the CEO-ER, including the gender baselines, mainstreaming strategy and GEEW action plan, and other relevant Annexes of the project. Therefore, it is suggested to provide the updated correct gender analysis during the project inception phase.

Response to Secretariat comments DS / Dec 17, 2020:

Co-financing commitments as elaborated in Table C in GEF Portal are fully confirmed by sources and categories, in line with the co-financing letters.

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

DS:

Yes. However, please remove Core Indicator 11 from the GEF Portal entry mask. The CCA tracking tool has been attached to the submission and is sufficient, so the Core Indicator 11 should be removed to avoid double counting.

Dec 17, 2019:

Please respond to the comment above. It appears there was a typo so the previous Agency response is not visible.

GEFSEC 13 Jan 2020:

Thank you for attaching the CCA indicators and metadata information. Particularly considering the scale of finance proposed, and the population who currently and are anticipated to rely on fishing for a livelihood and/or for their food security, please identify ways to significantly increase the number of beneficiaries through this project. Please also strive to achieve a 50-50% balance of men and women benefiting. Furthermore, based on the focus of the outcomes and outputs, as well as your explanation in this document, please do indicate an explicit and ambitious hectares target. Finally, please consider ways to significantly increase the number of people trained, especially considering a number of the activities will include community engagement and capacity building with a substantial number of people.

GEFSEC 25 Sept 2020:

We note with appreciation the increase of the indicator levels indicated in the attached LDCF/SCCF indicators document. However, we also note 10,000 direct beneficiaries are indicated in the excel attachment, but 5,000 direct beneficiaries are indicated in paragraph 71. Please clarify consistent indicator figures throughout the relevant documentation.

GEFSEC 25Feb2021:

The consistency of indicator levels is noted with thanks. However, in the newly submitted indicators table, the # of people and # of hectares are incorrectly numbered, and LDCF/SCCF indicators 3 and 4 have been deleted. Please use the correct numbering and complete set of LDCF/SCCF indicators.

GEFSEC 7May2021:

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Agency Response 14 April 2021:

The CCA tracking tool with the correct entries has been uploaded to the portal.

UNIDO Response to Secretariat comments DS:

Core Indicator 11 removed from the GEF Portal entry mask, and the CCA tracking tool attached to the submission.

August 2020: UNIDO Response to GEFSEC 13 Jan 2020 comment, and updated response to GEFSEC 25 September 2020

The comment is addressed by increasing the total number of beneficiaries to 10,000 direct beneficiaries (60% women to 40% men ? as the fish processing sector is women dominated); 2,000 directly trained people staff of agencies, institutions, and operators, managers, and labor at landing sites - predominantly youth and fish processing enterprises - predominantly women (50% men and 50% women); and the target of 10,000 hectares of land is proposed along with the 4,000 sq. km national coastal zone (equivalent one percent direct impact to approximately 400,000 hectares and replicable). The investments that will be targeted at improved marine and coastal attached landscapes will addition cover estuarine habitats such as mangroves and swamp forests that are important breeding sites, brackish and inland aquaculture waters, mudflats, and salt marsh, and coastal fishing and landing area - associated agricultural

lands. The resubmitted Logframe ? Indicators and targets (Annex A, CEO Endorsement Request), and the CCA tracking tool is updated, accordingly.

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Response to Secretariat comments N/A

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

DS:

Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments N/A

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

DS:

Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments N/A

10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

DS:

Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments N/A

Agency Responses

11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:

GEFSEC

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

DS:

Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

STAP

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Council

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

DS:

No. Please provide responses to GEF Council comments in the relevant field in GEF Portal.

GEFSEC 17 Dec 2019:

Please provide a response to the GEF Sec comment above. It appears there was a typo so the Agency response is not visible.

GEFSEC 14 Jan 2019:

Please address the comments above.

GEFSEC September 2020:

Please address the additional comments above.

GEFSEC 25Feb2021:

Please address the remaining comments underlined and in yellow highlight above above.

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Agency Response 14 April 2021:

The comments have been addressed (please refer to the responses above).

UNIDO Response to GEFSEC 30 September 2020 comment

The comments have been addressed (please refer to the responses above).

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Response to Secretariat comments

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

DS:

Not yet, please address comments above and resubmit.

GEFSEC 17 December 2019:

Not yet. Please address the comments above and resubmit.

GEFSEC 14 January 2019:

Not yet. Please address the comments above in yellow highlight and resubmit.

GEFSEC September 2020:

Not yet. Please address the comments above in yellow highlight and resubmit.

GEFSEC 25 February 2021:

Not yet. Although most comments have been cleared, a few comments still need to be fully addressed as detailed above

GEFSEC 14April2021:

All technical review comments have been technically cleared by the PM, and this CEO endorsement is recommended for consideration of MGR, RC and any further comments by PPO.

GEFSEC 20April2021:

Four additional comments have been provided on adherence to GEF policy issues. 2 of these relate to budget; and 2 relate to co-finance. Please address these comments and resubmit.

GEFSEC 11May2021:

One comment is remaining on uploading co-financing information to the correct section.

GEFSEC 14May 2021:

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Agency Response 14 May 2021

Thank you - the comment has been addressed.

GEF Agency Response 4 May 2021

The four additional comments on adherence to GEF policy issues have been duly addressed.

GEF Agency Response 14 April 2021:

The comments have been addressed (please refer to the responses above).

UNIDO Response to GEFSEC 13 Jan 2020 comment

The comments have been addressed (please refer to our responses above).

Review Dates

**Secretariat comment at CEO
Endorsement Request**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review	
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/17/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/14/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/30/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/25/2021

CEO Recommendation

Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations