GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	**5636**		
Country/Region:	**Bangladesh**		
Project Title:	**Community-based Climate Resilient Fisheries and Aquaculture Development in Bangladesh**		
GEF Agency:	**FAO**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Climate Change**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$100,000**	Project Grant:	**$5,425,114**
Co-financing:	**$15,200,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$20,725,114**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Fareeha Iqbal**	Agency Contact Person:	**Doris Soto**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating **country eligible**?	Yes. Bangladesh is a Least Developed Country and has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	Yes. A letter of endorsement from the OFP dated July 14, 2013 is attached.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	N/A	
	• the focal area allocation?	N/A	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Yes. Bangladesh has already accessed $15.8 M in LDCF resources.The current funding request of $5.425 M will bring the total funding request for Bangladesh	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

[1] Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		to approximately $21.225 M. This is roughly consistent with the resources available in the LDCF based on the principle of equitable access.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	N/A	
	• focal area set-aside?	N/A	
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).*	FI, 11/26/13: Please see comment for Item 7. FI, 1/9/14: Yes, the project is aligned with LDCF strategic objectives CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3.	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient **country's national strategies and plans** or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	Yes. Bangladesh's Initial National Communications (2002) calls for "immediate adaptation measures for the fisheries and aquaculture sectors to the adverse impacts of climate change". Bangladesh's NAPA (2005) highlights the need for adaptation in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors as priority interventions, and Bangladesh's Country Investment Plan, endorsed in June 2010, comprises a 'Country Investment Plan for Fisheries Resource Development (2010-2015).	
	6. Is (are) the **baseline project(s),** including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and	FI, 11/26/13: Not quite. The baseline problem -- vulnerability to climate change in the fisheries and	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	based on sound data and assumptions?	aquaculture sectors -- is well-described. These sectors are important for the country from several perspectives: poverty reduction, food & livelihoods security, and export earnings. They are highly vulnerable to adverse impacts of extreme climatic events -- cyclones, storms surges and ensuing salt-water inundation, all of which are expected to increase in frequency and intensity with climate change. Comments relating to the baseline projects will provided upon PIF resubmission, as they will be examined in context of the investments planned (yet to be included). FI, 1/9/14: Further changes are requested. Seven baseline projects have been listed, relating to fisheries, aquaculture and agriculture. However 3 of these cannot be included in the list of baseline projects as they are already providing adaptation benefits to communities (baselines cannot include adaptation aspects, otherwise it is difficult to demonstrate the "additional" adaptation benefit of the LDCF grant). These 3 projects are: i - 'Community-based Adaptation to Climate Change Through Coastal Afforestation'; ii - 'Community-based Adaptation to Climate Change in Ecologically Critical Areas'; and iii - 'Smart Farm Project' (which is supporting climate-resilient integrated	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		farming). Recommended action: Please remove the above-mentioned 3 projects from the baselines section, and highlight them in Section A4 instead as projects the LDCF project will coordinate with. Please also provide additional information on how coordination will be done. Update, FI, 2/3/14: Yes. The Agency has removed two of the above-mentioned baseline projects. It has provided reasonable justification for continuing to include the 3rd as a baseline project, namely that is currently lacks focus on aquaculture and relevant capacity building of aquaculture-dependent activities.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	FI, 11/26/13: Not quite. All proposed components are TA. While we welcome the inclusion of TA activities, the bulk of the LDCF project funding should support investments on the ground (to reduce vulnerability, enhance adaptation, or provide relevant technology). At present, only sub-component 3.1 seems to have investment aspects to it -- though there is also potential within Component 2, if it involves development/provision of actual on the ground investments in early warning systems. Recommended action: Please reformulate the project so that substantial funding is supporting	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		investment (INV) rather than technical assistance (TA) components. FI, 1/9/14: Yes. Following informal communication with the Agency on Dec. 3, 2013, appropriate changes have been made to this section. Over 60 percent of the LDCF grant will support Component 3, which includes site-specific and gender-differentiated on-the-ground adaptation actions in fisheries and aquaculture. These include improvements to fish, crab and shrimp species, supporting technological improvements to hatcheries and brood banks, wetland/swamp restoration, options for climate-resilient alternate livelihoods, etc. By CEO endorsement: Please provide further information on where (which districts) the project activities will be undertaken.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	FI, 11/26/13: Not quite. The project is clearly aimed at facilitating adaptation to climate change in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors, but until a revised version is received clearly identifying investment components, it is not possible to fully comment on the additional adaptation reasoning. FI, 1/9/14: Yes. The LDCF project will integrate additional adaptation benefits within fisheries & aquaculture policy, capacity building, and practices in Bangladesh.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the **socio-economic benefits**, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	FI, 11/26/13: Not quite. A table has been provided detailing stakeholder engagement. However, it does not discuss how communities will be involved. Once the investment components have been included for this project, please also include discussion on community engagement in the PIF, including consideration of how women will be involved. FI, 1/9/14: Yes. The project has a strong community focus in terms of awareness-raising, capacity building and on-the-ground adaptation benefits. NGOs and CSOs will be involved in participatory planning assessments, project implementation, local advocacy and governance, and related activities. Local community-based organizations will be engaged as primary participants in project planning, implementation and monitoring of the adaptation measures.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g.,	FI, 11/26/13: Comment will be provided upon submission of the revised PIF. A clearer idea of risks and their mitigation can be had once investment components have	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	measures to enhance climate resilience)	been described. FI, 1/9/14: Yes for PIF stage. Risks to coordination, availability of project inputs (e.g., fish stock), availability of data and risks posed by climate change and variability have been discussed. Appropriate mitigation measures have been suggested. By CEO endorsement: Please also discuss risks to sustainability of project outcomes. How will it be ensured that community-based organizations continue to monitor the on-the-ground measures -- and are able to monitor them adequately?	
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	FI, 11/26/13: Not quite. The projects listed in this section do not relate to the fisheries and aquaculture sectors. Please list relevant initiatives (GEF-financed or other) in the fisheries/aquaculture sector that this project will coordinate with -- through coordination mechanisms, data and lessons sharing, etc. FI, 1/9/14: Further adjustments are requested to this section. As mentioned in the "recommended action" for Item 6, above, please provide more detail on how the LDCF project is expected to coordinate with the projects listed in section A4. Update, FI, 2/3/14: Yes. The project will coordinate with (i) the LDCF 'CBA to Climate Change	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		through Coastal Afforestation' project, particularly on the use of salt-tolerant fish species; (ii) the UNDP 'Comprehensive Disaster Management Program - Phase II', on local monitoring systems and EWS for fisheries/hatcheries; (iii) the Worldfish 'Feed the Future' aquaculture project, on information exchange and technical support in the use of salinity-tolerant aquaculture species; and (iv) the Worldfish 'Smart Farm' project, on efficient farming systems.	
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.	FI, 11/26/13: Comment will be provided once investment components are known. FI, 1/9/14: Innovativeness: Yes, the project is innovative as (i) very little has been done thus far to integrate climate resilience in the fisheries & aquaculture sector in Bangladesh, which has prime importance for the livelihoods and sustenance of the poor; and (ii) locally-relevant innovative aquaculture technologies will be developed. Sustainability: Yes. The project will emphasize community engagement and has strong awareness-raising and capacity-building elements. By CEO endorsement: Please provide more information on how the continuation of project benefits will be ensured. Scale-up: Yes; there is high potential for	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		scale-up, as fisheries & aquaculture is a large and significant sector.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	FI, 11/26/13: Comment will be provided once investment components and corresponding financing are known. FI, 1/9/14: Clarification is requested. GEF funding is adequate, but the final apportioning of co-financing across components is yet to be provided (see 1/9/14 comment for Item 17, below). Update, FI, 2/3/14: Yes, GEF funding and co-financing are adequate.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?	FI, 11/26/13: Comment will be provided once investment components (and corresponding changes in financing, if any) are known. FI, 1/9/14: Clarification of total co-financing amount is requested. Please confirm co-financing once the 3 ineligible projects have been	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		removed from the baseline list. Update, FI, 2/3/14: Yes. Co-financing of $15.2 million will be provided.	
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	FI, 11/26/13: Yes. As the costs have been presented in the current version of the PIF, costs are appropriate.	
	19. At PIF, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	Yes. PPG has been requested and is within the norm.	
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	FI, 11/26/13: Not yet. Please see comment for Item 7. Clarification, 1/9/14, FI: The review conducted on 11/26/13 requested resolution of several items, with the summary comment provided under Item 7. FI, 1/9/14: Not yet. Clearance for approval is now pending resolution of issues raised under Items 6, 12, 16 and 17. FI, 2/3/14: Yes.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Items 7, 11, and 13.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		
	First review*	November 26, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	January 09, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 03, 2014	

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**