



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

GEF ID:	6955		
Country/Region:	Chile		
Project Title:	Strengthening the Adaptive Capacity to Climate Change in the Fisheries and Aquaculture Sector		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$2,500,000
Co-financing:	\$15,737,794	Total Project Cost:	\$18,437,794
PIF Approval:	September 03, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	October 30, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Saliha Dobardzic	Agency Contact Person:	Alejandro Flores

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 ?	DS, August 14, 2014: Yes. Chile is a non-Annex I country Party to the UNFCCC.	As at PIF approval.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	DS, August 14, 2014: Not yet. Letter of endorsement by focal point is missing. Update Aug 28, 2014: The letter of endorsement has been provided, which endorses project costs of \$2.5 million. However, the funding sought from the SCCF, inclusive of the agency fee, would exceed \$2.5 million. Recommended action:	Yes. As at PIF.

*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.
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Please submit a revised letter of endorsement or revise the project so as to fit the envelope endorsed by the Country's Operational Focal Point.</p> <p>Update 8/29/2014: A revised letter of endorsement from Chile's Operational Focal Point has been provided.</p>	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		NA
	• the focal area allocation?		NA
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		NA
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	DS, August 14, 2014: Yes. the proposed grant amount is available under the SCCF.	As at PIF approval.
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		NA
	• focal area set-aside?		NA
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <i>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).</i>	DS, August 14, 2014: Yes. Project alignes with CCA-1 and CCA-2 objectives.	Yes. The project aligns with GEF-6 CCA results framework objectives: CCA-1, CCA-2, and CCA-3.
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national	DS, August 14, 2014: Yes. The project is consistent with	Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	Chile's second National Communication.	
Project Design	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>DS, August 14, 2014: Not clear. Listed baseline initiatives include a vulnerability assessment by the Fisheries and Agriculture Undersecretariat and ongoing efforts to develop the National Plan for Adaptation to Climate Change in Fisheries and Aquaculture Sector (NAP-FAS) by the Ministry of the Environment, among other national initiatives. It is clearly elaborated that the proposed SCCF project would facilitate trial implementation of some of the measures identified in the NAP-FAS in pilot sites. However, the initiatives that are identified as baseline initiatives seem insufficient vis-a-vis SCCF principles, since SCCF resources should complement non-adaptation related baseline initiatives and ensure that adaptation to climate change is integrated throughout these baseline initiatives.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please identify baseline projects that do not already address adaptation matters and elaborate how the SCCF resources would help integrate adaptation to climate change into these baseline initiatives.</p> <p>Update August 28, 2014: The project identifies the fisheries and aquaculture baseline program of the</p>	As at PIF approval.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>Fisheries and Aquaculture Undersecretariat (FAU) as the co-financing, specifically the aquaculture research fund and programme (FIP).</p> <p>DS, August 14, 2014: Partly. Component 1 is clear and sound. However, Outcome 2.1 under Component 2 lists "new type fishing gear and onboard equipment" as an adaptive measure to climate change. It seems insufficiently clear as to how these investments link to reducing vulnerability to climate change.</p> <p>In addition, Outcome 2.2 includes aspects related to Technical Assistance. While these aspects are in line with SCCF objectives, Technical Assistance should be identified as such. Currently, however, this outcome has been categorized as an investment component as opposed to Technical Assistance.</p> <p>Recommended action:</p> <p>(i) Please elaborate as to how "new type fishing gear and onboard equipment" as part of Outcome 2.1 under Component 2 contributes to reducing vulnerability to climate change. Please further provide more detail on the other proposed investments under Outcome 2.1 and how they relate to climate change adaptation.</p> <p>(ii) Please split Outcome 2.2 in two individual outcomes, so as to disentangle Technical Assistance aspects from</p>	<p>Yes. Project design now includes more detailed assessments of the state of fisheries and aquaculture resources; climate information and projections; and vulnerability of fisheries and the aquaculture sector to the expected impacts of climate change.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>concrete investment. This would create two components, one related to Technical Assistance (in this case, training) and one related to Investment. Please then adjust the project framework accordingly.</p> <p>Update August 28, 2014: Component 2 has been separated, and the components describe more clearly the adaptation elements and their outcomes.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>DS, August 14, 2014: Partly. Please address comments under Questions 6 and 7.</p> <p>Update August 28, 2014: This has been done.</p>	<p>Adaptation benefits are identified and additional reasoning is sound.</p>
	<p>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?</p>		<p>There is a clear description of adaptation benefits at the community level, however it is not exactly clear what the quantifiable socio-economic benefits are. Also direct beneficiaries are discussed for Component 1, but not for Component 2 or 3 in section A7, although there seem to be indicators included in the Adaptation Benefits section, ie "increased sustainability of fisheries and sustainability of incomes"...</p> <p>Recommended Action: It would be helpful to pull out indicators related to socio-economic benefits from the project results framework and the tracking tool and present them briefly in section A7.</p> <p>Update, 7/14/2016</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Yes. Socio-economic benefits are now articulated in further detail in section A7.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	DS, August 14, 2014: Yes. Public participation, including civil society has been identified as part of the project design and implementation.	Yes. As at PIF.
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	DS, August 14, 2014: Yes. The proposal identifies potential major risks and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures.	Yes. The risk matrix is sufficiently developed, including mitigation measures.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	DS, August 14, 2014: Yes. The project will be coordinated with and complement other relevant initiatives in the country, including the following two GEF-financed projects: (i) Towards Ecosystem Management of the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem; and (ii) National Biodiversity Planning to Support the Implementation of the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan. Recommended action by CEO Endorsement: Please specify in more detail how the proposed SCCF project would seek synergies and coordinate with other national, as well as bilaterally and multilaterally financed or implemented initiatives in Chile.	Not yet. Two GEF projects are referenced in the endorsement request - GEFID 2772 and GEFID 3749. A clearer explanation on exactly how the proposed project will coordinate with the two GEF projects under implementation would be helpful. Additionally, providing information on any bilateral or nationally funded adaptation initiatives or other initiatives being implemented either nationally or in the project area, would be helpful. Update 7/14/2016 Yes, further explanation has been provided on coordination mechanisms in subsection 3.1 of the FAO GEF project document.
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects,	DS, August 14, 2014: Unclear. Please address comments under	Innovativeness, sustainability, and potential for scaling up is addressed and

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>Questions 6 and 7.</p> <p>Update August 28, 2014: The project is innovative in that it addresses in Chile a sector that is quite important for the economy and has so far not benefited from a deliberate focus on the climate change vulnerabilities and identification of adaptation measures. By investing in capacity and information/knowledge base on adaptation, the basis for sustainability of the fisheries sector will be greatly strengthened. The project's focus on capacity building means that there will be further scope for building resilience in the fisheries sector further, and the project component on pilot sites will be scaleable as well. By CEO endorsement, as the activities are being defined, the expectation is that these aspects will be further strengthened.</p>	<p>elaborated upon.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>Yes, no major changes from PIF stage.</p>
	<p>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?</p>		<p>Not clear. The description of alternatives analysis has not been included.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please provide further clarifications regarding the cost-effectiveness of the approach proposed here.</p> <p>Update 7/14/2016 Yes. Detailed information supporting the cost effectiveness of project activities is included in section 4.5 of the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			project document.
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?	DS, August 14, 2014: Yes.	Yes.
	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?	DS, August 14, 2014: Yes. At \$15.60 million, the indicative co-financing is adequate.	Yes, co-financing letters have been signed by the Undersecretariat of Fishing and Aquaculture for \$14.7 million and by the Ministry of the Environment for \$846,421 and included with the Endorsement request.
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	DS, August 14, 2014: Yes. PMC equals 5% of the sub-total of individual project components.	Yes. As at PIF.
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , 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? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	DS, August 14, 2014: Yes. The proposed PPG of \$100,000 is in line with the norm.	Yes. A table is included in Annex C.
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		7/6/2016 More clarification requested. Usage of indicators is not clear (e.g., some indicators are listed but with the comment NA.)

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Update 7/14/2016 Yes, the tracking tool has been updated.
Agency Responses	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes, included in Section C.
	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		<p>7/20/2016 - More clarification requested. It is unclear if the Agency has responded to STAP comments submitted at PIF stage, which include one minor and one major issue to be addressed by Endorsement stage.</p> <p>Recommended Action Please briefly clarify if and how STAP comments have been addressed.</p> <p>UPDATE 8/3/2016 Yes. The Agency has provided a table summarizing how STAP comments have been addressed in Annex B.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council? 		Yes, and responses are included in Annex B.
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>DS, August 14, 2014: Not yet. Please address comments on Questions 2, 6, 7, 8 and 13.</p> <p>Update August 28, 2014: Not yet. Please address the pending comments under Question 2.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Update August 29, 2014: The project is ready to be recommended.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please specify in more detail how the proposed SCCF project would seek synergies and coordinate with other national, as well as bilaterally and multilaterally financed or implemented initiatives in Chile. Please consider the sustainability, scaleability, and innovativeness in the development of the project.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		7/14/2016 The project will be recommended for CEO Endorsement after items 9,12,15, and 21 are addressed. 7/20/2016 Not yet. Please refer to Item 23. 8/3/2016 Yes. The agency has adequately responded to all relevant items at this stage.
	First review*	August 14, 2014	May 27, 2016
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		July 07, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 29, 2014	July 14, 2016

* 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.