



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9194		
Country/Region:	Gambia		
Project Title:	Strengthening Adaptative Capacities to Climate Change through Capacity Building for small scale Enterprises and Communities Dependent on Coastal Fisheries in The Gambia		
GEF Agency:	UNIDO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$2,200,000
Co-financing:	\$5,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$7,700,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Dustin Schinn	Agency Contact Person:	Juliet Kabege

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	DS, August 3, 2015: Yes. The project is aligned with CCA-1 and CCA-3.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	DS, August 3, 2015: Partly. Project is consistent with the Gambia Vision 2020 and the country's National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA), however, while the project addresses increasing fish production through conservation of	Kindly, see response to comment 4 below.

<sup>1</sup> 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>post-harvest fishery products, it seems unclear whether, and if yes, how, the project also aims to increase fish production through aquaculture, as this is part of the same NAPA. Please clarify.</p> <p>DS, September 29, 2015: Agency clarification has been provided under Question 5 below. Comment cleared.</p>	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	DS, August 3, 2015: Yes.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>DS, August 3, 2015: Yes, at PIF stage. Project incrementally builds on baseline initiatives in the context of development and conservation. However, the fisheries sector itself potentially may suffer from the adverse effects of climate change. Therefore, by CEO Endorsement, please consider potential adverse effects of climate change on current and planned fisheries investments and elaborate how those effects will be integrated in the project design.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate	DS, August 3, 2015: Partly. While the overall framework is	The sub-totals have been re-adjusted so that the total GEF project financing

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>clear and sound, some issues remain:</p> <p>(1) GEF Project Financing in Table B adds up to \$2.07 million, while the total is listed as \$2.20 million. Please adjust the sub-totals so that the total GEF Project financing reflects the sum of the sub-totals.</p> <p>(2) Co-financing in Table B adds up to \$5.5 million excluding Project Management Cost (PMC), however, the total amount should include PMC. Please adjust the sub-totals so that the total of \$5.5 million includes PMC co-financing.</p> <p>(3) Outcome 3 in Table B mentions 'early weather warning (EWS)', while this term is not mentioned in the body of the document. Please clarify whether this term differs from 'early warning system' and change, as appropriate.</p> <p>(4) Please refer to comment under Question 2 above related to the National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA). While the project addresses increased fish production through conservation of post-harvest fishery products, it seems unclear whether, and if yes, how, the project aims to also increase fish production through aquaculture. Please clarify.</p> <p>(5) Investment components (Component 2) represent an essential</p>	<p>reflects the sum of the sub-totals.</p> <p>Output 2.3 Selected enterprises develop climate resilient business plans with updated feasibility assessments has been expanded to also evaluate the status of implementation of aquaculture in the target region and assist enterprises with the development climate resilient business plans for aquaculture, where appropriate. This output is treated as an investment component and has been allocated 135,000 USD from the GEF grant and 300,000 USD of co-financing.</p> <p>The PMC cost was re-adjusted to reflect a budget of 9% of the sub-total (181,000 USD).</p> <p>The error in the co-financing calculation has been corrected.</p> <p>The co-financing budget breakdown has been re-adjusted in order to allocate for funds for aquaculture (Output 2.3).</p> <p>The correct terminology is Early Warning System and this has been corrected in Outcome 2 Table B.</p> <p>The project will explore vertical value chain linkages between fish waste utilization for feeds, and aquaculture, animal production and poultry value</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>aspect of this project, however, it seems unclear which post-harvest fisheries technologies will be demonstrated.</p> <p>(6) Related to (5), it would seem advantageous to develop a plan for the up-scaling of the demonstrated technologies in the PPG phase.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement: The PIF mentions at several places that 'climate resilient' measures will be undertaken. Please ensure, that by CEO Endorsement, a clear rationale is provided as to how measures will build resilience to climate change and/or increased climate variability.</p> <p>DS, September 29, 2015: (1) Comment cleared. (2) Comment cleared. (3) Comment cleared. (4) Comment cleared. (5) The development of business plans seems to fall into the category of technical assistance, rather than concrete investments. Please make sure to label planning, teaching and other technical assistance activities as such. Please elaborate on the concrete investment aspects of Component 2 and increase the share of concrete investments vis-à-vis technical</p>	<p>chains. These diversified supplies will be evaluated for direct impacts on reduced pressure on fisheries resources, and diversified livelihoods. PIF document, Component 2 (paragraphs 29 and 30), Output 1.2 (paragraph 27) and Output 2.1 (paragraph 34) have been revised accordingly.</p> <p>PIF document, Component 2: Output 2.1 has been revised accordingly (paragraph 34).</p> <p>The following text was inserted on page 13/ paragraph 42 / Output 3.3:</p> <p>To achieve the scale-up of demonstrated technologies the project will focus on planning a robust long-term scale-up strategy to identify the needed factors for success, during the PPG phase. The project will ensure an active and inclusive stakeholder consultation process from the start of the project to ensure the buy-in and active participation of key institutions, organizations and other stakeholders, as needed for a successful scale-up. PPG activities, in this regard, will include a feasibility assessment for scale-up, taking into consideration policy and institutional support, potential leaders/champions, networks/partnerships and related costs, as well as, barriers to scale-up, that the project will need to</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>assistance, given the overall size of the project. (6) Comment cleared.</p> <p>DS, October 5, 2015: Component 2 has been revised to increase share of concrete investments and to merge the technical assistance sub-components. All comments cleared.</p>	overcome.
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	DS, August 3, 2015: Yes.	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	DS, August 3, 2015: Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>DS, August 3, 2015: Not yet. Please address comments under Questions 2 and 5.</p> <p>DS, September 29, 2015: Not yet. Please address remaining comment under Question 5.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>DS, October 5, 2015: Yes. Comments cleared. Program Manager recommends PIF for CEO approval.</p> <p>DS, August 21, 2017: An updated PIF, including an annex summarizing the specific aspects that required updating, was submitted and cleared. The Program Manager thus recommends the updated PIF for CEO approval given that resources available in the LDCF are sufficient to process the project for funding approval.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement: Please refer to comments under Questions 4 and 5.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	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)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.