



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

GEF ID:	5328		
Country/Region:	Malawi		
Project Title:	Building Climate Change Resilience in the Fisheries Sector in Malawi		
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;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$120,000	Project Grant:	\$5,460,000
Co-financing:	\$4,480,000	Total Project Cost:	\$10,060,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Devin Bartley

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. Malawi is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Point and dated December 18, 2012, has been attached to the submission.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of	NOT AT THIS TIME. As at March 2013,	

*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)
	equitable access	<p>Malawi has accessed \$20.84 million for five full-sized projects approved under the LDCF. Given a current equitable access ceiling of \$20 million, the proposed project will be recommended for approval only once additional contributions permit the ceiling to be increased sufficiently.</p> <p>02/06/2014 “ YES. The proposed grant is available from the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>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></p>	<p>YES. The proposed project would contribute towards objectives CCA-1 and CCA-2 and, specifically, outcomes 1.1, 1.2 and 2.1.</p>	
	<p>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?</p>	<p>YES. The proposed project would address Malawi's NAPA priorities associated with sustainable rural livelihoods, and climate information and early-warning systems. The project is also consistent with Malawi's UNDAF, National Medium-Term Priority Framework and National Policy on Fisheries. National-level coordination</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		and coherence will be ensured through Malawi's National Climate Change Programme.	
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>NOT CLEAR. The PIF lists a range of relevant baseline initiatives carried out by the Department of Fisheries (DOF), the Department of Climate Change and Meteorology Services (DCCMS), FAO and other partners.</p> <p>It is not clear, however, how the baseline initiatives listed relate to the co-financing figures cited in Table C, particularly in the case of the considerable in-kind co-financing provided through DOF, DCCMS and DDP.</p> <p>With respect to Component 2, the list of relevant baseline initiatives could potentially be expanded to encompass investments targeting rural development and food security more broadly, given that these would be strengthened by the diversified and climate-resilient practices introduced by the proposed project. The PIF also mentions two private enterprises that would benefit from Component 2, but none of the indicative co-financing is associated with the private sector.</p> <p>With respect to the proposed Component 3, finally, the PIF could provide further information regarding the baseline situation, particularly the current state of hydro-meteorological monitoring and early-warning systems in the pilot areas.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i)</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>clarify how the baseline initiatives cited in sections B.1 and B.2 of the PIF relate to the indicative co-financing figures and sources provided in Table C; (ii) consider capturing, under Component 2, a broader baseline of projects, programs and investments in food security and rural development, including from the private sector; and (iii) provide further information regarding the current state of hydro-meteorological monitoring and early-warning systems in the pilot areas under Component 3.</p> <p>02/06/2014 –“ YES. The re-submission clarifies how the baseline initiatives relate to the indicative co-financing figures and sources provided in Table C. Section A.1.2 of the PIF also elaborates on the baseline scenario as it relates to hydro-meteorological monitoring and early warning systems in the pilot areas. The PIF provides additional information on baseline investments in food security and rural development; as well as the potential for private sector engagement; and should further explore opportunities for enhanced coordination and additional co-financing by CEO Endorsement.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Component 2 has been treated as TA in the project framework (Table B), yet based on outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 it appears that the component would focus on investments.</p> <p>Please refer also to sections 6 and 8.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please adjust the project framework accordingly, as appropriate. In addition, consider treating Component 2 as INV rather than TA, or clarify the associated activities.</p> <p>02/06/2014 “ YES. The project framework has been revised as recommended.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above. Some of the baseline initiatives listed in section B.1 of the PIF include projects that would provide direct co-financing towards the adaptation measures proposed, particularly the FAO TCP project, Implementation of the NAPA in the Fisheries Sector of the Lake Malawi Basin, and the research initiative led by the University of Minnesota. In contrast, the PIF does not clearly capture the full range of baseline development initiatives that the proposed project would build on and strengthen, in line with additional reasoning.</p> <p>With respect to Component 2, the scope and nature of the pilot adaptation measures remains somewhat unclear. Examples of potential demonstration activities would help justify this component.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please (i) revisit the additional reasoning, with reference to the full range of baseline development initiatives that</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the proposed project would build on and strengthen. In addition, please (ii) provide examples of potential demonstration activities to be carried out as part of Component 2.</p> <p>02/06/2014 “ YES. The additional reasoning and expected adaptation benefits have been adequately clarified for this stage of project development.</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>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>YES. Public participation, including the participation of CSOs, has been adequately described for this stage of project development.</p>	
	<p>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)</p>	<p>YES. Relevant risks and appropriate mitigation measures have been adequately considered for this stage of project development.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Among the initiatives with which coordination will be sought, the PIF could mention the World Bank-GEF-LDCF Shire Natural Ecosystems Management Project.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure coordination with the World</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Bank-GEF-LDCF Shire Natural Ecosystems Management Project.</p> <p>02/06/2014 “ YES. The Shire Natural Ecosystems Management Project has been identified among the projects and programs with which coordination and coherence will be sought. Coordination arrangements and complementarities with the initiatives listed in Section A.4 of the PIF should be specified by CEO Endorsement.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project’s innovative aspects, 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>NOT CLEAR. The proposal uses a previous PIF template, which does not provide for a discussion specifically on innovation, sustainability and scaling up.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please adopt the most recent PIF template and -- upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8 -- describe in Section A.1 of the PIF the innovative aspects, sustainability strategy and potential for scaling up of the proposed project.</p> <p>02/06/2014 “ YES. The proposed project is the first concerted attempt at understanding and addressing the effects of climate change on fisheries in Lake Malawi. The project will thus serve as an important demonstration activity with potential for replication across the Lake Malawi Basin and beyond. Through close integration into national policy-making and planning processes, as well as potential for private-sector engagement, the proposed project presents a viable</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		strategy to ensure sustainability and promote the adoption of successful approaches, practices and technologies at greater scale.	
	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?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please adjust the grant and co-financing figures per component accordingly, as appropriate.</p> <p>02/06/2014 â€œ YES. The grant and indicative co-financing per component are adequate and appropriate.</p>	
	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?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Sections 6, please adjust the indicative co-financing figures accordingly, as appropriate.</p> <p>02/06/2014 â€œ YES.</p>	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	YES. At \$260,000 or 5 per cent of the sub-total for project components, the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		proposed LDCF funding level for project management is appropriate.	
	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?	YES. A PPG of \$120,000 has been requested and will be recommended once the PIF is ready for clearance.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
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?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 3, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 16 and 17. 02/06/2014 – YES.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO	Please refer to sections 6 and 12.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	March 14, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	February 06, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **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.**