



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

GEF ID:	5113		
Country/Region:	Regional (Angola, Namibia, South Africa)		
Project Title:	Enhancing Climate Change Resilience in the Benguela Current Fisheries System		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Multi Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-1; CCA-1; CCA-1; CCA-1; CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-2; CCA-2; CCA-2; CCA-2; CCA-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,725,000
Co-financing:	\$14,650,000	Total Project Cost:	\$19,375,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Cassandra De Young

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	YES. Angola is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA. Namibia and South Africa are non-Annex I Parties to the UNFCCC.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	NO. Letters of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Points of Namibia and South Africa, and dated August 30 and 31 respectively, have been attached to the submission. However, an LoE from the Angolan OFP is still required for the project to be eligible. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please provide a signed LoE from the OFP of Angola. 09/24/2012 “ YES. The re-submission includes a signed LoE from the Angolan	

Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	YES. FAO has a clear comparative advantage in scientific and technical assessments, policy support and capacity building in the area of fisheries and aquaculture.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	<p>NOT CLEAR. The PIF notes that the proposed project is aligned with FAO's strategies on fisheries and climate change. The PIF does not clearly articulate, however, how the proposed project would benefit from the Agency's programming and human resources in the three countries.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify how the proposed project would benefit from FAO's programming and human resources in the three participating countries.</p> <p>09/24/2012 -- YES. The re-submission clarifies that FAO has adequate staff capacity and relevant programming in the three participating countries.</p>	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	YES. The proposed grant for Angola (\$1.87 million, including Agency fee) is available under the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
		YES. The proposed grant for Namibia	

	Technology Transfer)?	including Agency fee) is available under the SCCF Adaptation Program.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	YES. The proposed project is well aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would contribute towards CCA-1 and CCA-2 and, specifically, outcomes 1.2, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3. The Focal Area Strategy Framework does not provide a breakdown of the indicative grant and co-financing amounts per outcome.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please provide a breakdown of the indicative grant and co-financing amounts per outcome.</p> <p>09/24/2012 -- YES. The Focal Area Strategy Framework has been revised as recommended, with a breakdown of grant and co-financing amounts per outcome.</p>	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	YES. The proposed project is closely aligned with the national communications of Namibia and South Africa, and the Angola NAPA, all of which identify the Benguela Current fisheries as vulnerable to the effects of climate change and in urgent need of adaptive management.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would build the capacities of regional, national and local stakeholders to understand the effects of climate change	

		<p>communities, as well as to identify, plan and implement appropriate adaptation measures. With respect to Component 1, however, it is not clear whether and how the project would contribute to the capacity of the Benguela Current Commission (BCC) and relevant national authorities to collect information for climate-resilient fisheries management beyond project completion.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify how the project would contribute to the capacity of BCC and relevant national authorities to collect information for climate-resilient fisheries management beyond project completion.</p> <p>09/24/2012 " YES. The re-submission clarifies that the project would enhance the capacities of BCC and national authorities to monitor and assess climate change vulnerabilities beyond the proposed project.</p>	
Project Design	11. 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?	NOT CLEAR. The project would build on several baseline initiatives at the regional and national levels, namely (i) activities carried out by the Benguela Current Commission (BCC), particularly its Science Plan; (ii) the FAO/Norway Nansen Project; (iii) the NORAD-financed NansClim project; (iv) the European Commission financed ECOFISH project; (iv) the NEPAD-FAO Joint Fisheries Programme (NFFP), supported by SIDA; (v) investments by the Government of Angola and the African Development	

Centres, fish landing sites and a Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) system; (vi) investments by the Government of Namibia in fish processing facilities and market expansion efforts; and (vii) initiatives by the Government of South Africa to strengthen the knowledge base and policy frameworks for the sustainable management of fisheries.

As for NFFP, it is not entirely clear how the program would form a appropriate baseline initiative, provided especially that its Component C appears to share one of the outcomes of the proposed LDCF/SCCF project. With respect to the initiatives overseen by the national governments, the PIF could provide more specific information as to the financing associated with these and their respective timeframes. Finally, it is not clear how the indicative co-financing figures relate to the baseline initiatives cited.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) clarify how NFFP would present an appropriate baseline initiative; (ii) provide further information as to the financing associated with the baseline initiatives overseen by the three national governments, as well as their respective timeframes; and (iii) clarify how the indicative co-financing figures relate to each of the baseline initiatives cited.

09/24/2012 â€œ YES. The re-submission moves NFFP among other related initiatives. The baseline projects and

		clarified and consistently reported in the revised PIF.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above. In absence of a clear description of the baseline initiatives, the additional cost reasoning cannot be adequately assessed.</p> <p>As for Component 1, in absence of a formal PPG request, it is not entirely clear what technical assessments and stakeholder consultations are planned for the project preparation phase and how these will be complemented by the more comprehensive vulnerability assessments proposed for the project itself.</p> <p>With respect to Component 2, the nature and scope of the local adaptation action plans is not clear, nor whether these would be implemented in the context of the proposed project. Moreover, with respect to output 2.3.1 on extreme weather events and early-warning system, it is not clear what means the proposed project would have to address the limitations and gaps it aims to identify.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11, please (i) revise the</p>	

		<p>necessary. In addition, kindly (ii) clarify what technical assessments and stakeholder consultations are planned for project preparation and how these will be complemented by Component 1; (iii) clarify the scope and nature of the local adaptation action plans proposed under output 2.1.1, and whether these will be implemented through the project; and (iv) explain how the project could address the gaps identified under output 2.3.1.</p> <p>09/24/2012 â€“ YES. The additional cost reasoning has been revised and clarified as recommended.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing recommendations under sections 11 and 13, please adjust the project framework accordingly, if necessary.</p> <p>09/24/2012 â€“ YES. The project framework is sound and sufficiently clear.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing recommendations under Section 13, please revise the description of adaptation benefits accordingly, if necessary.</p> <p>09/24/2012 â€“ YES. The adaptation benefits are clearly described in the re-submission.</p>	

	16. 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?	YES. The socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions are well described for this stage of project development.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	YES. Public participation, including the role of CSOs, is well considered for this stage of project development.	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	YES. The project identifies relevant risks, along with appropriate mitigation measures.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Section B.6 of the PIF includes projects already included among baseline initiatives.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: For clarity, please distinguish between the baseline initiatives on which the project will build and the resilience of which it will enhance (Section B.1), and other related initiatives with which coordination will be sought (Section B.6).</p> <p>09/24/2012 “ YES. Section B.6 of the PIF has been clarified as recommended.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	YES. The proposed project will primarily be executed by the Benguela Current Commission in close collaboration with relevant national authorities.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	YES. At \$225,000 or 5 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 through 4, the proposed funding level for project management is appropriate.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing recommendations under sections 11 and 13, please adjust the indicative grant and co-financing amounts per component accordingly, if necessary. 09/24/2012 â€“ YES. The grant and co-financing amounts per component are appropriate and adequate.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing recommendations under Section 11, please adjust the indicative co-financing figures per component accordingly, if necessary. 09/24/2012 â€“ At \$14.65 million, the indicative co-financing level is appropriate.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	YES. In line with its role, FAO would bring \$650,000 in indicative co-financing, of which \$150,000 is grant resources.	
Project Monitoring	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools		

	all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	NA	
	• Convention Secretariat?	NA	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	NA	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 2, 5, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 19, 24 and 25. 09/24/2012 â€œ YES.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 05, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 24, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.