



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

GEF ID:	9443		
Country/Region:	Global (Chile, India, Namibia, Ukraine, South Africa)		
Project Title:	Strengthening Capacity for International Cooperation in the Ecosystem-based Management of the Antarctic Large Marine Ecosystem.		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4473 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-3 Program 7;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$6,192,694
Co-financing:	\$45,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$51,192,694
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	Andrew Hudson

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	23rd of March 2016: Partly. The suggested activities are foundational, and hence the project activities falls under objective 1, as the project will be supporting multi-state cooperation in the Antarctic LME, the proposal needs to better illustrate how the proposed project activities link to identified needs from the CCAMLR Commission and the Convention. Further, the	

¹ 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>development of a TDA/SAP approach to support the convention and commission's work will be a useful tool, that should be investigated and included.</p> <p>Further, the project activities to some extent aligns with objective 3 (as it intend to foster sustainable fisheries of finfish and krill.), but since this project is a foundational project, it would make more sense to align fully with objective 1.</p> <p>Please adjust results framework and deliverables, to align with Objective one as well as ensure that outcomes include TDA/SAP.</p> <p>18th of April: Yes, a section has been added to PIF, which clarifies that this proposed project is indeed the equivalent of a SAP implementation project, that directly will support implementation of activities under the guidance of the CAMLR Convention.</p>	
	<p>2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?</p>	<p>23rd of March 2016: As this is a truly international waters body, it is essential to understand how the countries that are parties to the convention supports work like suggested in PIF. Having the submitted national endorsements of this project is fine, (it is noted that the</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>submitted endorsement letters provided are not from all GEF eligible Convention member countries Please provide) but can not be counted as fully representing all convention member states, nor the Convention itself. Therefore, please provide proof that the Commission and Convention is behind the suggested activities (and that these align with their own short and long term workplans) as well as how, especially the Commission will support this project.</p> <p>Please provide further information as to which countries constitute the main bulk of the fin fish and krill fleet capacity? Please note that the TDA/SAP should secure involvement of GEF eligible countries that contribute to the fishing fleet capacity.</p> <p>19th of April 2016: Yes the submission now includes a support letter from the Commission of the Antarctic LME, that clearly describes how the Convention member countries are behind the proposal. Further, four GEF eligible recipient countries have endorsed the proposal</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		29th of august 2016(cseverin): Yes, five GEF eligible countries have endorsed the proposed project.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>Yes, the PIF indicates a range of drivers of degradation, a) climate change, b) overfishing, and c) IUU fishing. Even though one of the indirect ways to deal with these pressures will be to increase capacity, the project does not provide much direction on how it tends to deal with some of these pressures. Not being able to address Climate change directly through this investment, but issues such as overfishing and IUU should be more directly targeted.</p> <p>The PIF needs to provide more information on what the proposed components will deliver.</p> <p>19th of April 2016: The PIF is still weak on impact on the ground, especially considering that this investment is to implement the strategic priorities of the Commission for the Conservation of the Antarctic Marine Living Resources. Outputs such as diversity and number of scientific papers indicates that this project will be much more focused on</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>research compared to impact on the ground.</p> <p>Further, please consider to reformulate outputs associated with Increased collaboration and information exchange, as merely counting the number of active bilateral or multilateral meetings is a poor output indicator. Rather focus on the impact such collaboration and information exchange s will have. following this line of argumentation, please elaborate on where the increased knowledge will be shared. the project should set up a data-sharing platform, so that the collected information not only benefits the four GEF eligible countries but all partner countries to the Convention.</p> <p>3rd of August 2016 (cseverin): NO. With one of the main objectives of this investment focusing on moving the fisheries in the Antarctica marine system to become more sustainable, it is expected, as mentioned on the 19th of April, that the proposed investment should be delivering activities that will diminish the stress on the ecosystem. The PIF need to make a clearer case. Please make the needed changes.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>29th of august 2016(cseverin):The concept now explains better that its implementation will be securing sustainable fishcatch. However, please during PPG elaborate extensively on how the suggested national capacity building activities will lead to the identified GEBS, especially the Finfish and Krill safeguarding needs to be elaborated further on.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>Partly,</p> <p>On page 12, the project indicates that a better understanding could contribute to the gradual increase in sustainable activities such as tourism and mariculture. Please make changes to this, so that it clearly is understood that the acquired knowledge will be applied in order to limit the effects of tourism (and its development) and potential mariculture developments on ALME, not to make additional advancements in tourism or mariculture in the fragile ecosystem.</p> <p>Please consider to add a reference (pp 11) to the CBD recommendation on the matter of sustainable mariculture(https://www.cbd.int/doc/publications/cbd-ts-12.pdf).</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>When providing more details on what the project will deliver, and provide a stronger description on the linkages between the Convention and the commission's workplans it will hopefully be easier to understand the incremental argumentation.</p> <p>Private sector buy-in (primarily from the fishing industry) is key when developing the TDA/SAP. Please explain how the private sector engages in the work of the commission and how the project intends to ensure private sector buy-in? Further, please explain if the private sector could play a role when looking at data research and monitoring data gaps. According to the PIF, filling these gaps are considered necessary to enforce CCAMLR objectives in all parts of the Convention Area.</p> <p>3rd of August 2016 (cseverin): Addressed, however private sector engagement needs to be strengthen considerably during project preparation, as the private sector role will be essential for safeguarding the fishery resource in the Antarctica marine system.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate	No, please make sure to add outcomes such as TDA/SAP for the ALME, to	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>support the commissions work and to provide a framework for political decision making in the member countries as well as within the Convention.</p> <p>Making this change, will cascade through all components, and hence radical change is expected. Further, please revise outputs so that they become more tangible, simply "increasing participation" is not enough.</p> <p>The overall funding available for this foundational project would be need to be lowered considerable. E.g. having demonstration projects to a value of 6 mio is out of proportions for a foundational project.</p> <p>19th of April 2016: The Components are listing outputs such as number and variety of scientific articles to be output indicators for</p> <p>3rd of August 2016 (cseverin):No, as this proposed project is the equivalent to a SAP implementation project, much more detailed information on quantifiable outputs are expected. Please make sure that results framework and Table B includes</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>more quantifiable indicators on impact on the ecosystem, and not only "increased, enhanced, improved" participation etc.</p> <p>29th of August 2016 (cseverin): Yes adequately addressed. However, please during PPG ensure to elaborate extensively on the environmental impacts of the suggested national capacity building efforts. the links can, and should, be strengthened.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes/gender : An audit on the gender issue will take place during the PPG. No indigenous people in Antarctica	
Availability of Resources	7. 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? 	<p>no, the proposed project grant is much higher than funding would be available for this proposed investment.</p> <p>19th of April 2016: If the proposal provides a better argument for impact, then the proposed revised amount will be available.</p> <p>3rd of August 2016 (cseverin): With the proposed changes leading a project document that is more specific on quantifiable outputs, the revised</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>amount is OK. Please make sure to tick the PPG request box (E), if a PPG is needed</p> <p>29th of August 2016 (cseverin): addressed</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>No, the PIF is not recommended for CEO Clearance.</p> <p>19th of April 2016: No, please address comments.</p> <p>3rd of August 2016 (cseverin): No, Please address comments. one of the main issues is still the lack of specificity on output level. Increased, enhanced and strengthened are words that are used throughout the logframe, please identify quantifiable outputs and insert these instead.</p> <p>29th of August 2016 (cseverin): yes the PIF is recommended for Technical Clearance.</p>	
Review Date	Review	March 21, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	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		

CEO endorsement Review

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

³ 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.