



IKAN Adapt: Strengthening the adaptive capacity, resilience and biodiversity conservation ability of fisheries and aquaculture-dependent livelihoods in Timor-Leste

Basic Information

GEF ID
10181

Countries
Timor Leste

Project Title
IKAN Adapt: Strengthening the adaptive capacity, resilience and biodiversity conservation ability of fisheries and aquaculture-dependent livelihoods in Timor-Leste

GEF Agency(ies)
FAO

Agency ID
FAO: 633369

GEF Focal Area(s)
Multi Focal Area

Program Manager
Fareeha Iqbal

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes. It is aligned with strategic objectives CCA-1 and CCA-2, and with BD 1-1.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI & SW 5/2/2019

Cleared, thank you for removing the proposed crocodile management activity. During CEO Endorsement, if there is cofinancing for this work we can see it as being part of a larger sustainable natural resource management approach.

FI, 4/26/2019:

Thank you for the changes. Please discuss whether there are any climate change related factors that would justify the use of LDCF resources toward crocodile management.

SW, 4/29/2019:

Crocodile management is still not justified as having global biodiversity benefit. Please be aware that vulnerable has a specific meaning when discussing species, which it does not apply in this case. The wetland choice does not appear to be justified in terms of its importance for biodiversity.

FI, 4/17/2019:

Further information is requested.

Please move indicators that are solely BD-related from the row displaying LDCF funding to the row corresponding to GEF TF funding in Table B. For example, indicators 1(c) and 1(d) should not be in the row that displays LDCF funding; please include them in the subsequent row (for GEF TF) instead, in addition to "same as above", as the remaining activities are blended across the two funds. Please delete Indicator 2(c) as it appears to show as Output 2.4 in the subsequent row for the GEF TF.

Related to SW comment for Table B, below, the rationale for using LDCF support for crocodile related activities is not clear.

SW: 4/16/2019:

Component 1:

1.2 – What are these national strategies for? Are they the national fisheries strategy? Please clarify.

The indicators for component 1 in Table B (plan development) seem to fit more with the activities of component 2.4. Please clarify. Please justify the choice of the wetland and where it will be.

Component 2:

2.1 – It seems like it make sense to include the identification of barriers to good biodiversity management in these places during these assessments and then implement strategies or technologies to address them.

2.4 – The language describing these activities is confusing. Will the project be undertaking community consultations to establish MPAs/LMMAs and then supporting their implementation? It would be better for the output title to be more straight forward in what will be done. Also, the output lists working in 7 and in 5 communities, please clarify.

2.4 – Vulnerable species action plans – please provide more information about why these species were selected (IUCN Red List status should be threatened or have an important ecological function). Given that the crocodile populations are growing, this species seems like an odd choice.

Indicator C – Please clarify what is meant by this.

Agency Response

In response to GEFSEC comments on crocodile conservation, this has been removed from the PIF.

The wetland Sui Loro or Suai Loro has been identified as being an area of richest mangrove biodiversity in South Coast of the country - and important habitat for fish and other species. Please see page 29 of report available on https://www.undp.org/content/dam/timorleste/docs/reports/Resilience/TL_Mangrove_Report%20-%2019.01.18docx.pdf. Further assessment will be done during PPG to determine if another wetland of higher global biodiversity importance can be included in the project instead.

Indicators have been moved

Component 1:1.2 – What are these national strategies for? Are they the national fisheries strategy? Please clarify.

The strategies are new and support the fisheries and aquaculture sectors to implement national policies related to climate change and biodiversity (NAPA, NBSAP). The additional strategies are required because the current national policies for fisheries (and strategy for aquaculture) do not integrate climate change adaptation or biodiversity conservation. The strategies will also support implementation of national development policies and is fully consistent with the new fisheries law and Aquaculture Strategy Plan.

During PIF discussions MAF outlined that the existing policies and laws have been developed but require implementation strategies to integrate and mainstream climate change and biodiversity conservation. .

The indicators for component 1 in Table B (plan development) seem to fit more with the activities of component 2.4. Please clarify.

DB 25-04-2019

The indicators for component 1 measure the strengthened capacity to develop plans by the number of plans developed (at all levels from community to national). The indicators in component 2 relate to actual implementation of the plans.

The text for the indicators in table B has been revised slightly to make this clearer.

Please justify the choice of the wetland and where it will be.

The initial suggestion for the wetland was made by MEIC and is "Sui Loro" in Covalima Municipality. An updated map has been prepared.

2.1 – It seems like it make sense to include the identification of barriers to good biodiversity management in these places during these assessments and then implement strategies or technologies to address them.

Agreed and text has been modified.

2.4 – The language describing these activities is confusing. Will the project be undertaking community consultations to establish MPAs/LMMAs and then supporting their implementation? It would be better for the output title to be more straight forward in what will be done. Also, the output lists working in 7 and in 5 communities, please clarify.

Yes the project will be working with communities to develop and implement the MPA's/LMMA's adopting the approaches already used in Timor Leste. The language of the Output 2.4 can be clarified during project design.

Overall this component will work in 7 communities. Of these it is foreseen 5 will have MPA/LMMA actions implement and 2 communities will have implementation of the “vulnerable species plans” . The language has been revised to make this clearer.

2.4 – Vulnerable species action plans

The vulnerable species action plans relate to 2 “vulnerable species” which will be agreed during PPG phase in more detail.

Turtles: During PIF consultations MAF and others reported that there are still fishers/ communities taking and consuming turtle eggs (and especially on the Southern coast). This practice is traditional but now against the law. The government wish support from the project to work with communities awareness raising and planning with communities to limit and eventually stop the practice. Communities will develop an action plan and develop local rules (Tara Bandu) for conservation with the support of the project. Conservation of marine turtles is recognized in the NBSAP of Timor Leste which lists the 7 marine turtle species recorded in Timor Leste. Stakeholders could not be specific about which species during the PIF consultation and the species and location will be determined during PPG phase.

Crocodiles: Crocodiles are a very important species culturally for Timorese people. Cultural/religious respect for crocodiles means that their persecution or removal from coastal areas is very difficult and may not be possible. Communities live in close proximity to them in many cases. Crocodile attacks are the main cause of loss of life amongst fishers. FAO has worked with the government and communities in relation to improving safety at sea in this respect. However, numbers of crocodiles are increasing. The government has requested support from the project to develop a crocodile management plan and to look at options for corralling them or ways to prevent them entering communities. The salt water crocodile is classed as a species of “least concern” by IUCN however the government of Timor Leste prioritize

action for unique social religious and cultural reasons. The use of climate change adaptation funds may be justified as successful crocodile management plans will improve livelihood opportunities (tourism) and resilience for coastal communities along with the direct benefit of reduced risk from attacks on fishers. The areas of crocodile management may also be considered protected/managed areas.

From a conservation perspective conservation of crocodile habitat (as a keystone or flagship species) will result in broader protection of the biodiversity of those areas.

The details of the locations and methods will be developed during PPG phase.

During PPG the species to be selected will be reviewed and a final decision taken. Other species may be considered.

Indicator C – Please clarify what is meant by this.

The indicator refers to the implementation of the biodiversity actions in Output 2.4. These are the MPA, LMMA and PA.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 5/7/2019:
Cleared.

FI, 5/6/2019:

Adjustment is requested to Table C. Please categorize (i) WorldFish as CSO; (ii) Australia as Donor; and (iii) Oxfam as CSO. For Oxfam please also enter all relevant information (type of financing, and whether recurrent/mobilized).

FI, 4/16/2019:

Adjustment is requested.

Indicative co-finance totaling \$9 million has been listed in Table C, of which \$3 million is investment mobilized.

However, not all of the initiatives described in the PIF appear to be directly co-financing the proposed project. Please remove those initiatives that are relevant baselines, which the proposed project will coordinate with (e.g., by avoiding duplication) and move these instead to the "Coordination" section. Only those projects that the proposed LDCF/BD project will directly influence, closely work with, or benefit from support from, should be shown as co-financing.

Agency Response

In response to comments of 5/6/2019, WorldFish and Oxfam have been categorised as CSO and Australia as donor. Other cells for Oxfam have been inserted.

This has been done. Only cofinance is reflected in the Baseline, the remainder moved to coordination.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes. Timor Leste has a BD STAR allocation of \$3 million for GEF-7 and is in any case fully flexible.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion FI, 4/16/2019:

Yes. As an LDC, Timor Leste may access LDCF resources. The grant request of \$3 million is within the current per-country ceiling for GEF-7.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 4/26/2019:

Cleared.

FI, 4/16/2019:

Adjustment is requested.

Row 2 of Table E mistakenly shows PPG for climate change being mapped to STAR CCM, rather than LDCF. This should be corrected.

Agency Response This has been corrected.

Core indicators**6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

SW: 5/2/2019

Cleared. We do anticipate that these numbers will be refined at CEO Endorsement with the marine hectares potentially divided between MPAs and mainstreaming.

FI, 5/2/2019:

Yes. However, please see comment of 5/2 for item 6 of Part II.

Update: FI, 4/26/2019:

The CCA core indicators and metadata still need to be submitted.

SW 4/29/2019

Please note that both core indicator 2 and 5 have contextual subindicators. This means that the subindicators are only to provide more information about those numbers and are not mutually exclusive or even required. For example, an LMMA

may have areas that will still have significant fishing and will be managed principally for fisheries rather than for biodiversity. Those areas would be considered under improved management (as they will be implementing regulations), but not part of protected areas. Those areas would be recorded under indicator 5 but not need any subindicators. Please remember that PAs will need to submit an improved METT score as part of the project.

FI, 4/16/2019:

Core Indicator targets and Metadata for the LDCF are required and need to be submitted. Please note that the Core Indicator table in the Portal does not apply to the LDCF; the adaptation indicators need to be submitted separately, as an excel file.

SW, 4/19/2016:

This project should be using core indicator #5 on area of marine habitat under improved management (marine mainstreaming). Please remember that new protected areas or existing protected areas will need an improved METT score. What are the 10 terrestrial hectares? Please provide a justification in the text for why project beneficiaries won't be 50/50 men and women.

Agency Response

The LDCF and Core indicator tables are now submitted. Data has been included under indicator 5 as advised.

The gender targets have been revised to 50/50

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion FI, 4/16/2019:

Yes.

Agency Response**Part II – Project Justification****1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

FI, 4/17/2019:

Yes.

Timor Leste is a highly vulnerable LDC SIDS, and a large share of its population is dependent on fishing for livelihood and nutrition. Climate change is placing fishers' lives at risk by exacerbating severe coastal storms, drought and flood risk, and coastal erosion. Ocean acidification as well as increased sea surface temperatures are leading to changes in the marine ecosystem. Higher temperatures are causing catch to spoil more rapidly, and flooding and intense rainfall result in damage to equipment. Climate change as well as unsustainable practices are affecting aquatic biodiversity. Several barriers to effective climate change adaptation and biodiversity conservation under the baseline scenario have been presented.

Agency Response**2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

FI, 4/26/2019:

Cleared.

FI, 4/16/2019:

Further information is requested.

Baseline problems, barriers and initiatives have been adequately described.

However, the PIF presents climate projections from 2010. Are more recent projections available? If so, please include.

Agency Response

The text has been updated to reflect more recent projections although the NAPA has not been updated as yet.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

The proposed interventions and their ability to enhance adaptive capacity and promote biodiversity conservation and improved management are adequately described.

Component 1 will support the integration of climate change adaptation and biodiversity conservation in national strategies while examining the needs of the fisheries and aquaculture sectors; mapping of climate risks and assessment of vulnerabilities for fisheries/aquaculture; more effective use of data; and collaborative management of CCA and BD institutional mechanisms.

Component 2 will focus on capacity building, including transfer of adaptation technology and practices in the fisheries/aquaculture sectors. Technologies will include safer vessel design with improved communications equipment (to improve fishers' safety during storms); improved and diversified fishing gear to target a wider range of species and conditions; improved (drought resilient) design of aquaculture ponds. The component will also support measures to conserve aquatic biodiversity.

Component 3 will focus on building institutional capacities, and support project monitoring as well as communications activities.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes.

Agency Response**5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

FI, 4/17/2019:

Yes. The project's approach to deliver CCA as well as BD benefits through a combination of institutional, capacity, participatory management and investment measures is clear. Existing initiatives in the fishery/aquaculture sectors do not address CCA and BD considerations.

Agency Response**6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

FI, 5/3/2019:

Cleared. The number of proposed direct beneficiaries has been revised.

FI, 5/2/2019:

Not yet. The proposed number of direct beneficiaries is low. Please revise this figure, or provide an explanation.

4/26/2019:

Pending submission of CCA core indicator targets.

FI, 4/17/2019:

Review comment for this item is pending submission of CCA Core Indicator information.

Agency Response The number of beneficiaries has been recalculated to 36560 persons (50% women) and the CCA Core Indicator sheet, and relevant sections in PIF have been updated.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 4/26/2019:

Cleared.

FI, 4/16/2019:

Innovation: Yes. For Timor Leste, this project is innovative in terms of its biodiversity mainstreaming aspect as well as due to the technologies it will introduce in the fisheries/aquaculture sectors to enhance climate resilience, such as technical advances in harvest as well as post-harvest processes.

Sustainability:

Further information is requested.

The project is expected to be sustainable as it works with existing government structures and will focus on building the capacity of stakeholders and local level institutions. However:

- please comment on the expected sustainability of of the collaborative CCA-BD initiatives that will be supported by the project;
- please discuss whether fisherfolk need to contribute financially (or in-kind) to receive the adaptation technologies;

- how will operations and maintenance be supported, e.g., if a device malfunctions on a fishing vessel?
- will community members that are engaged in the monitoring activities be provided literacy skills? how will their capacity be built beyond the project?

Scale up: Yes, scale up is expected both through institutional capacity strengthening as well as through local uptake by other communities.

Agency Response

The project is expected to be sustainable as it works with existing government structures and will focus on building the capacity of stakeholders and local level institutions. However:

- please comment on the expected sustainability of the collaborative CCA-BD initiatives that will be supported by the project;

Sustainability will be ensured through working within current structures and programmes and building the capacity of stakeholders and institutions at local and national level. Project activities will be up-scaled through integration with the national development programmes implemented by NGO/CSO, government and partner agencies. A focus on technical capacity support at this stage is a critical foundation for future up-scaling of the work.

- please discuss whether fisherfolk need to contribute financially (or in-kind) to receive the adaptation technologies;

The communities, fisherfolk and fish farmers will contribute their time (in kind) to participate in the project activities and training. It is not foreseen that during the initial piloting of the technologies that they will need to contribute financially.

- how will operations and maintenance be supported, e.g., if a device malfunctions on a fishing vessel?

The types of technology and approaches that will be proposed will be suited to adoption by small scale fishers and fish farmers and are low maintenance and repair. Stakeholders will benefit from training in the sustainable management and use of any equipment provided. In addition, adoption of co-management groups for fisheries and clusters for fish farmers means that they were able to support each other.

- will community members that are engaged in the monitoring activities be provided literacy skills? how will their capacity be built beyond the project?

Yes, community members involved in monitoring activities will have the opportunity to improve literacy and numeracy skills. A capacity needs assessment will be undertaken for all participants including community members. Training and interventions will be targeted initially to existing literacy and numeracy levels but will be strengthened according to need. The project will very much adopt group training and action approaches which greatly increases the likelihood of continuity of group action following project implementation. Training of District fisheries officers, extension officers and local NGO staff in facilitation skills (and training of training for service providers) will ensure capacity to support the groups remains within local institutions.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 4/26/2019:

Yes for PIF stage. Cleared.

FI, 4/16/2019:

Please provide information on the localities or districts where the project will be implemented. Which areas are being considered, and what are their characteristics?

By CEO Endorsement:

Please provide coordinates of the project's location.

Agency Response

A georeferenced map is attached as separate file on Documents section.

The provisional Municipalities (Districts) are below. 7 Will be selected from this list during PPG and once a better understanding

- 1) Bobanaro
- 2) Dili (Atauro island)
- 3) Covalima
- 4) Liquica
- 5) Oecusse
- 6) BauCau
- 7) Lautem

8) Manatuto

The text has been adjusted to include brief descriptions of these Districts.

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 4/26/2019:

Cleared. A table summarizing the consultations that have taken place has been provided. Women's groups will be consulted during project preparation.

FI, 4/16/2019:

Further information is requested. A table of potential stakeholders has been included. The agency is requested to also discuss whether any stakeholder consultations have already taken place, and, if so, with whom. Will women's groups also be consulted? if such consultations have not yet occurred, please outline a stakeholder consultation plan.

Agency Response

Yes, stakeholder consultation has been undertaken as part of the PIF design. Consultations have been undertaken with government officials from the involved ministries and departments, NGO's, Universities, donors and research organizations. Community groups have been consulted also.

FAO will follow its guidance on stakeholder consultation for project development and this will include full consultation with communities and women's groups during project document preparation. Consultations with women's groups and the development of gender specific and sensitive implementations will be undertaken in a participatory manner.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 5/3/2019:

Cleared

FI, 5/2/2019:

Please see comment of 5/2 for item 6 of Part II.

FI, 4/26/2019:

Not yet. CCA indicators and Metadata have not yet been submitted, nor have the Gender checkboxes in the Portal template been selected.

FI, 4/16/2019:

Further information is requested. The PIF states that the project will explore how to raise the profile of women, who are currently "invisible" in the fisheries sector, will address gender issues throughout the project cycle, include gender-sensitive planning and interventions, and develop gender-sensitive indicators and targets. However, the measures listed appear to fall short of pro-actively seeking to empower and benefit women. The agency is requested to consider project activities that will specifically address their vulnerabilities, and empower them in terms of resources, skills and knowledge. Also:

- 1) The agency is required to submit sex-disaggregated Core Indicators for the LDCF at PIF stage.
- 2) The agency is requested to please also respond yes/no to the mandatory questions relating to gender mainstreaming in the relevant section of the Portal template.

Agency Response

CCA Indicators and metadata have been included in Document section. Gender check boxes have been selected.

The agency is requested to consider project activities that will specifically address their vulnerabilities, and empower them in terms of resources, skills and knowledge.

This is agreed and will be done. FAO has worked with the government of Timor-Leste (under the RFLP programme) in the development of guidance applicable to the integration of gender into programming for the fisheries and aquaculture sector. The lessons from this work in Timor-Leste will ensure gender issues can be addressed throughout the project cycle. Specific lessons generated by the RFLP program in Timor-Leste include; documentation of the traditional resource management practices of women known as Tara Bandu, the inclusion of women through participation in resource management planning and the active inclusion of women's representatives in co-management groups.

Building on the existing good practice developed in Timor-Leste, the project will include gender sensitive planning and interventions, and specific activities in this regard will be mainstreamed throughout the project design (e.g. gender specific vulnerability assessment and capacity development planning, and gender sensitive and balanced pilot interventions). Specific gender sensitive indicators and targets will be developed during the project inception and preparation phase. Such a gender focused approach will help empower gender balanced development in the sector, critical for long-term climate resilience, and will generate important adaptation learning which can be further integrated and addressed through the national planning processes in Timor-Leste.

) The agency is required to submit sex-disaggregated Core Indicators for the LDCF at PIF stage

This has been provided.

2) The agency is requested to please also respond yes/no to the mandatory questions relating to gender mainstreaming in the relevant section of the Portal template.

This has been done.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 4/16/2019:

Yes. The project will engage the private sector through its focus on improving the livelihoods of smallscale, private fisheries and aquaculture operators, who also undertake processing and trading. The (private fisheries) sector is fragmented and lack organization. Some tourism companies may be involved in MPA planning aspects.

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SW 4/29/2019

Cleared.

SW, 4/16/2019:

1) Aquaculture and FADs: If poorly implemented, both of these can have serious negative impacts on biodiversity. The project doesn't discuss this and how it will assess and address this risk.

2) Given the frequent changing of roles and positions within the Ministries, how will capacity building efforts be designed to account for this risk?

3) At CEO Endorsement, please provide more details on how the project will actually change perceptions about the role of women in fisheries and more broadly. Awareness raising is likely insufficient.

Agency Response

1) Aquaculture and FADs: If poorly implemented, both of these can have serious negative impacts on biodiversity. The project doesn't discuss this and how it will assess and address this risk.

Agreed and FAO recognizes this as a very important consideration. These options will only be considered should implementation be appropriate and if this can be done in a sustainable manner. FAO has developed guidance to ensure that these interventions are implemented in a sustainable way and do not impact biodiversity. The focus of the project is on small scale aquaculture groups and household level production for consumption local.

2) Given the frequent changing of roles and positions within the Ministries, how will capacity building efforts be designed to account for this risk?

DB: Capacity building will be undertaken with a wide range of staff and external stakeholders. Training of trainers will also be undertaken to ensure that capacity to train is retained. The new Fisheries Training institute and existing universities will be central to the training effort ensuring that expertise is retained outside of the ministries.

3) At CEO Endorsement, please provide more details on how the project will actually change perceptions about the role of women in fisheries and more broadly. Awareness raising is likely insufficient.

Agreed and this will be provided.

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral**

initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 4/26/2019:

Thank you. Cleared.

SW, 4/16/2019:

Please discuss further the agency's presence on the ground in Timor Leste and how it will be able to support and oversee the implementation of this project.

FI, 4/17/2019:

The project will establish or strengthen joint CCA-BD bodies or centers. Please discuss how such collaborative institutional arrangements will sustain.

Agency Response

Please discuss further the agency's presence on the ground in Timor Leste and how it will be able to support and oversee the implementation of this project:

FAO has been working in Timor-Leste since 1999 and has a permanent office based in the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAF) in Dili. Among all the UN Agencies working in the country, FAO is the only agency that is hosted by the government outside the UN premises. Timor Leste is an active member of FAO. The FAO office in Timor Leste is fully staffed and has an FAO Representative (shared with the Indonesia office), an Assistant FAO representative, admin, operational and support staff. The office is also has technical and operational support from the FAO regional office in Bangkok and FAO HQ in Rome. FAO in Timor Leste works through its country program framework which is aligned to the National policy (and part of UNDAF). FAO enjoys a very close collaboration and good partnership with the different technical offices of the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries. The FAO team in Timor Leste is very capable of implementing projects (including GEF). FAO currently has 14 projects under implementation with a strong pipeline. These projects cover a broad range of support under three priority areas.

Priority Area 1. Support to improvement of institutions and coordination mechanisms for policies, laws and regulations and programmes and plans to ensure 100% equitable year-round access to adequate, nutritious and affordable food for all

Priority Area 2. Support to first Timor-Leste agriculture census and enhanced capacity for statistics, information and knowledge management systems for agriculture sector and food and nutrition security.

Priority Area 3. Support to improved farming livelihoods, food availability and diversity of household diets through increased productivity and production and consumption of under-utilised food crops.

Priority Area 4. Support to smallholder fishing and aquaculture households to become more resilient in the face of climate change and to sustainably improve their livelihoods and free themselves from hunger and malnutrition.

Priority Area 5. Support to renewal, realignment and development of Timor-Leste's cash crop economy, particularly the coconut industry and the coffee industry

FI, 4/17/2019:

The project will establish or strengthen joint CCA-BD bodies or centers. Please discuss how such collaborative institutional arrangements will sustain.

Through donor support the government of Timor Leste has already established a National Biodiversity and Climate Change Centre (NBCCC) in Dili. During PIF consultations the government expressed their wish to sustain this center in the long run. The two government Ministries involved in this project (MAF (NDFA) and MEIC) proposed that wherever possible the project coordinate and collaborate the center. The center recognize that it faces challenges in terms of funding and staffing.

Output 1.5 in the PIF outlines the proposed main areas of collaboration with the center which will relate to the fisheries and aquaculture sectors, climate change and biodiversity. The project support the center and to the Universities to strengthen capacity (in for example teaching, research, data sharing , monitoring and reporting) and to develop linkages and networks will remain with the stakeholders after project closure.

Detailed background on how the project will work with the center will be developed during project document formulation.

The relevant section in the project document with revision to show that the centre is developed is below.

Output 1.5. National Biodiversity and Climate Change Centre (NBCCC) strengthened through support from NDFA and sector on issues related to fisheries and aquaculture: The proposed LDCF/BD project will work closely with ~~the development of the new~~ NBCCC on areas related to fisheries and aquaculture and climate change. It is foreseen that NDFA staff will benefit through training and capacity building from the centre but also that NDFA will contribute data and information from the sector to the NBCCC in order to inform national policy making.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes. The project is aligned with Timor Leste's NAPA, as well as its Strategic Development Plan 2011-2030. It is also aligned with Timor Leste's NBSAP.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 4/26/2019:

Cleared.

FI, 4/17/2019:

The PIF mentions that communications with fishing communities is difficult and this poses a barrier to informing them of new technologies available. Please confirm that the project will include in its KM plan long-term measures to improve communication with fisherfolk in the Sucos.

Agency Response

Yes, the KM plan will aim to improve communication at all levels and especially so in the Sucos.

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes. A letter of endorsement from Mr. Soares, OFP of Timor Leste, has been submitted.

Agency Response**EFSEC DECISION****RECOMMENDATION**

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

5/7/2019:

Yes.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

- 1) At CEO Endorsement please include time to test and revise communications strategies.
- 2) Please provide more details on how the project will actually change perceptions about the role of women in fisheries and more broadly. Awareness raising is likely insufficient.
- 3) Please clearly identify the additional climate resilience benefit of the proposed activities, given that the LDCF resources are not intended to enhance resilience generally but to the adverse impacts of climate change (including increased variability).
- 4) Please provide more recent climate change projections for Timor Leste, if available.
- 5) Please discuss institutional measures to enable closer CCA-BD linkages in the country.
- 6) Please ensure that the direct beneficiaries for the LDCF and BD are properly estimated for each Fund, and please try to avoid double-counting.

View Dates

| | PIF Review | Agency Response |
|----------------------------------|------------|-----------------|
| First Review | 4/17/2019 | 4/26/2019 |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 4/26/2019 | 5/1/2019 |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 5/2/2019 | 5/3/2019 |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 5/3/2019 | 5/7/2019 |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 5/6/2019 | |