



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

GEF ID:	9940		
Country/Region:	Regional (Cabo Verde, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Morocco, Senegal)		
Project Title:	Towards Sustainable Management of the Canary Current Large Marine Ecosystem (CCLME) – Initial Support to SAP Implementation		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-1 Program 1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$1,826,000
Co-financing:	\$6,600,000	Total Project Cost:	\$8,426,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Cyrille Barnerias	Agency Contact Person:	Merete Tandstad

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>	2017-10-23  - Yes, the project is aligned with IW Program 1 (foster cooperation for sustainable use of transboundary water systems) in particular through components 1 and 2. A short paragraph highlighting the alignment would still be appreciated.  2018-01-08	

<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>- Thank you for your response in the review sheet. Please insert the paragraph in the document or indicate where it has been added.</p> <p>2018-02-15 - Yes, comment addressed</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>2017-10-23</p> <p>- yes, the project shows the consistency with the national priorities.</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?	<p>2017-10-24</p> <p>- Yes, the drivers of global environmental degradation are well detailed. Regarding the nature of the project, issues of sustainability, scaling-up and innovation can be considered as sufficiently detailed.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>2017-10-24</p> <p>- Yes, the document explains the incremental reasoning of building mechanisms to bring the existing relevant institutions and partners together to ensure the implementation of the Strategic Action Programme that was agreed among the CCLME countries.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate	<p>2017-11-01</p>	

<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>- Component 1:</p> <p>- The TDA identified the need for action on three fronts (i) fisheries and marine living resources (ii) halting or reversing degradation of critical habitats, and (iii) water quality. The project seems to be too exclusively focused on the fisheries aspects with less attention than expected showing to cross-sectoral involvement on the latter two areas of concern. While the MSP has limited resources, it could be instrumental to advance SAP investments concepts to a more fundable/pre-investment level. Could you please explicit more how this project will prepare the ground for a whole SAP implementation.</p> <p>- In order to advance a maximum on the governance framework and mechanism, it could be interesting, if feasible, that the project would go as far as to propose mandates (incl. delineating these from e.g. regional fisheries organizations) and Terms of References for all three 'bodies' proposed (CCC, RSC and RCU), and clarify how these will function – incl. their composition (and maybe bringing nominations at the end of the project) . If some of these elements could be covered by the project,</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>please explicit them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- On the same order of ideas, it would be a real plus if the project could support the setting of a lean version of the RCU and build its capacity to manage funds, and monitor activities (latter is mentioned already). If possible, during PPG prepare TORs and financing models for the RCU as well as propose criteria for the location of the RCU and agree on this with the countries.</li> <li>- Ecosystems valuation: Could you please detail how the project could usefully help to take into account valuation of ecosystem services to leverage finance on priority SAP investments. Ecosystems values e.g. of mangroves and seagrass beds are highlighted in the SAP, but there is little solid information on their economic values for specific geographies in the CCLME region. Similarly, the costs of pollution to the use of the coast (incl. tourism and fish catch) would be worth to quantify.</li> <li>- on page 15, could you please expand a little bit on the plan for the dialogue to agreed investments and financing mechanism with some hints on the possible funders (bi- and multi-</li> </ul>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>laterals, governments (national and local, incl. municipal; and private sector entities).</p> <p>- The intention to build up a partnership for SAP implementation across sectors and countries is excellent. For now there seems to be no separation between players in the countries and funding/development partners (Outcome 1.1). It may be on purpose, but that would be worth explicating.</p> <p>- The project is mentioning the establishment of working groups across countries to detail various action needs. So far this seems to be limited to ecosystem working groups, yet it could be worth to consider also including other threats to improve coastal planning and ameliorate coastal pollution.</p> <p>2018-01-09</p> <p>- Some comments were addressed.</p> <p>- We still have two main overall comments:</p> <p>1) we would appreciate if you could show more in the PIF on how the project will support all SAP priorities than "just" fisheries.</p> <p>2) Could you also make sure</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>that all partnerships or mechanisms that the project will support are sufficiently defined in the PIF?</p> <p>- Could you please narrow the project objective in table B, ideally in one sentence?</p> <p>- To what kind of agreement and on what will lead component 1?</p> <p>- For outcome 1.1, could you please clarify the kind of partnership targeted? Will it be between countries or other partners (donors)? Of course we hope it will be both but we think this should be made clearer in the PIF.</p> <p>- For output 1.1.2 Could you give us more details of what the project envision? Could a pledging conference (on all SAP priorities areas) be specified as an output?</p> <p>- As output 1.1.3 refers to NAPs, we think it would be good to detail some of the priorities for example in the part 6 on national priorities.</p> <p>2018-02-15 - Yes.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs	<p>2017-11-01</p> <p>- No, please address following</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	considered?	<p>comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please tick one of the boxes regarding indigenous people on page 18.</li> <li>- Gender consideration is not shown in the components or background. In addition to the gender representation mentioned (part 3, page 22), could the component 3 (in particular outputs 3.12 and 3.13) be used as a platform to also add elements of gender considerations in the capacity building programs of fisheries institutions and communities? Because, they are not part of the future decision making, women will anyway be impacted by the choices that will be made while incorporating EAF. We also expect a gender inclusion plan for PPG phase.</li> </ul> <p>2018-01-08 -comments addressed. Yes.</p>	
<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>	<p>2017-10-23</p> <p>- Yes</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDCF under the principle of</li> </ul>		

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	equitable access		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> <li>• Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>2017-11-01</p> <p>- No. Please address previous and following comments.</p> <p>- Please delete Mauritania from the list of countries (first table of PIF) if not endorsed yet; and note in footnote that they are expected to come on board during PPG (unless you get LOE by next submission)</p> <p>- Please indicate the executing partners in the first table. They could be such as CECAF or other RFMO bodies such as SRFC (on fisheries), PRCM or other on coastal zone management and please explain in text how far national ministries will be part of execution and if yes, which. Please note that implementing and executing agencies cannot be mixed – see GEF policy/Council paper GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01 IV page 37.</p> <p>- Could you also please explain how the project target of 0.05% to 1% of fisheries by volume on table F has been calculated and what support the important span between the two</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>estimates (with a ratio of 20 between both percentages)?</p> <p>- On page 19, you indicate that the "project will dedicate up to 1% of its operational budget to participating in GEF IW: LEARN and IW:LME activities". We appreciate your commitment. Nevertheless, would it be possible to replace "up to", by "at least"?</p> <p>2018-01-08                      - thank you for this updated version. A few comments remain to be addressed.</p> <p>- Regarding the executing partners, will the CECAF have a scope broad enough to embrace all thematic areas to properly prepare for a comprehensive SAP implementation. CECAF area of work is fisheries and it may be difficult for CECAF to prepare the ground for investments on the other SAP priorities. Would it be possible to explain in the PIF the articulation with Abidjan convention?</p> <p>- Regarding the baseline, we note a good list of regional projects (which could be completed by the WACA project led by World Bank and also co-financed by GEF). We would</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>appreciate if you could make sure to add to the list the relevant national initiatives and bilateral projects.</p> <p>- On page 10, the PIF refers to the table 3 as a list of key fisheries organizations ... Is it table 1? If yes, it is also mainly focused on fisheries bodies and would benefit from a broader perspective including stakeholders working on other issues.</p> <p>2018-02-15</p> <p>- Yes, the PIF is recommended for clearance.</p> <p>- We appreciate the aim of this MSP to prepare and hold a donor conference to leverage funds for a full SAP implementation across key issues of coastal erosion and habitats degradation, fisheries, and pollution incl. from cities and extractive activities as identified in the SAP. Full SAP implementation clearly will require cooperation and co-finance by a number of agencies and development partners.</p> <p>- By CEO endorsement, please assure that the donors' conference identified will be budgeted. We also strongly encourage to have it spelled out in output 1.1.2.</p> <p>- The PIF states (page 15) that the MSP will work on all SAP priorities</p>	

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
		to some degree. Component 1 and outcome 1.1 refer to the SAP implementation. We understand that it is implicitly a "full" SAP implementation but would prefer to have it spelled out at CEO Endorsement.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	November 01, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	January 08, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 15, 2018	

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<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?		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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?		
	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		

<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.

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEF Council</li> <li>• Convention Secretariat</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		