



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

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|----------------------|
| GEF ID: | 9692 | | |
| Country/Region: | Madagascar | | |
| Project Title: | Second South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Governance and Shared Growth Project (SWIOFish2) | | |
| GEF Agency: | World Bank | GEF Agency Project ID: | 159562 (World Bank) |
| 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: | | Project Grant: | \$6,422,018 |
| Co-financing: | \$83,729,400 | Total Project Cost: | \$90,151,418 |
| PIF Approval: | | Council Approval/Expected: | |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | Astrid Hillers | Agency Contact Person: | Karin Shepardson |

| 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 | | |
| | 2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions? | | |
| Project Design | 3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and | | |

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)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|----------------------------------|---|---------------------|-----------------|
| | innovation? | | |
| | 4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning? | | |
| | 5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs? | | |
| | 6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered? | | |
| Availability of Resources | 7. 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 equitable access | | |
| | • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? | | |
| | • Focal area set-aside? | | |
| Recommendations | 8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified? | | |
| Review Date | Review | | |
| | 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 national/regional plans in the country or in the region? | | |
| | 9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that | | |

CEO endorsement Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement | Response to Secretariat comments |
|-------------------------|---|--|----------------------------------|
| | 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? | <p>December 6th: Comments sent via email on Dec. 6 and are filed in PMIS. The overall/main comments have been incorporated in the WB response matrix for the World Bank ROC meeting.</p> <p>(Jan. 23, 2017) Comments have been addressed in the revised PAD and project documentation. The project is recommended for endorsement.</p> | |
| Review Date | Review | December 06, 2016 | |
| | Additional Review (as necessary) | January 23, 2017 | |
| | 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.