



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR PROGRAMMATIC FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	9433		
Country/Region:	Madagascar		
Program Title:	Sustainable Management of Madagascar's Marine Resources		
GEF Agency:	WWF-US and World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	153370 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-3 Program 7; BD-1 Program 1; BD-1 Program 2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Program Grant:	\$12,706,422
Co-financing:	\$39,962,250	Total Program Cost:	\$52,668,672
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
Program Manager:	Astrid Hillers	Agency Contact Person:	Herve Lefevre

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Program Consistency	1. Is the program aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	<p>3-18-16</p> <p>For IW:</p> <p>The program is aligned with the IW strategy given that it is part of a SOP which includes regional and national activities, involves relevant regional institutions (incl. IOTC and SWIOFC) and is related to the WIO SAP. The IW funded child project supports regional coordination among SWIO countries and national actions in Madagascar (through GEF and co-finance).</p>	

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)?

		<p>For BD: The program is in line with the Biodiversity Objective 1, Programs 1 and 2, Aichi Target 11.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
Program Design	<p>2. Is the description of the baseline scenario reliable, and based on sound data and assumptions? Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>3-18-16</p> <p>The "Baseline project", that is, the projects on which the GEF investments will build on and that will take place whether or not the GEF project gets funded, is clear for the IW project (i.e. World Bank Loan). Nevertheless, it is not clear what is the "Baseline project" for the MPA project. Please clarify.</p> <p>Once the Baseline project is clarified, the incremental reasoning should be easier to describe. Please be more distinct in the text where you describe the 'without project alternative' and where you describe the future situation achieved through GEF incremental finance. As written the reader can get somewhat confused between these two scenarios.</p> <p>3-29-16 Cleared .</p>	
	<p>3. Is the program framework (Table B) sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve program objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>3-18-16</p> <p>1. Please explain why output 1 b is not allocated a finance amount in table B.</p> <p>3-29-16 Addressed in agency response matrix and in resubmission.</p> <p>2. Table B and moreover the text of the</p>	

	<p>PFD needs to better represent the integration of the two projects into the program. While the two project concepts initially came up separately, all actors agreed that the coordination among the MPA and sustainable fisheries initiatives is providing substantially better impact than two uncoordinated efforts. Along the same logic the coordination and cooperation between the two ministries is important to implement a consistent and integrated set of measures. Currently, the program is not well enough presented as a coordinated whole and rather as 'child project synergies'. Please enhance the program logic - please also see comment under # 8.</p> <p>3-29-16 Addressed in agency response matrix and in resubmission.</p> <p>3. There are too many acronyms. Please create a table with the meaning of the acronyms and spell them out when used for the first time in the text. Please also spell them out in Table B.</p> <p>3-29-16 Addressed in agency response matrix and in resubmission.</p> <p>4. The MPA project aims at increasing the MPA coverage from 0.8 million ha. to 2.5 million ha. during a period of only 2.5 years. The budget for this component in the MPS child project is \$3.1 M. Based on this, the project is overpromising and likely to under deliver. The target becomes even harder to achieve when</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>these additional 1.7 million are not in the same location. Indeed, there are already 4 target regions that have been identified as priorities; Antongil Bay, The northwest including Ambaro Bay, Barren Islands and central western coastal areas and The southwest.</p> <p>3-29-16 Addressed/Cleared.</p> <p>5. When selecting the geographies for the new MPAs, please ensure that these are considered "Key Biodiversity Areas" (KBAs). This is a critical filter for the GEF to consider supporting the creation of new PAs. Include text in the PFD making reference to the KBAs as a selection criteria.</p> <p>3-29-16 Addressed in agency response matrix and in resubmission.</p> <p>6. Please elaborate on Component 3. Sustainable Funding Strategies. Although it is clear what the project wants to do, it is not clear how this can be achieved. If there is no clarity on how this will be done, it is very unlikely that this will be achieved, specially considering all the previous efforts made in Madagascar on this front.</p> <p>3-29-16 Addressed in resubmission.</p> <p>7. The co-financing \$ figures do not add-up (in table B). Please check all \$ figures</p>	
--	---	--

		<p>ensuring that they are all OK. 3-29-16 Pending financial review/clearance.</p>	
	<p>4. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>3-18-16</p> <p>There is a summary of the socio-economic benefits included in the PFD. Please elaborate on these benefits and in detail during the development of the child projects.</p> <p>Please elaborate on the gender dimensions in more detail in the social assessment during child project development, and findings translated into the project design.</p> <p>3-29-16 Cleared at PFD stage. To be addressed within child project development.</p>	
	<p>5. Does the program 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)</p>	<p>3-18-16</p> <p>The program takes into account major risk and mitigation measures. The program and child project design needs to address relevant impacts of climate change and support measures to enhance climate resilience. While mentioned to some level in the PFD, please confirm that child project development will address relevant key climate risks.</p> <p>3-29-16 Addressed in agency response matrix and in resubmission of PFD. Detailed assessment of CC impacts need to be carried out in the development of child projects and measures supported to enhance resilience. Please address before submission for endorsement.</p>	

	6. If there is a non-grant instrument in the program, is the GEF Agency(ies) capable of managing it?	N/A.	
	7. Is the program coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	<p>3-18-16</p> <p>The program mentions coordination with a number of MPA and LME related projects. On the LME side this include the ASCLME SAP implementation project ("Sapphire") and this is mentioned. Please also include reference to the SAP priority areas addressed by the proposed project.</p> <p>Please also mention coordination with the WIOSAP project as issues of pollution and coastal degradation addressed by WIOSAP are essential to be addressed in assuring sustainable fisheries which is noted in the PFD.</p> <p>The ASCLME ("SAPPHIRE") project (UNDP), the WIOSAP project (UNEP) and the SWIOFish (WB) projects form a family of projects in support of addressing priority actions in the WIO region and support to the WIO Strategic Action Program/WIOSAP implementation.</p> <p>3-29-16</p> <p>Addressed in agency response matrix and in resubmission. This is sufficiently addressed at PFD stage.</p> <p>During child project development/design details of how to operationalize ongoing/regular coordination mechanisms need to be outlined between</p>	

		the proposed child projects under this PFD and the regional GEF funded LME ("SAPPHIRE"/ASCLME; UNDP as GEF agency) and the regional coastal WIOSAP project (UNEP as GEF agency) and coordination of the two proposed child projects and other ongoing initiatives on national level.	
	8. Is the program implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>3-18-16 The program will be implemented through coordinated efforts and PIUs lead by the two ministries. In the program structure diagram it is not very clear how coordination will be assured especially in the areas of geographical overlap where the two child projects will work with many similar/same actors. Please expand on this in the PFD and explain how this will be further developed during child project design.</p> <p>3-29-16 Addressed in agency response matrix and in resubmission.</p>	
	9. Does the program include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	<p>3-18-16 No. There is no program level M&E plan and indicators and targets. While component 4 is supporting 'cohesion and coordination', there is not clear overall program level M&E plan aggregating program level key results and overall targets.</p> <p>The results chain analysis diagram is a good start aiming to depict the results logic on what leads to what/Theory of Change, but needs more work to make that clear. for example: the 'effective management of MPAs and LMMAs"</p>	

		<p>seems to not lead to anything and appears stuck in the middle of the diagram and not relating to four higher level outcomes on the right.</p> <p>Please address.</p> <p>3-29-16 Addressed in agency response matrix and in resubmission. An overall budget has been set aside for M&E and expected program deliverables been provided.</p> <p>During child project design/by endorsement: Please provide a clearer common program level results framework and child project level results frameworks including detailed M&E plans.</p>	
	10. Does the program have description of knowledge management plan?	<p>3-18-16 Yes. The PFD outlines knowledge management efforts.</p> <p>Please make sure at submission for endorsement that of the IW grant 1 % is allocated to participation in IW-Learn, including formulation of a minimum of 2 experience notes, establishment of a website, and participation at IW conferences.</p> <p>3-29-16 Cleared at PFD level. Please note comment above when submitting for endorsement.</p>	
Resource Availability	11. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

	• the STAR allocation?	BD: yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	Please reduce the IW allocation to match (not exceed) the STAR allocation. 3-29-16 Addressed in agency response matrix and in resubmission.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
PFD Clearance	Is the PFD recommended for clearance to include in the work program?	3-18-16 No, the PFD is not yet recommended for work program inclusion. Please address comments above. Thanks. 3-29-16 The PFD is recommended for technical clearance and for inclusion in a future work program.	
Review Date (s)	Review*	March 19, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 29, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the program. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.