

West Africa Regional Fisheries Program Phase 2

Edit and Submit CEO Endorsement

Basic project information

GEF ID

9797

Countries

Regional (Cabo Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Senegal, Gambia)

Project Name

West Africa Regional Fisheries Program Phase 2

Agencies

World Bank

Date received by PM

11/27/2018

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Astrid Hillers

Focal Area

International Waters

Project Type

FSP

PIF ☐**CEO Endorsement** ☐**Project Design and Financing**

1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

(12/12/2018) The draft document is aligned with what was presented at PIF stage.

Please in the re-submission for clarity and transparency add a comparison on how the corporate indicators at PIF and endorsement stage compare and how they were calculated. Thank you.

Response to Secretariat comments

2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

(12/12/2018)

The project design is aligned with the well structure phased approach of the West Africa Fisheries program. The design of the program for each country builds on lessons of previous phases (for Cabo Verde, Guinea-Bissau, and Senegal and/or country situation and readiness for Gambia which is entering WARFP).

The program and each country specific circumstances, progress and challenges are clearly laid out and the project design for each country and regional support to the regional fisheries organisation, CRSP, well laid out.

Please in the re-submission, address:

1. Rio Markers: Please let us know if portal issues prevail to set a Rio Marker to "Zero" when resubmitting (Rio Marker for Mitigation in this case).
2. As discussed, please add a couple of footnotes in the Results Framework to clarify the meaning/scope of measures e.g. figures for "vessels inspected on behalf of other countries": these numbers by itself would seem low, yet knowing that these in fact refer to cases where one country asks another for inspection of vessels and legal action is a rare event. Same for a few other variables as discussed (e.g. community led fisheries management systems in fact refer to # of fisheries addressed and not # of communities). Besides these few points, the results framework is very well laid out and targets are realistic and adequate (no changes requested).
3. Please note the CRSP dashboard did not load/did not function at the time of the review. Please address with the client.
4. Thank you for pointing to the additional work ongoing and mentioned already in the PAD on anticipated impacts of climate change on fisheries mentioned in the PAD. We will be curious to see these studies whenever ready to share as it will be informative across the GEF portfolio in Africa.
5. We welcome the reference and continued commitment to active participation in IW-learn via participation in regional and global meetings, but also a project website and providing two 'experience notes' over the lifetime of the project.

Overall the project design appears very thorough and the long term approach of the overall program is well appreciated.

Response to Secretariat comments

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

(12/12/2018)

Yes the finance is adequate and well laid in a structured a logical phased approach. Cleared.

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)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

(12/12/2018) yes, risks , including the risks of climate change, including sea level rise, salinisation, and fish migration are laid out and addressed in the project design.

Please fill in some text/ a short (!) summary in section A.5 of the endorsement request.

Response to Secretariat comments

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement (12/12/2018) Co-finance is assured via blending with IDA resources. Country-co-finance will be assured within the overall WB negotiation and Board package. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

(12/12/2018)

The project was submitted after June 30th and is reporting on the corporate indicators (see first comment to please compare PIF and endorsement stage). No tracking tools required. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement N/A

Response to Secretariat comments

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

(12/12/2018)

Yes, the project design has been consciously taking account of ongoing, most relevant initiatives and those under development.

We note and welcome the cooperation with CFI and other initiatives (AFDB/FAO Blue Economy, WACA and other). Please ensure that the PMU and teams on the ground continue this cooperation as both this project and these other initiatives develop and are implemented.

Please fill in some text/ a short (!) summary on "institutional arrangements/coordination" in **section A.6** of the endorsement request.

Response to Secretariat comments

9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement (12/12/2018) Yes, the M& E plans is clearly laid out and budgeted. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

(12/12/2018)

Yes, the project and program design is consciously building in knowledge capture. This includes e.g. exchange across countries to learn from experiences as well as building the phased program on lessons and experiences from the previous interventions in each country.

The project will also actively continue to participate in IW-LEARN activities. Please indicate clearly that at least 1 % of the grant resources are budgeted for this (incl. participation at IW global and relevant regional meetings; website and two experience notes.)

Please fill in some text/ a short (!) summary in section A.8 of the endorsement request.

Response to Secretariat comments**Agency Responses**

11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:

GEFSEC**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

(12/12/2018)

Yes, comments with e.g. regard to gender, coordination with other initiatives, and GEB calculations have been addressed. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

STAP

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

(12/12/2018)

Yes, comments have been addressed in the agency response matrix and incorporated into the project design. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Council

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

(12/12/2018)

Yes, comments by the U.S. and Germany Council members have been addressed in the matrix.

Please assure - as mentioned already under question 2 above - that the reason for the non-functioning of the dash-board at times are analyzed and permanently addressed (see also U.S. comments).

Response to Secretariat comments

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement N/A

Response to Secretariat comments
Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

(12/12/2018) Thank you for the submission of a very well designed and detailed draft project document.

Please address the few remaining comments and also fill in respective short summaries for sections A.5 to A.8 of the endorsement request in the Portal and resubmit. We are looking forward to receiving the final decision meeting package when ready. From our side there will do not see a need for another pre-decision meeting unless the team prefers to have another meeting at that time (before the Decision meeting which GEFSec will attend).

Response to Secretariat comments
Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		