



Promoting sustainable fisheries management in the Red Sea Large Marine Ecosystem (RedSeaFish project)

Basic Information

GEF ID

11113

Countries

Regional (Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Jordan, Yemen)

Project Title

Promoting sustainable fisheries management in the Red Sea Large Marine Ecosystem (RedSeaFish project)

GEF Agency(ies)

FAO

Agency ID

FAO: 744425

GEF Focal Area(s)

International Waters

Program Manager

Leah Karrer

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

General Project Information / Eligibility

- a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?
- b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments (Karrer, April 17, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments - - -

Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments (Karrer, April 17, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments - - -

Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

(Karrer, May 8, 2023). Yes.

(Karrer, April 17, 2023). No.

Outcomes 3.1 and 3.2 seem very similar. Please combine or differentiate. Based on the outputs, Outcome 3.1 seems more focused on regulations and Outcome 3.2 seems more focused on resources and tools.

Outputs 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 also seem like they could be combined. And Output 3.2.3 seems like it could be included within Outputs 3.1.1 and 3.1.2. Spell out CMMs and HCRs.

Agency's Comments

Response FAO:

The wording of the two Outcomes under Component 3 has been revised to differentiate between them, to make clearer that Outcome 3.1 is focused on the design of regulations and the fisheries management framework (Fisheries Management Plans based on best practice and the regional guidance provided from Component 2), while Outcome 3.2 is focused on implementation and operationalization of the regulations and management framework through the improved tools outlined in the Outputs 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3 as well as based on the Outputs 1.1.3, 1.2.1 and 1.2.2. The revised Outcome 3.1 is 'National fisheries regulations and management frameworks aligned with EAF and sustainable fisheries best practices, and regional agreements on management of Red Sea fisheries' to reflect the focus of this outcome on project activities to strengthen the regulatory and management frameworks; and Outcome 3.2 now reads 'National fisheries agencies managing shared or priority Red Sea fisheries stocks, in line with agreed national and regional fisheries management measures and international best practice'.

Outputs 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 have been revised to clarify that they address distinct issues (3.1.1 focuses on regulations, and 3.1.2 focused on specific fisheries management plans). Output 3.2.3 has been revised to make clear that it addresses needs to operationalize co-management in shared fisheries in the Red Sea (while Outputs 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 address the need to include co-management in regulations and fisheries management plans).

The fisheries management acronyms 'CCM' and 'HCR' have been explained in the revised PIF (CCM = Conservation and Management Measures; HCR = Harvest Control Rules). However, the acronyms have been removed from Output 3.1.1 as they are included under the term 'technical measures', and don't need to be explicitly mentioned.

Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

(Karrer and Biro, May 8, 2023). Yes.

(Karrer and Biro, April 17, 2023). Yes.

(Biro) An overall approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been provided in the Project Description, including an Outreach and Awareness Raising Strategy and a digital KM platform. Project proposal includes KM and learning deliverables, including knowledge materials, online/virtual training events, knowledge sharing as well as awareness raising activities. Dissemination of outputs and results will be achieved through IW: Learn and other relevant online platforms. During PPG the proposed Outreach and Awareness-Raising Strategy could be expanded into a broader Communications Strategy.

(Karrer) During PPG these aspects will need much greater elaboration. Regarding KM, be sure to explain how the project will learn from other global initiatives and share experiences with them, including through relevant global institutions. For KM be sure to include not only webinars, but also in-person fora, meetings, workshops, as well as informal communication through a project listserve and other means (e.g. Facebook group, WhatsApp group).

Agency's Comments

Responses FAO:

Gender dimensions, KM and M&E will be much more developed during the PPG phase, including how the project will learn from other global initiatives and share experiences with them (for example, these include various opportunities through FAO fisheries programmes).

The GEFSEC's suggestion to include "in-person fora, meetings, workshops, as well as informal communication through a project listserve and other means (e.g. Facebook group, WhatsApp group)", has been added to the revised PIF.

In addition, as suggested by the PPO review, the initially proposed 'Outreach and Awareness-Raising Strategy' in the PIF has been rephrased as a broader 'Communications Strategy', and the wording of Output 4.1.1 in the PIF revised to reflect this.

- a) Are the components adequately funded?
- b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments (Karrer, April 17, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments - - -

4 Project Outline

. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

- a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?
- b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

(Karrer, May 8, 2023). Yes.

(Karrer, April 17, 2023). Yes; however, section A. ii. Underlying drivers... highlights increased demand for fish products and the poor socio-economic situation of local fishers (low fish prices, high operation costs, few livelihood alternatives) as key drivers of unsustainable fishing. Yet, these key drivers are not mentioned in the theory of change. Please explain or include for consistency.

Agency's Comments

Responses FAO:

The use of the word 'driver' in section A on 'underlying drivers' and in the section presenting the ToC may be a cause of some confusion/misunderstanding as the word 'driver' has different meanings in each section. In section A, the word 'driver' refers to factors that are causing or are sustaining the environmental problem (essentially over-fishing in the case of the RedSeaFish project). However, the use of the term 'driver' in the ToC section denotes significant external factors that can positively influence the direction of change along the project's causal pathways from project activities to outputs to outcomes to impacts (definition of the term is given in the footnote on page 17 of the PIF). Consequently, the term 'driver' in section A has been changed to 'root cause' to help differentiate and help avoid confusion between the two terms.

The two root causes ('drivers') mentioned by the GEFSEC reviewer above in section A, namely 'increased demand for fish products and the poor socio-economic situation of local fishers (low fish prices, high operation costs, few livelihood alternatives)' are not addressed directly by the project – there are no specific project activities to encourage people to avoid eating fish and look to alternative sources of animal protein (or become vegetarian), or measures to directly improve the socio-economic conditions of local fishers through efforts to manipulate markets to increase fish prices or argue for tax reliefs on fisher equipment to reduce operating costs; because:

- (i) Other initiatives by governments, donor agencies and civil society are seeking to address these;
- (ii) They are substantially beyond the scope and resources of the current project and its set of partners, and:
- (iii) Even if socio-economic conditions were achieved, improved management of the fish stocks by the fisheries agencies of the Red Sea would still be needed for sustainable fisheries (the activities proposed through the RedSeaFish project).

Instead, these two causes ('drivers') have been captured and reformulated as two additional assumptions in the Theory of Change which have been added to the text and graphic in the ToC section. These are that: (i) global demand for Red Sea fish and fish products can be controlled within sustainable limits (with for instance, other sources of fish e.g. through aquaculture, made available), and (ii) the general socio-economic conditions of Red Sea fishers can be improved and then maintained over the long-term. It should be noted that the last of these will be indirectly addressed through the project by ensuring the long-term existence of the fisheries resource that the fishers largely, or partly rely on for livelihoods.

It should be noted that root causes are analysed as part of the process of developing a project or programme Theory of Change (ToC) and, as mentioned, specific causes for the RedSeaFish project are identified and discussed in the section A. Information on root causes is not repeated later in the ToC section because: (i) presentations on Theory of Change do not usually present detail on root causes; and (ii) the ToC graphic is already crowded and focuses more on illustrating the linkages between project elements and their potential contributions to wider, longer-term outcomes, and there is insufficient space to include an additional row on root causes (although the barriers are included to show the direct linkage with project components).

JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

- a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**
- b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?**
- c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?**
- d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?**

Secretariat's Comments

(Karrer, May 8, 2023). Yes.

(Karrer & PPO, April 17, 2023). No. There is brief mention of the GEF/UNEP project in the same region led by UNEP and focused on fostering a blue economy, including addressing pollution and habitat destruction. Given the high relevance of these threats to fisheries sustainability, it is important that these projects closely collaborate. Please elaborate as to how these two projects will collaborate beyond the brief statement provided.

Regarding stakeholder engagement (Annex H), this Annex was in the PDF version posted in the Portal but not in the main Portal text consequently PPO did not review and will consider in next version. For the PIF focus seemed to have been on government agencies. During PPG there will need to be a much more exhaustive list of stakeholders, discussions with them, and then clear plans for inclusion in the project.

Agency's Comments

Responses FAO:

The RedSeaFish project was planned to be developed together with the UNEP-GEF HESBERSGA project (GEF ID 11050) and submitted jointly in 2022, and there were several meetings and discussions between FAO in Rome and UNEP in Nairobi during 2022 to develop the projects in parallel. However, due to discussions between the countries of the region on the proposals to establish a Regional Fisheries Management Organisation for the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden, the RedSeaFish PIF proposal was postponed until the following GEF submission.

During the PPG phase the FAO RedSeaFish project development team will work in close coordination with UNEP sharing information on the development of both projects and examining opportunities for mutual exchange and cooperation such as on technical workshops and capacity building events of common interest, knowledge management and exchange, and how each project can support delivery and promotion of results and further the impacts of the other. For instance, the HESBERSGA project will be invited to attend the Project Steering Committee meetings of the RedSeaFish project as an observer. It is expected that project activities particularly relating to EAF will be a key area of cooperation between the projects. Contact has been made with the UNEP/GEF HESBERSGA project (29 March 2023) and UNEP as the GEF Implementing Agency for this project has been waiting for the RedSeaFish project to be approved for the PPG stage before engaging in detailed discussions between the two projects to explore key activities for collaboration.

Specific collaboration between the RedSeaFish and HESBERSGA project will be modelled on the guidance under the CBD Sustainable Ocean Initiative Global Dialogue with Regional Seas Organizations and Regional Fishery Bodies on Accelerating Progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and particularly the modality for cooperation outlined in the 2016 Seoul Outcome (para 11). Some additional text has been added to the revised PIF to indicate that the two projects will coordinate during the PPG phase to identify areas of mutual support and collaboration.

As a general point, there will be a much more exhaustive analysis of stakeholders for the project during the PPG, with PPG funds reserved to ensure effective participation of stakeholder groups at local/community as well as national and regional levels, from which a full project Stakeholder Engagement Plan will be developed that will detail the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders during the full project implementation.

5 Project Description

.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

- a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?
- b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

(Karrer, May 8, 2023). Yes.

(Karrer, April 17, 2023). Yes. While the diagram is very clear and the linkages make sense, but the text is delayed in conveying the story of the diagram. Instead the text first focuses on explaining each individual box. Much later the linkages are explained in the ii. Long-term changes section. Please move the explanation earlier and ensure it provides a clear overview of the theory of change.

Agency's Comments

Response FAO:

The text in the PIF explaining the linkages between the various elements of the Theory of Change (ToC) has been moved from the end of this section to immediately follow the ToC graphic. The text and graphic also includes information on two additional assumptions (see above).

INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments (Karrer, April 17, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments - - -

3.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

- a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?**
- b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).**
- c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area**
- d) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?**

Secretariat's Comments (Karrer, April 17, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments - - -

- a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?**
- b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?**

Secretariat's Comments (Karrer, April 17, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments - - -

NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

RISKS

- a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?
- b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?
- c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments (Karrer, April 17, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments - - -

Qualitative assessment

- a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?
- b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?
- c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments (Karrer, April 17, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments - - -

6 Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments (Karrer, April 17, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments - - -

Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments (Karrer, April 17, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments - - -

For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

(Karrer, April 17, 2023). No.

(Karrer, May 7, 2023). Yes

Agency's Comments**Response FAO:**

A table summarizing the type of contribution to the 23 Kunming-Montreal Global BD Framework has been added in section "C. Alignment with GEF-8 programmatic strategy..." of the PIF template in the portal. The table has also been uploaded as a standalone document in the roadmap of the submission for easy reference purposes.

7 Policy Requirements**.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?**

Secretariat's Comments (Karrer, April 17, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments - - -

. Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments (Karrer, April 17, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments

note from FAO:

The PPO reviewer commented that "On stakeholder engagement (comment provided by Gabriella): The submission mentions that a preliminary stakeholder analysis undertaken during the PIF development phase has been uploaded to the GEF Portal. I cannot locate this annex. Please ask agency to clarify."

A detailed list of preliminary stakeholders consulted during the PIF (and engaged particularly with the identification and design of the technical elements of the project) was compiled and had been included as an annex to the PIF (Annex H) prepared by FAO. The ODF for the PIF is uploaded in the roadmap of the submission. Annex H has also been uploaded as a standalone document in the roadmap of the submission for easy reference purposes.

A full stakeholder analysis will be undertaken during the PPG phase. The sentence 'The preliminary stakeholder analysis undertaken during the PIF development phase has been uploaded to the GEF Portal' has been removed from the revised PIF.

8 nexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments (Karrer, April 17, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments - - -

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

8.3 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?

Secretariat's Comments (Parhizkar, April 24, 2023). No. Please provide a breakdown of the contributions of each of the co-financiers listed all together in the table

(Karrer, May 7, 2023). Yes

Agency's Comments

Response FAO:

At the request of the PPO review of the PIF, indicative amounts of co-financing provided under the row 'Donor Agency' has been clarified as follows:

- World Bank – estimated provisional US\$ 5,000,000, through the 'Sustainable Fishery Development in Red Sea and Gulf of Aden' (SFISH) project, co-financing provided through two of the elements of the SFISH project addressing regional fisheries management in the Red Sea and national fisheries management in Yemen.
- UNIDO – estimated provisional US\$ 1,000,000, through the 'Building Institutional Capacities for an Eco-System Approach to Management of The Marine Fishery in The Red Sea State (Phase II)' project.

Other institutional co-financing partners, including WorldFish, WWF and IFAD were unable to provide a specific breakdown of potential co-financing at the PIF stage (only available at the PPG stage when project activities have been more developed and overlap with partner priorities and finding is clearer).

PPO: In addition, the PPO reviewer comments that *"Letters of Endorsement (I forgot to include this comment in Portal): LoEs from Susan, Jordan and Saudi Arabia are missed - please confirm that Saudi Arabia is eligible to receive funds (I recall there was a discussion not that long ago about this, but don't remember the final decision from Management)"*.

FAO: No GEF funding is being requested for Saudi Arabia as they are considered ineligible for GEF funding and they will self-fund their participation, and the project has been structured to use GEF funds for all the countries except for Saudi Arabia which will be completely self-financing. In addition, discussions were held with the GEF Secretariat at an early stage of the development of the RedSeaFish PIF on the inclusion of Saudi Arabia in the project when it was clarified that the participation of Saudi Arabia will be through their own funding (e.g. email from Leah Karrer, GEF Secretariat, to Lorenzo Galbiati, FAO, dated 12 May 2022).

It is important to note that Saudi Arabia is very keen to engage with the project given the regional nature of the project, and has indicated during discussions that it will provide significant co-financing for the project (amounts and details to be agreed during the PPG phase, but likely to include technical support for capacity building, potential venues for regional meetings, workshops, support on fish stock assessments, etc). Saudi Arabia has a substantial Red Sea coastline and important Red Sea fisheries so is a key stakeholder in regional fisheries and consequently considers the RedSeaFish project to be an important regional initiative that will also be of benefit to their national fisheries in achieving sustainability.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country's(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

(PPO, May, 2023) TBD

(Salvazar, April 24, 2023). No. LoEs from Sudan and Jordan are missing. Please remove Saudi Arabia from list of recipient countries.

(Karrer, May 7, 2023). Yes

Agency's Comments**Response FAO:**

The LoEs of Sudan has been included.

Saudi Arabia has been removed from the list of recipient countries.

For Sudan, the OFP Letter of Endorsement has not been provided due to the conflict in Sudan. However, an email communication from the OFP dated 6 April, shortly before the conflict began indicated that the official LoE was to follow, but unfortunately this could not be provided in time for submission of the PIF and has been delayed due to the conflict. However, the precursory email from the OFP indicating the Government of Sudan's endorsement of the project has been uploaded to the GEF Portal.

A discussion was held with GEF SEC on Friday 28 April to agree to is to temporarily remove Sudan with the view to including the country in a later stage as soon as the situation gets better.

In terms of the project, this will not be an issue because: 1) the fish stock of Sudan is one of the less important in the Red Sea; 2) the first part of the project will deal with regional activities, therefore by the time we will move to country pilots and assessments we hope Sudan will be back to normality. Also, there is a lot of interest in this regional fishery project, which has been wanted for a long time. Only the fact that Yemen, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia have agreed to work together is exceptional.

It should be noted that the RedSeaFish project design team has updated the risk analysis and mitigation measures (in the risk table – see above) should the conflict in Sudan continue into the PPG phase and project implementation.

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

(Karrer, May 8, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

(Karrer, May 8, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments (Karrer, April 17, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments - - -

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments (Karrer, April 17, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments - - -

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

nnex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

(Karrer, May 8, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments

nnex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

GEFSEC Decision

.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

(Karrer, May 8, 2023). Yes.

Agency's Comments

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

View Dates

PIF Review Agency Response

First Review	4/17/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/8/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	