



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

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|----------------------|
| GEF ID: | 9911 | | |
| Country/Region: | Regional (Angola, Benin, Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Cameroon, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Sao Tome and Principe, Togo) | | |
| Project Title: | Strengthening of the Enabling Environment, Ecosystem-based Management and Governance to support Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme of the Guinea Current Large Marine Ecosystem | | |
| GEF Agency: | UNEP, FAO, UNDP and UNIDO | GEF Agency Project ID: | 1609 (UNDP) |
| Type of Trust Fund: | GEF Trust Fund | GEF Focal Area (s): | International Waters |
| GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | IW-3 Program 5; IW-3 Program 6; IW-3 Program 7; | | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | \$150,000 | Project Grant: | \$4,416,210 |
| Co-financing: | \$13,751,750 | Total Project Cost: | \$18,167,960 |
| PIF Approval: | | Council Approval/Expected: | |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | Cyrille Barnerias | Agency Contact Person: | Yegor Volovik |

| 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 | (9/12/2017) - Comment 1.1: Could you please add a paragraph on the contribution of the project to the three IW programs mentioned in table A? - Comment 1.2: Please add the missing Endorsement letters for Angola and Congo. | |

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)?

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|---|--|-----------------|
| | | <p>- Comment 1.3: Please merge the two parts of table F on page 6.</p> <p>(9/29/2017)</p> <p>- Yes, Cleared. We noted that you consider to add Angola to the project during PPG depending on the possibility to get a letter of Endorsement.</p> | |
| | <p>2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?</p> | <p>(9/12/2017) Yes, on a regional level the project is well aligned with the priorities mentioned in the Guinea Current Large Marine Ecosystem Strategic Action Programme (2.2, 2.4, 3.1.1, 3.1.3, 3.1.4., 3.2.2, 3.3.1)</p> <p>- Comment 2.1: Please add some overview for each country how the priorities addressed by the project are addressed in what key national strategies and policies. This does not need to be entirely comprehensive at this point but should cover main countries and relevant strategies. More detail can then be added during the project design/ PPG phase.</p> <p>(9/29/2017)</p> <p>- As proposed, we expect more details on the consistency of the project with national strategies, plans, reports when relevant to be detailed during</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------------|---|--|-----------------|
| Project Design | 3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation? | <p>PPG. (9/12/2017)</p> <p>The drivers of the global environmental degradation are well indicated at PIF stage.</p> <p>- Comment 3.1: Could you please explain how the project will be able to strengthen institutions at national and local level given the very large geographic scope of the project? Which institutions are the focus in this regard?</p> <p>- Comment 3.2: The innovation argument is partly based on the multi-agency partnership. Could you please complete the argument by showing how the project will bring more than 4 individuals projects, how it will bring more than the simple addition of its parts? This intention of a multi agency project needs to be balanced with the complexity that such a multi-agency partnership within a limited project scope brings.</p> <p>- Comment 3.3: During PPG, on sustainability, could you please indicate some ways that could be explored to improve access to</p> | |

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|---|---|-----------------|
| | | <p>innovative finance as this will be one of the core issues?</p> <p>(9/29/2017)</p> <p>- Comments addressed. We noted the agencies motivation to pursue this complex project and hope also that the concerted approach will effectively "allow to reverse the presently prevailing trends of environmental degradation".</p> | |
| | <p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p> | <p>(09/12/2017)</p> <p>- Comment 4.1: Given the time passed since the TDA and SAP formulation, please describe a baseline of most relevant ongoing national investments (GEF and non-GEF).</p> <p>- Comment 4.2: Could you also please expand and clarify on the incremental cost reasoning what the GEF funds will bring additionally to the baseline and the co-financing?</p> <p>- Comment 4.3: Could you also please indicate the main aspects of the co-financed activities?</p> <p>(9/29/2017)</p> <p>- Yes. Thank you for your efforts to complete the baseline.</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|--|---|-----------------|
| | | <p>We expect during PPG phase to complete the baseline with other ongoing national and bilateral investments and to detail the coordination with the project. In particular it would be good to explore the articulation of outcome 3.1 with previous projects or current ones such as WACA to avoid any redundancy.</p> | |
| | <p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p> | <p>(09/14/2017)</p> <p>Overall comments - Comment 5.1: The aim of the project to strengthen cooperation on various levels is well placed and well outlines overall. This includes: (i) country-to-country cooperation and establishment, design and operationalization of the Guinea Current Commission (GCC) and transition from the previous IGCC [a big effort that will take a substantial and multi-level effort within this project and working with 16 countries] ; (ii) inter-sectoral cooperation and establishment or strengthening of inter-sectoral committees [not easy across 16 countries]; (iii) partner (incl. donor/funder) cooperation with GCC and supported themes; (iv) private sector sensitization (with focus on maybe initially coastal planning and fisheries/ incl. fishery supply chains)</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | | <p>[the PIF still needs strengthening]; and (iv) coastal – central government interaction [needs addressing during PPG]. The first three areas are well addressed already in what is currently component 1 but would benefit from shifting additional resources from other components. Others need further work. Could the components 3 and 4 be reduced in budget so to actually be able to carry out needed inter-country and inter-sectoral consultations leading to participatory discussion and eventual negotiation of the GCC protocol, including its mandate, staffing, and finance?</p> <p>- Comment 5.2: Could you please strengthen the arguments to show how the project will allow to achieve the GEBs and also ensure coherence between the GEB indicated in table F and the text on page 21?</p> <p>- Comment 5.3: Could you please indicate the main executing partners and their roles?</p> <p>- Comment 5.4: The PIF text does not give much more details in the proposed alternative scenario compared to table B, especially for components 3 and 4. It would be appreciated to have examples or</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | | <p>precisions on the implementation, for example on 1.3.1 on the kind of financing mechanisms that could be set up, on the role of the GCC in outcome 1.4, or on the demonstration activities mentioned in the scaling-up paragraph.</p> <p>- Comment 5.5: Could you please add the WACA project in the coordination part? It is mentioned in table B, but it would be interesting to show the link also in this part.</p> <p>Component 1: -Comment 5.6: We see the proposed donor/partner coordination and donor conference as a very useful effort to get momentum reestablished to support work in GCC under a coordinated program and provides a chance to reengage across suit of bi-laterals and multi-laterals (incl. US-NOAA) within a coordinated programmatic view and to support an emerging GCC. This would provide also opportunity to attract finance/co-finance for further actions. In that context, it would be good to discuss with IGCC countries and the Abidjan convention the timing to update and/or supplement the TDA (from 2006) and SAP (of 2008).</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | | <p>- Comment 5.7: If any, could you please explain the link between 1.1 and 1.3.3 as the partnership with donors and business community may be one of the way to develop financial mechanisms?</p> <p>- Comment 5.8: Component 1 lists agency coordination meetings (under 1.4.1. and 1.4.2.). Please assure that the project will not aim to fund GEF agency staff or travel expenses.</p> <p>Component 2:</p> <p>- Comment 5.9: Fisheries – given the engagement by countries and importance of fisheries in the region both in terms of GDP and/or food supply the delineation of cooperation between the Abidjan Convention and the GCC and the regional fisheries bodies appears timely and well designed. FAO – as outlined - is the logical lead in this, plus the national work on review and strengthening national laws and policies incl. in support of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries and the implementation of the voluntary guidelines for small scale sustainable fisheries, and so forth. Would that include support to translate in national laws and rules the</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|-----------|---|-----------------|
| | | <p>Port of State Measures Agreement where relevant? Just a few small notes: please include in the baseline reference to the CFI and mention/describe the link to substantial work by countries on regional and national level supported by the WB (incl. country loans).</p> <p>-Comment 5.10: Building on this, we suggest to set the stage to strengthen the private sector engagement angle in the formulation of the GCC mandates more explicitly (see 1.3.3 and 1.3.4.) and the wider GCC agenda, including coastal zone management (incl. WACA) as well as in component 2 with regard to fisheries and fisheries supply chains.</p> <p>- Comment 5.11: During PPG, it would be helpful to provide examples of beneficiaries of the capacity building programme in 2.2.2?</p> <p>- Comment 5.12: Could you please clarify the synergies between 2.1.1 and 1.1.3 as they will both target to develop cooperation modalities?</p> <p>Components 3 and 4</p> <p>- Comment 5.13: The description of the outcomes and activities under</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|-----------|---|-----------------|
| | | <p>component 3 at present seem isolated from other components and their outcomes (e.g. who and what does the mentioned regional information and knowledge platform serve?). Please address.</p> <p>- Comment 5.14: the assessment of pollution sources is valuable and should then inform later programs on pollution abatement including the choice of tools- with TEST mainly addressing private sector entities. Other issues highlighted in the TDA/SAP are BOD/COD from growing population and urbanization, as well as marine pollution from ballast water and litter. The momentum of the entering into force of the ballast water management convention may provide logic to addressing its implementation. If not immediately, this project could pave the road for further actions in this direction. This could also build on the previous LOA between the IGCC and IMO.</p> <p>- Comment 5.15: Please consider to have the proposed assessments and hotspot analyses undertaken on a shorter timeline than the overall project, to best inform timely interventions under GEF 7. We</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|-----------|---|-----------------|
| | | <p>discussed this before and including to keep this first project focused mainly on the institutional aspects under component 1 and supported by component 2. For example under component 4, at this stage studies that could inform future phases of the GCLME program could sufficiently be carried as a desk study of pollution sources by urban and industry locations – supported by some remote sensing information, i.e using data that are already available (previous studies, GIS, satellite data). This will also allow reallocation of funds to component 1 (process for establishing GCC commission and related) as mentioned in the overall comments.</p> <p>- Comment 5.16: Could you please clarify which themes 3.1.1 will deal with other than fisheries and aquaculture ecosystems as these will be dealt with by 2.3.1?</p> <p>- Comment 5.17: Could you please clarify the differences with regard to pollution in the component description between components 3 and 4?</p> <p>- Comment 5.18: Could you please assure that a minimum of 1% of the project will be dedicated to participate</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|-----------|---|-----------------|
| | | <p>in IW:Learn activities? (9/29/2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes. Thank you for your answers. - As the coordination at different level will be a important basis for the success of this project, it could be helpful to explore during PPG the possibility to recruit at least on person financed by all components (including with some co-financing if possible) that could be seated at the Abidjan Convention and participate in the capacity building of the organization. - As project mentions spatial monitoring (output 3.2.2), it could be interesting during PPG to explore cooperation with long term stakeholders on the subject such as NOAA. - Regarding the countries part of the GCLME, it seems necessary to include the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission for West Africa (SRFC/CSRP). - We expect during PPG <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a more detailed strategy for strengthening inter-ministerial committees at national level, | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|---|--|-----------------|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - options on how to strengthen the interaction between local coastal government and central level governments - discussions with IGCC countries and Abidjan convention on the timing to update TDA and SAP as needed, - discussion on fishery value-chain and certification, - examples of beneficiaries of the capacity building actions. <p>- As mentioned, we expect a fine tuning of the activities under components 3 and 4 to target concrete activities. For example under component 4, it would be interesting to target well known pollution hotspots related to extractive industries in selected localities or countries (such as abandoned oil platforms, Kpeme) and prepare plans to address these issues.</p> | |
| | <p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p> | <p>(9/12/2017) No, please choose one of the option regarding the indigenous people in the stakeholders part (yes or no) and explain.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comment 6.1: Could you also please expand on the stakeholders giving some examples and their roles? - Comment 6.2: Could you please expand on how gender aspects will be | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------|
| | | <p>addressed in the Design and not only implementation of the project?</p> <p>- Comment 6.3: Could you please describe the socio-economic benefits of the project?</p> <p>(9/29/2017)</p> <p>- Yes. As indicated, we expect the work of mainstreaming of gender considerations to start during PPG.</p> | |
| Availability of Resources | 7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply): | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? | (9/12/2017) Yes, the allocation at present fits within the available International Waters funds. | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? | | |
| Recommendations | 8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified? | <p>(09/12/2017) No, please address the comments above.</p> <p>(09/29/2017) Yes.</p> | |
| Review Date | Review | September 12, 2017 | |
| | Additional Review (as necessary) | September 29, 2017 | |
| | 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 | | |

CEO endorsement Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement | Response to Secretariat comments |
|-------------------------|---|--|----------------------------------|
| | 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? | | |
| 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? | | |
| Review Date | Review | | |
| | Additional Review (as necessary) | | |
| | 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.