



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR PROGRAMMATIC FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT*

| | | | |
|--|---|----------------------------|----------------------|
| GEF Program ID: | 4487 | | |
| Country/Region: | Regional (Comoros, Mauritania, Mozambique, Tanzania) | | |
| Program Title: | Strategic Partnership for Sustainable Fisheries Management in the Large Marine Ecosystems in Africa (PROGRAM) | | |
| GEF Agency: | World Bank | GEF Agency Project ID: | 125797 (World Bank) |
| Type of Trust Fund: | GEF Trust Fund | GEF Focal Area (s): | International Waters |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | IW-2; Project Mana; | | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | \$0 | Project Grant: | \$25,000,000 |
| Co-financing: | \$135,000,000 | Total Project Cost: | \$160,000,000 |
| PFD Approval: | | Council Approval/Expected: | November 01, 2011 |
| | | Expected Program Start Dt: | |
| Program Manager: | Andrew Hume | Agency Contact Person: | Paola Agostini |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comments on Program Framework Document |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| Eligibility | 1. Is the participating country eligible? | [AH 3/24/11]: Yes, all countries of this regional program are eligible. |
| | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the program? | <p>[AH 4/11/11]: Letters of Endorsement have been received informally for Mozambique, Mauritania, Comoros, and Gabon. Please make sure these LoEs are submitted through GEF Coordination. Letters of Endorsement are still needed for Cameroon and Tanzania. Please be advised that program approval cannot be granted until all NPFs in participating countries are complete.</p> <p>[AH 5/4/11] Letters of Endorsement are included for all countries except Tanzania. Please be sure to update the table in Section A of Part III (page 16 of PFD) with proper date of OFP endorsement (MM/DD/YYYY).</p> <p>[AH 8/22/11] Letters of Endorsement for Tanzania and Seychelles are currently being sought and will be delivered before the November 2011 Council Meeting. OFP Endorsement dates have been added.</p> |
| Agency's Comparative Advantage | 3. Are the Agencies' comparative advantages for this program clearly described and supported? | [AH 4/13/11]: Yes, the World Bank has the comparative advantage to run this program based on strong country interaction and past experiences with programmatic approaches for poverty reduction and environmental conservation in the Africa region. |

| | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| | 4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the program, is the GEF Agency(ies) capable of managing it? | [AH 4/13/11]: N/A |
| | 5. Does the program fit into the Agencies' programs and staff capacity in the country(ies)? | [AH 4/13/11]: Yes, this program fits well into the World Bank's baseline program in the area and is well suited with staff capacity in the countries to ensure success. |
| Resource Availability | 6. 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? | <p>[AH 4/4/11]: The Mozambique and Tanzania projects say, "the projects will likely also tap into the STAR allocation for Biodiversity for [Mozambique/Tanzania] to implement activities for the conservation of MPAs, once the government completes its planning exercise on using the GEF5 STAR resources. These will be detailed as preparation continues and confirmation is available on the funds" If Biodiversity focal area funds are being considered, it is recommended that these be requested outside of this PFD. Otherwise substantial changes to the current PFD will be required to bring the program inline with BD strategy as well as updating the amount of GEF financial resources being requested etc.</p> <p>[AH 5/4/11] Addressed.</p> |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? | [AH 3/24/11]: N/A |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access? | [AH 3/24/11]: N/A |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? | [AH 3/24/11]: N/A |
| Program Consistency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? | [AH 3/24/11]: N/A |
| | 7. Is the program aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF results framework? | <p>[AH 4/4/11]: Partly, but the results framework's indicators need to be quantifiable. Please add an output indicator measuring development of interministerial committees. Also consider rewording Outcome Indicator 1 from "Strengthened governance and management of the fisheries" to "Innovative solutions implemented that will show results for rebuilding and protecting fish stocks through rights-based management" so that the program framework is more in line with IW's GEF 5 Expected Outcomes.</p> <p>[AH 5/4/11] Addressed.</p> |
| | 8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ | [AH 4/13/11]: Yes, the PFD is aligned with IW Objective 2 by rebuilding |

| | | |
|----------------|--|--|
| | objectives identified? | |
| | 9. Is the program consistent with the recipient country(ies)' national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP? | <p>[AH 4/11/11]: Please be sure that any program participating countries NPFEs are complete before PFD recommendation is sought. It is our understanding that Cameroon, Mauritania, Mozambique, and Tanzania are considering or have already started the NPFE process at this time.</p> <p>NPFEs must also be highlighted in the PFD text (Part II B.2)</p> <p>[AH 5/4/11] PFD recommendation can only be given upon completion of participating countries NPFEs and PFD text should include considerations from this exercise. This policy has been in place since inception of NPFE, and is valid for both projects utilizing and not utilizing STAR, including International Waters projects.</p> <p>[AH 8/22/11] Letters of Intent will be supplied for all participating countries that are currently completing their NPFEs.</p> |
| | 10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of program outcomes? | [AH 4/13/11]: Yes. Among other things, this proposal's outcomes include improved fisheries governance and dialogue/cooperation among African fishing nations in the region which will lead to more sustainable institutions in the region. |
| Program Design | 11. Is the description of the baseline scenario/baseline project – what would happen without GEF financing – reliable, and based on sound data and assumptions? | [AH 3/24/11]: Yes. This PFD will build off approximately \$140M in IDA, IBRD, and grants from the World Bank which concentrate mainly on investments in infrastructure (fish landing sites), skills (quality control systems and local training for fish processing and handling) and "offshore economy" investment climate reform to spur socioeconomic development in local communities. |
| | 12. Are the activities to be undertaken by the program partners (or for which they will provide funding) sufficient given the nature of the program and is it likely that these activities (or funding) will not materialize if the GEF does not fund this program? | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p> | <p>[AH 4/11/11]: Yes, program will build incrementally off the success of the first African Fisheries program with the World Bank. However, please identify how program will build off other successes in region, namely MACEMP. Also, please be more specific as to the value added of this PFD to national reforms/legislation and other policies/measures.</p> <p>[AH 5/4/11] Addressed.</p> |
| | <p>14. Is the program framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p> | <p>[AH: 4/11/11]: This PFD needs to include a Results Framework matrix in line with GEF 5 Objectives with QUANTIFIABLE indicators (like the RF matrix attached as an annex to the PFD for the previous Investment Fund), including potential reforms/policies/measures in addition to stress reduction and fisheries conservation indicators.</p> <p>[AH 5/4/11] A results framework with expected outcomes more inline with GEF-5 IW focal area objectives is now included with PFD.</p> <p>Since specific national targets, according to the agency response, will be developed during the project preparation, Project VII (Program Coordination) should be tasked with summarizing targets (indicators), where possible.</p> <p>Also, please be sure to correct title of project 7, no longer coordination.</p> <p>[AH 8/22/11] Addressed.</p> |
| | <p>15. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the program, and b) how they will support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?</p> | <p>[AH 4/11/11]: Yes, socio-economic benefits are a major aspect of the program design and is well described in the PFD.</p> |
| | <p>16. Is public participation taken into consideration, and the roles of the various stakeholders identified and addressed properly?</p> | <p>[AH 4/11/11]: Yes, these roles have been addressed and the program highlights the involvement of woman (who are active in fish processing) and local communities as essential to economic growth.</p> |
| | <p>17. Does the program take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p> | <p>[AH 4/11/11]: Please consider the risks associated with increased piracy in the Indian Ocean. It has become an increasing threat and hampered the success of some GEF projects in the region.</p> <p>[AH 5/4/11] Addressed.</p> |
| | <p>18. Is the program consistent and properly coordinated with other</p> | <p>[4/13/11]: Yes, this program is consistent with the previous programmatic approaches on fisheries in Africa as well as other initiatives identified in the</p> |

| | | |
|-------------------|--|---|
| | the region? | |
| | 19. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate? | |
| Program Financing | 20. Is funding level for program management cost appropriate? | <p>[AH 3/24/11]: Yes, PM cost is ~7% of total GEF funding.</p> <p>[AH 9/21/11] Please cap program management costs at 5%.</p> <p>[AH 9/22/11] Program management has been reduced to 4.9%.</p> |
| | 21. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | [AH 3/24/11]: Yes, funding per objective is justified. |
| | 22. Comment on the indicated co-financing. | <p>[AH 3/24/11]: As identified above, coordination project co-financing is worrisome. It is also unclear why co-financing ratio among country projects varies so much and needs to be described in the project description.</p> <p>[AH 5/4/11] Issue identified earlier. Please be sure to address.</p> |
| | 23. Are the co-financing amounts that the Agencies are bringing to the program in line with their roles? | <p>[AH 4/13/11]: The overall Program co-financing brought by the World Bank is very strong (approximately 1:3.5). However, the co-financing among some of the projects is troubling:</p> <p>1) It is worrisome to see that the World Bank has match the "coordination" project with a co-financing ratio of 10:1. Please strongly reconsider the World Bank's role in this program and adjust co-financing appropriately.</p> <p>2) It is also unclear why Gabon and Mauritania have a 1:1 co-financing ratio relative to the other country projects - it is not explicit in the sub-project descriptions.</p> <p>[AH 5/4/11] It is noted that the Bank cannot lend to its partners and a higher amount cannot be committed at this stage by IDA funds. However, it is unacceptable for a GEF project to have 10:1 co-financing ratio - especially with the new Programmatic approach with development banks. Please work with partners, such as WWF or FAO, to secure additional co-financing for this</p> |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| Program Monitoring and Evaluation | 24. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable? | |
| | 25. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? | |
| Agency Responses | 26. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from: | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? | |
| Secretariat Recommendation | | |
| PFD Clearance | <p>27. Is PFD clearance being recommended?</p> | <p>[AH 4/13/11]: This PFD is very promising but needs some moderate modification and further clarification before it can be recommended. Specifically, please address the following: (1) issues about STAR and the Biodiversity Focal Area; (2) the missing Letters of Endorsement; (3) completion of NPFEs; (4) issues with the results framework and quantifiable indicators; (5) project co-financing and justification for requested resources; and (5) other points highlighted above.</p> <p>[AH 5/4/11] There are still some outstanding issues that must be addressed before recommendation can be given. These include: 1) issue of NPFEs; 2) missing LOE for Tanzania as well as filling in actual endorsement dates in PFD; 3) "Coordination" project co-financing; 4) inaccuracies in Annex D; 5) other points highlighted above.</p> <p>Also, please make sure that it is stated explicitly in the text of Annex C that each project will commit 1% of its total GEF resources to IW:LEARN activities (e.g. conference participation, experience notes, website, etc) as well as tracking tool submissions and are inline with GEF-5 indicators. Tanzania, Cameroon, and the Collaboration projects have no mention of IWLEARN etc. and the remaining projects are missing the other aspects identified above.</p> <p>[AH 8/22/11] The PFD has addressed the necessary issues and is being recommended for clearance.</p> <p>[AH 9/21/11] The PFD was not cleared at this time. Please cap program management costs at 5% and resubmit</p> |

| | | |
|-----------------|---|---|
| | | [AH 9/22/11] The PFD has lowered the program management cost to 4.9%. The PFD is being recommended for clearance. |
| | 28. Items to consider at subsequent individual project submissions for CEO endorsement. | N/A |
| Review Date (s) | First review* | April 13, 2011 |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | May 04, 2011 |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | August 22, 2011 |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | September 21, 2011 |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | September 22, 2011 |

* 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.

REQUEST FOR PROGRAM COORDINATION BUDGET/PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL

| Review Criteria | Decision Points | Program Manager Comments |
|---|--|--------------------------|
| Program Coordination Budget/Project Preparation Grant for Program | 1. Are the proposed activities for program coordination appropriate? | |
| | 2. Is itemized budget justified? | |
| Secretariat Recommendation | 3. Is PCB/PPG for Program approval being recommended? | |
| | 4. Other comments | |
| Review Date (s) | First review* | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | |

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