



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	<b>4581</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Global</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Sustainable Management of Tuna Fisheries and Biodiversity Conservation in the Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ)</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>FAO</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>IW-4; IW-4; BD-2; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$26,922,936</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$148,200,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$175,122,936</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Nicole Glineur</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Kevern Cochrane,</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Global project - N/A  within the t-RFMOs only developing countries are eligible for GEF funding	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Global project - N/A  However through t-RFMOs, their member countries have expressed support for the project	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes, FAO, has a comparative advantage in handling ABNJ fisheries issues. FAO has close working relationships with tuna RFMOs and its Committee of Fisheries (COFI) is the only global	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		inter-governmental forum addressing fisheries on a global scale.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes, tuna fisheries and supporting ecosystems and species conservation is an instrumental part of FAO's Fisheries and Aquaculture Department's program and strategic objectives. Please move FAO para in section B5 to section C  [9/7/11]: Addressed.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	N/A	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes, \$17 M is requested from IW and \$13M from the BD global set-aside  [9/7/11]: PIF now requests \$21,027,073 from IW and \$5,895,863 from BD set-aside	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	• focal area set-aside?  \$13M is requested from BD FA set-aside  [9/7/11]: PIF now requests \$5,895,863 from BD set-aside	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes, this proposal is in line with GEF-5 IW Output 4.1 which aims to improve management of ABNJ resources, including fisheries. The proposal is also in line with GEF-5 BD Output 2.1 which aims to incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services into tRFMO management plans.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes, GEF-5 IW Objective 4 and BD Objective 2 are correctly identified by the proposal.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	Yes, the proposal is consistent with the strategies of RFMOs member countries. As a global project, the proposal is also consistent with international guidelines developed by the CBD, UN Law of the Sea, and FAO.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes, capacity development within countries is key to the proposal's success and future sustainability of global tuna populations.	
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>The baseline scenario, specifically global declines in tuna stocks due to mismanagement, is reliable.</p> <p>The relevant baseline projects of RFMOs, i.e current RFMOs conservation and management measures need to be added. These were summarised in a document delivered by ISSF at the Kobe meeting.</p> <p>Please move WWF para in section B5 to B1</p> <p>Please move BLI para from section B5</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>to the end of B1 and provide the tangible results of the albatross task force as their baseline</p> <p>[9/7/11]: Addressed.</p>	
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>Section B.2 is OK but needs to be strengthened: please provide better explanation as to how GEF funds will be used over and above the baseline programs to make a transformational impact and as to what would happen without GEF funding.</p> <p>M&amp;E component should be updated, e.g.: (4) Project monitoring and evaluation (M&amp;E). To be implemented efficiently and effectively, project management will need a specific M&amp;E system, allowing for a close monitoring of the different project activities, outcomes and impacts, as well as for midterm and post-completion evaluations to draw all useful lessons for the future and capitalize on the experience acquired. Project M&amp;E will adhere to the IW:Learn criteria, including a IW:Learn project website, development of experience notes, and participation in IW conferences and workshops, and will be funded by 1% of the total GEF International Waters</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>grant. Further, both GEF International Waters and Biodiversity tracking tools will be submitted as required. Along with three other projects dealing respectively with deep-sea fisheries, a high-seas Ocean Partnership Fund, and global coordination, the present project is an integral part of an overall Program called " Global sustainable fisheries management and biodiversity conservation in the ABNJ ". The Project M&amp;E should therefore constitute a "module" (self-standing but fully integrated) of the overall M&amp;E system put into place at the Program's level.</p> <p>[9/7/11]: Addressed.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>Output 1.1.2 - Please specify the number of t-RFMOs which will benefit. If all, then state five like in Output 1.1.1</p> <p>Output 2.2.1 - This is really two outputs: 1) "Best-practices identified..." and 2) "Analysis of value chains carried out...." Please split accordingly. Further, please specify if only one RFMO is benefiting from each aspect of this output or only the latter.</p> <p>Output 2.2.1 - Please specify if the 10 developing countries are from one (or more) RFMO</p> <p>Outcome 3.1 - Since all outputs refer to only two RFMOs, please remove "At least" and just say two.</p>	<p>[9/7/11]: Please correct project M&amp;E (Component 4) so that the IW tracking tool is reported three times during project's life (inception, mid-term, and closure). Please also add that the project will complete a BD tracking tool at same three times during project's life (inception, mid-term, and closure).</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Output 3.1.1 - This output is really two outputs: 1) "Bycatch data collection..." and 2) "Results used for priority...". Please split accordingly.</p> <p>Output 3.2.2. Also two outputs: 1) "Priority areas for targeted..." and 2) "integrated into fisheries and conservation...". Please split accordingly.</p> <p>Output 3.2.3 - Please use more quantifiable language for "increase substantially". Consider using percent increase instead.</p> <p>Component 4 (M&amp;E) needs to comply with IW:LEARN, including allocating 1% of IW budget to IW:Learn activities. Please use the following language:</p> <p>For outcome - "... transmission of lessons learned via the IW: LEARN program (financed at 1 percent of the GEF IW Grant).</p> <p>For output - "...The project will establish a website with the IW:LEARN program to transmit lessons learned, report annual IW tracking tool, participate in IW conferences and workshops, and produce experience notes."</p> <p>[9/7/11]: Please correct project M&amp;E (Component 4) so that the IW tracking tool is reported three times during project's life (inception, mid-term, and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		closure). Please also add that the project will complete a BD tracking tool at same three times during project's life (inception, mid-term, and closure).	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes, the methodology is sound to achieve the additional benefits with GEF funds.	
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	yes	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Section B5. Please delete the ISSF para in section B5 which is repetitive of part of the one in B1.  [9/7/11]: Addressed.	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	Overall, potential major risks are accounted for.  The risk on impacts from climate change should not just relate to issues at the ecosystem and biodiversity level, it should also account for changes in tuna migration patterns. Please address.  [9/7/11]: Addressed.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	yes please define TCP.  [9/7/11]: Addressed.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Please provide the following adjustments:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Part 1: project identification table - executing partners: Please start with T-RFMOs/Countries and provide name of 5 RFMOs.</p> <p>In B1: please add T-RFMOs/Countries and move the t-RMOs paras under B5 to B1 after FAO. Please add for each RFMO their baseline (see above comments)</p> <p>[9/7/11]: Addressed.</p>	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	yes. PM is about 3.8% of the total budget.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	the co-financing per objective is 1:5.5.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>Table C (which is incorrectly labeled X) currently combines cash and kind. Please provide separate indicative figures for cash and kind</p> <p>[9/7/11]: The above is addressed with available knowledge at this stage. While the co-financing ratio remains at 1:5.5 to 1 with increased co-financing of \$14,7M from NOAA and errors in cost calculations addressed, there is a reduction in co-financing by FAO from</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		\$30 million to \$25 million. FAO sent an email on 9/2/11 indicating that: "The reason for that is because we realized after the original submission that we will also need to be providing co-financing for the Oceanic Fisheries Management Project 2 (OFMP 2) in the near future. As you will appreciate, there is overlap in FAO activities and financing for these two projects and we have estimated that \$5 million of the original \$30 million is more appropriately allocated as FAO co-financing to OFMP."	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	yes	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	Administrative glitches;please use the full PIF template including correct table letters. Subject PIF will be recommended for approval upon addressing of all above comments	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Thank you for the corrections. Recommendation will be granted following edits requested above.</p> <p>[9/7/11] All the above comments have been addressed satisfactorily. The proposed PIF is recommended for approval.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 04, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 07, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	

	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.