



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

GEF ID:	4581		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	<b>Sustainable Management of Tuna Fisheries and Biodiversity Conservation in the Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ)</b>		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		<b>IW-4; IW-4; BD-2; Project Mana;</b>	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$350,000	Project Grant:	\$27,172,936
Co-financing:	\$150,805,100	Total Project Cost:	\$178,328,036
PIF Approval:	September 12, 2011	Council Approval/Expected:	November 10, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Nicole Glineur	Agency Contact Person:	Frank Chopin

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	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	8th of May 2013 (cseverin): The project is still a global project, hence no endorsement letters needed.  eligibility criteria for GEF funding is unchanged from PIF stage.
	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 inter-	8th of May 2013 (cseverin): Yes the Agency's comparative advantage has been described and substantiated. However, based on the comparative advantage included it is not clear how FAO will be able to achieve the project goals of achieving efficiency and sustainability of the global Tuna fisheries.

		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	N/A
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	<p>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.</p> <p>Please move FAO para in section B5 to section C</p> <p>[9/7/11]: Addressed.</p>	8th of May 2013 (cseverin): Yes, FAO will have to draw on all internal resources to be able to successfully reach the project objective.
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?	<p>Yes, \$17 M is requested from IW and \$13M from the BD global set-aside</p> <p>[9/7/11]: PIF now requests \$21,027,073 from IW and \$5,895,863 from BD set-aside</p>	9th of May 2013 (cseverin): Yes, Funding is available, however the reason for the increase is not eligible. Please adjust back to amount at PIF stage.
	• 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	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>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 t-RFMO management plans.</p>	<p>9th of May 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed project is aligned with Objective 4 in the GEF 5 IW Strategy and with Objective 2 in the GEF 5 BD Strategy.</p> <p>1st of September 2013 (cseverin): it seems that the Project results framework from page 25-40 of the Request for CEO endorsement covers all four components. However, then on page 40 Component 2 reappears with new targets. Please do make sure that each components only appears once in the results framework. in the below comments have only been provided to the first time the components have been mentioned. Further, component 4 have a different title in Table B and in the results framework.</p> <p>Please do make sure that the targets mentioned in the project results framework will be quantifiable. Please see below for a number of such targets that should be made quantifiable:</p> <p>for the overall project objective the target of "conservation and management measures in place to enable catches of main species (23 stocks) of tuna to be fished sustainably" please include end target.</p> <p>Further for the overall Objective, following tager needs to be quantifiable: Threats from tuna fishing on priority becatch species including sharks, seabirds and marine turtles are significantly reduced.</p> <p>Component 1, output 1.1.1: "160 national fisheries management personnel trained in fisheries management, planning and policy" it is not clear what the baseline is, please include.</p> <p>Output 1.1.2. What is the baseline for the "national fisheries staff from atleast ten t-RFMO coastal developing states trained in fulfilling t-RFMO member</p>

		<p>and conserve the tuna stock. Will this be measured on the amount of staff trained? or will it be merely a matter of making sure i.e. one person is trained in each t-RFMO?? it is not clear.</p> <p>Further, it is not clear if the baseline of "2013 number of participants utilizing t-RFMO capacity building funds" is actually a baseline or a target. if a target, what is the actual target to be reached??</p> <p>output 1.1.4: the baseline is missing to the target : 250 fisheries management personnel trained in fisheries management, planning and policy t-RFMO G77 Member states trained.</p> <p>COmponent 2, outcome 2.1, the target indicator " Strengthened national institutions coupled with new technologies and greater collaboration among MCS professionals reduced IUU fishing" is not quantifiable, please reformulate so that it becomes measurable.</p> <p>Output 2.1.3: it is not clear what the baseline is to the target : "160 national fisheries staff from IOTC/WCPFC regions trained in national laws, regulations, license conditions and strengthen MCS programmes to operationalize t-RFMO CMMs"</p> <p>the target for output 2.1.4 of training 160 in legal policy and management of fisheries officers trained in drafting legislation and PSM implementation seems a bit low. Please do explain why the number 160 have been chosen and seems to be the target for the training activities.</p> <p>Outcome 3.2, the target of " threats to seabirds from longline fishing abated through adoption of best practice mitigation measures by 40% of the tuna vessels operating in the IOTC and ICCAT fishing areas" is not quantifiable. please do include a baseline figure, even if it is zero.</p>
--	--	--

			<p>Output 3.2.2: does not have a target, please formulate one and include.</p> <p>Output 4.1.1 and 4.1.3: Target missing, please do include. would it be # of Experience Notes produced or??</p> <p>Above has been addressed</p>
	<p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</p>	<p>Yes, GEF-5 IW Objective 4 and BD Objective 2 are correctly identified by the proposal.</p>	<p>9th of May 2013 (cseverin): Yes, GEF-5 IW Objective 4 and BD Objective 2 are correctly identified by the proposal.</p>
	<p>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?</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>9th of May 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the developed project proposal is still relevant to the t-RFMO countries, UN Law of the Sea, Aichi Strategic Goal B: Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use, target 6 illegal, as well as international guidelines on unreported and unregulated fishing (IUU). However, it is noted that the T-RFMO (IATTC) in their newest summary publication (<a href="http://www.iccat.int/Documents/BienRep/REP_EN_12-13_I_1.pdf">http://www.iccat.int/Documents/BienRep/REP_EN_12-13_I_1.pdf</a>), note in section on GEF project on pp 7, that "It was agreed that the Commission could accept the invitation to participate but maintain the right to withdraw if the activities to be carried out were not in line with the tasks inherent in Commission decisions." Surely this statement is only valid for this RFMO, but if other RFMOs have the same attitude towards the proposed project, it may be hard to realise the objective, outcomes and outputs of this project.</p>
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>Yes, capacity development within countries is key to the proposal's success and future sustainability of global tuna populations.</p>	<p>9th of May 2013 (cseverin): No. How capacity developed will reach sustainability is not clear and needs to be articulated. The project documents mention specific numbers of people to be trained as part of the capacity development envisioned. However, it is not clear from reading the project documents how these e.g. national fisheries staff to be trained is to be selected or how their increased capacity is to contribute directly to the long term sustainability. Please elaborate on this</p>

Project Design	<p>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>	<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 to the end of B1 and provide the tangible results of the albatross task force as their baseline</p>	<p>9th of May 2013 (cseverin): No changes to the baseline project since PIF, according to the project documents presented.</p> <p>However, the baseline has changed from the onset of the project with progress made by partners and RFMOs outside this project and the changes have not be reflected accordingly. The results from the PPG need to be weaved in explicitly as well.</p> <p>According to the content and outputs/outcomes proposed the project is going backward. There is a clear need to go back to the deliveries laid out at the PFD &amp; PIF stage unless force majeure prevents this-in which case a strong justification is needed.</p> <p>9th of May 2013 (Cseverin) please do make sure that the project document is much clearer on what is to be delivered through the components. Presently, there is a strong focus on quantifiable capacity building indicators and it is strongly believed that the project will be able to deliver a stronger set of long term sustainable outcomes and outputs.</p> <p>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>9th of May 2013 (cseverin): It is hard to assess the cost-effectiveness as the proposal does not really make a clear case of what will be achieved through the project interventions.</p> <p>The project fails to demonstrate the tangible outputs and transformation to be achieved with \$30M. Project components description are lacking in the text and their outcomes/outputs and how they will be linking to the overall objective are unclear. The goals should be more tangible and lead to a clearer case for project cost effectiveness.</p> <p>Addressed</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 grant. Further, both GEF International Waters and Biodiversity tracking tools will be submitted as required. Along with three other projects dealing respectively with deep-</p>	<p>9th of May 2013 (cseverin): 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. It is still not clear how the GEF funds will be central in achieving a transformational impact, through the suggested activities.</p> <p>Overall, there is progress in components 3&amp;4. However, the progress has to be articulated more clearly, especially in terms of what the components and the project will specifically deliver including specific results and transformational impact. There is a piecemeal approach versus a clear integrated plan with specific outputs and implementation strategies of what is expected to be delivered from the PIF.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>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>	
14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<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>Output 3.1.1 - This output is</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> <p>9th of May 2013 (cseverin): The PIF framework is clear. The current one is not. It is hard to understand how the suggested activities will be working towards supporting the overall goal of the project and of the components. Further, the suggested outputs are setting out too low targets, especially seen in the context of large GEF grant and co-financing amounts. Please do revise.</p> <p>Examples: the low amount of people to be trained, as well as the very low participation in IWLEARN activities.</p> <p>Addressed</p>

	<p>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</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>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>	
	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.	<p>9th of May 2013 (cseverin): It seems that the methodology and rationale is sound, however. there is still room for improvements, e.g. to make sure that KOBE III recommendations are better integrated into the proposed activities. Further, as mentioned under #12, 13 and 14, please do improve the description on how the suggested activities will enable the project in reaching its objective.</p> <p>Addressed</p>
	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	<p>9th of May 2013 (cseverin): Please provide</p> <p>Addressed</p>
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>Section B5.</p> <p>Please delete the ISSF para in section B5 which is repetitive of part of the one in B1.</p> <p>[9/7/11]: Addressed.</p>	<p>9th of May 2013 (cseverin): Please provide.</p> <p>Description of public participation has been provided.</p>
	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	<p>Overall, potential major risks are accounted for.</p> <p>The risk on impacts from climate change should not just relate to issues at the</p>	<p>9th of May 2013 (cseverin): Yes, a risk matrix have been included, including potential mitigation measures and commenting on Climate Change impacts.</p> <p>A number of adjustments are needed. Risk3: If co-financing is an issue following PPG then the project</p>

		<p>level, it should also account for changes in tuna migration patterns. Please address.</p> <p>[9/7/11]: Addressed.</p>	<p>delivery of co-financing will flow as planned, otherwise implemenation of the project is questionable; risk 4 does not appear to be relevant in ABNJ.</p>
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>yes please define TCP.</p> <p>[9/7/11]: Addressed.</p>	<p>9th of May 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed project activities is to be coordinated with the RFMOs and other regional activities and organisation. However, it may make sence to make a stronger reference to the KOBE process and identify ways of how to work in closer cooperation with it.</p> <p>Addressed</p>
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>Please provide the following adjustments: Part 1: project identification table -executing partners: Please start with T-RFMOs/Countries and provide name of 5 RFMOs. 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>	<p>9th of May 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the implementation arrangement described seems to be adequate.</p> <p>Since FAO is the executing agency and reported lacking LT consultant contracts as intruments within its hiring system, FAO has informed the GEF that the project director will be recruited as a FAO staff for the duration of the project. Please clearly indicate in the contract that it covers tasks pertinent to the project during the project life cyle.</p> <p>Addressed</p>
	<p>21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>9th of May 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the structure is close to what was presented at PIF stage, however, the request for CEO Endorsement along with te full project document, does not make a strong case in explaining how the components and their associated outcomes and outputs will be facilitating reaching the project objective. It was oped that this would be achieved during project preparation.</p> <p>Addressed</p> <p>While the structure is close to what was presented at PIF</p>

		<p>content is not. The request for CEO endorsement and the full project document fail to describe the components and make a strong case to explain how the components and their associated outputs and outcomes will fulfill the project objective. This was to be achieved through the PPG. Please provide the story line and connect it to clear outputs and transformational impact.</p> <p>Component 1 fails to deliver effectiveness in ONE RFMO. Outputs 1.1.3 &amp; 1.1.5 are identical. The VDS scheme assessment falls under the mandate of FAO. Regarding VDS, a real output of the project would be, for example, improvement of VDS in WCPFC. Raising awareness on RBM through workshops should not be carried out with GEF funds. It is far from convincing especially given the multitude of past and ongoing RBM workshops held by many partners. It is more productive, and convincing, to demonstrate through a pilot. Where are the expected outputs from the PIF: 1.1.1 &amp; 1.2.1? Another option could be to, within IATTC, work with 1 or 2 countries which exceed capacity to develop a buyback plan. Yet another option which could be explored with ICCAT is the reconciliation of aspirational quotas and tag recovery model for 1 species. Moving the agenda of IOTC with pilot in one country is yet another option.</p> <p>Component 2:2.1 is unclear. 2.1.1 where are the action plans? overall 2.2 is good. 2.2.1 what the CLAV database to be let by IOTC is &amp; what it will deliver are not convincing. We hear from countries that there is a lot of interest for 2.2.3 &amp; 2.2.4, if indeed this is the case it could be tested in other regions as well. Output 2.2.6: is it not a duplication of FAO catch documentation scheme traceability best practice guidelines and of experts like Clarke's numerous published guidelines?</p> <p>Component 3. like for all the other components, its outputs are unclear and its storyline is lacking in the text and fails to demonstrate transformative results.</p>
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of	NA

Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	yes. PM is about 3.8% of the total budget.	9th of May 2013 (cseverin & Glineur): Yes, PM budget is ~5% of the total GEF funds. The GEF PMC is increased while the PMC cofinancing is reduced by 47%. Why is this the case? The original PM co-financing is needed if the project is to be successful.  Addressed
	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.	9th of May 2013 (cseverin): Yes the cofinancing is adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs. However, when these are reformulated, a re-assessment of the co-financing will be carried out.  Cpt 4. Please revert to original PIG GEF contribution and use the difference toward increasing electronic monitoring pilots.  The co-financing table needs to differentiate cash and in kind in separate lines  NOAA's in cash contribution of \$7.5M needs to be reflected (see PFD)
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Table C (which is incorrectly labeled X) currently combines cash and kind. Please provide separate indicative figures for cash and kind  [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 \$30 million to \$25 million. FAO sent an email on 9/2/11 indicating that: "The reason for that is because we	9th of May 2013 (cseverin): The Co-financing has been confirmed.

		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	9th of May 2013 (cseverin): Yes co-financing has been confirmed.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		9th of May 2013 (cseverin): Yes, all tracking tools have been submitted along with the proposal.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		9th of May 2013 (cseverin): Yes, a budgeted M&E Plan has been included.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> <li>• Council comments?</li> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
Secretariat Recommendation			
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	

		<p>comments</p> <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.	<p>Please address all comments above.</p> <p>It is crucial to articulate the request for CEO endorsement clearly. The case for reaching sustainable management of tuna fisheries and associated has to be made and demonstrated using the PFD and PIF as a basis. The storyline and clear outputs to deliver transformational results with a few crucial well targeted and integrated activities with clear outputs: one transformative activity in RBM in one RFMO; MCS-IUU: what will be better monitored and how it reduces IUU; by-catch: how and in which amount will it be reduced. This can be addressed rapidly in component 2&amp;3. Regarding component 1, decision needs to be made on testing an efficient activity relevant to RBM in one RFMO. This activity has to be identified</p>	

		PPG expected input, and can be implemented through the project.	
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?		9th of May 2013 (cseverin): Yes, PPG budgetary information were submitted (annex c)
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		<p>9th of May 2013 (cseverin): No, CEO Endorsement is not recommended at this stage, please address above comments.</p> <p>9/4/13. All GEFSEC comments above, except re. the Result Based Framework, have been addressed satisfactorily. Please also take this opportunity to include the two new partners (CMS &amp; the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific) with their relevant activities and parallel financing in the stakeholders' section.</p> <p>9/19/13. All GEFSEC comments have been addressed satisfactorily. Project is recommended for CEO endorsement</p>
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	<p>1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?</p>	<p>At this stage, no. The focus of the PPG should be on preparing a project document to be ready by early July for the COFI meetings and preparing for one pilot activity with high impact potential for tuna conservation. Consultants should be hired to cover work that cannot be performed in house by FAO, RFMOs, WWF, and other baseline project partners. The PPG currently covers activities that are beyond the baseline of project preparation and could be carried out by project partners. The following activities should be modified or excluded from the PPG as they have already been undertaken or can be funded from other sources:</p> <p>Activity 1: Numerous consultations have been held during and after PIF preparation. FAO held a consultation at the Kobe meeting which was to be immediately followed by call for, and receipt of RFMOs priorities. If not already done this should start immediately. Thereafter, should consultations be needed, a partners meeting w/RFMOs, to consolidate the priority activities, could be organized on the margins of one of their numerous meetings.</p> <p>Activity 2: This activity needs to be reduced. The baselines are known and consolidation can be completed in house by FAO staff. Baseline, project progress and impact indicators and targets agreed should be completed as part of workshop in either activity 1 or 6.</p> <p>Activity 3: The capacity needs assessment at the national level are part of the FAO and RFMOs baseline.</p> <p>Activity 4: This activity should explicitly state how results will feed into project implementation.</p> <p>Activities 5 and 6: These two Activities can be condensed into one activity. Output 5.1 should be part of the FAO baseline.</p> <p>[3/5/12] Proposed PPG activities have been reorganized and now are above the baseline. The proposed timeline in the annex is realistic and it is expected that it will be followed closely.</p>
	<p>2. Is itemized budget justified?</p>	<p>The proposed budget is too high for the activities described as many of them have already been carried out.</p> <p><i>There is a plethora of consultants with fisheries specialty profiles that could be</i></p>

	<p>team leader consultant, a seasoned and experienced practitioner team leader should be able to address financial, capacity building, and M&amp;E aspects of the project while calling on Fisheries specialists needed that do not have the profile of FAO staff. Please note that GEF funded consultants cannot be paid more than \$3000/week.</p> <p>[3/5/12] The scope of the PPG has been honed for non-baseline project preparation activities, which has led to a reduction of the number of consultants hired and the overall cost of the PPG. Please reduce the workshop cost from \$137,275 (as listed in Table E) to \$20,000 according to senior management guidance.</p> <p>[3/7/12] In line with senior management guidance, please reduce the travel budget and adjust PPG GEF funding to an amount of \$350,000.</p> <p>[3/12/12] Travel has been reduced to \$66,300 to bring the overall requested amount to \$350,000.</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	<p><b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b></p> <p>No, the PPG is not being recommended at this time. Please make the requested changes and resubmit.</p> <p>[3/5/12] Please adjust the following. In Table E (PPG Budget) the total amount listed for consultants paid with GEF funding is \$199,000. Our calculations show the true cost based on Annex A is \$201,000. Please double check calculations and modify table if necessary. Please also adjust workshop cost as identified in Box #2 above.</p> <p>[3/7/12] Please address the issues above and resubmit.</p> <p>[3/12/12] The PPG has been resubmitted following further reduction and will prove extremely useful for project preparation of this ambitious global project under the ABNJ program. The PPG is being recommended for approval at this time.</p>
	4. Other comments
Review Date (s)	<p>First review*</p> <p>Additional review (as necessary)</p>

\* 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.