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

GEF ID:	**9797**		
Country/Region:	**Regional (Cabo Verde, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Senegal)**		
Project Title:	**West Africa Regional Fisheries Program Phase 2 in Cabo Verde, The Gambia, Guinea Bissau and Senegal**		
GEF Agency:	**World Bank**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**161906 (World Bank)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Multi Focal Area**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**IW-3 Program 7; BD-1 Program 1; BD-4 Program 9;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	**$9,132,420**
Co-financing:	**$101,000,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$110,132,420**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Astrid Hillers**	Agency Contact Person:	**gayatri kanungo**

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]	(3/9/2017) Yes, the project is aligned with the IW GEF 6 objective 3 addressing both sustainable fisheries and habitat management. The main focus under IW 3 program 7. The project is also accessing BD resources in Guinea Bissau and is addressing AICHI targets 6, 14, and 11 (see page 51). It will reinforce IBAP and partners to sustainably manage protected areas and advance	

[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
		country's sustainable conservation financing through support of the BioGuinea Foundation (BD1-Program1). It will also help align fishing capacity with biological state of stocks and coordinate policies for fish resource management (BD4-Program 9). Please submit the missing LOE for Senegal. 3/30/2017: The LOE for Senegal was submitted. We note and confirm that each and evert correction in the letter has been signed by the OFP. We also note the confirmation by the WB office that the OFP will sent another letter once she is back in her office. Nevertheless, the LOE is acceptable and legally valid as is. Cleared.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	(3/9/2017) Yes, the alignment with national and regional strategies and plans has been outlined in detail on the document.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	(3/9/2017) The project is providing details on the intervention logic, experiences in previous interventions and lays out a clear and well designed phased approach for investments in each country under WARFP.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound	(3/9/2017) The incremental reasoning	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	incremental reasoning?	and global environmental benefits are described and provide a sound reasoning for GEF support. Please though revisit the numbers in table F: i. please revise the area under improved seascape management. Please only include a number that is distinctly addressed by the project (e.g. be specific for BD finance). ii. Please fill in an estimate for % fisheries moved to more sustainable levels. Please note that BY ENDORSEMENT we will request details on more firmed up numbers at that point and how these have been estimated. (3/28/2017) Comments addressed in the revised submission and details provided in the PID (pages 52 on) and the GEF datasheet. Cleared.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	(3/9/2017) The component description in the PID and GEF datasheet is well detailed and is describing in sufficient detail on how the project will be designed to achieve the PDO.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements,	(3/9/2017) The project is distinctly designed to provide benefits and work	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	with communities on sustainable fisheries management. Gender aspects are considered sufficiently at PIF stage. AT endorsement: please indicate how gender considerations enter project component design. For example, what will be provisions to assure that women will have adequate access to resources provided to small scale community measures.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	(3/9/2017) Yes, the Project correspond to the full use of the BD STAR allocation.	
	• The focal area allocation?	(3/9/2017) The project is within anticipated resources available remaining under GEF 6. (3/28/2017) Comment above is unchanged but please note that the remaining availability of resources under GEF 6 will be reassessed at each remaining WP constitution within GEF 6.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	(3/9/2017). The project is well designed and part of a long-term phased approach to sustainable fisheries in the region. Please submit the missing LOE for Senegal and address comments on the GEBs listed in table F above. Please also submit the ICR/terminal evaluation for the phase 1 investments which have already closed. By endorsement : please take note of the comments on GEF calculations and on gender considerations in project design. (3/28/2017). Thank you for quick resubmission and addressing in detail the calculations for the corporate GEB indicators (Table F and incremental costs annex. Cleared. Furthermore, that you for submitting the ICR and lessons learned documents. We look forward to receiving additional documents for WARFP as they become available. Cleared. The project will be technically cleared and recommended for WP inclusion as soon as the final LOE from	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Senegal is transmitted. We understand it is on the way. (3/30/2017) The LOE has been submitted and the project is technically cleared and recommended for consideration for a future work program.	
Review Date	Review	March 09, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 28, 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?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and 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		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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.