



PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF)

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

THE GEF TRUST FUND

Submission Date: January 25, 2007

Re-submission Date: August 28, 2008

PART I: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

GEF PROJECT ID¹:3314

PROJECT DURATION: 3YRS

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: P092062

COUNTRY(IES): Senegal

PROJECT TITLE: Sustainable Management of Fish Resources

GEF AGENCY(IES): World Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): Ministry of Maritime Economy

GEF FOCAL AREA (S)²: International Waters

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): SO#1, SP#1

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT (if applicable):

STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP FOR A SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES

INVESTMENT FUND IN THE LARGE MARINE ECOSYSTEMS OF SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

INDICATIVE CALENDAR*	
Milestones	Expected Dates
Work Program (for FSP)	N/A
CEO Endorsement/Approval	9/20/2008
Agency Approval Date	10/30/2008
Implementation Start	12/01/2008
Mid-term Evaluation	1/15/2010
Project Closing Date	12/31/2011

* See guidelines for definition of milestones.

PROJECT PROMOTES SOUND CHEMICAL MANAGEMENT (if applicable): yes no

A. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To empower communities to reduce fishing pressure on the fish stocks supporting the central coastal fisheries of Senegal (from the Cap Vert Peninsula to the Saloum River Delta).								
Project Components	Indicate whether Investment, TA, or STA**	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Indicative GEF Financing*		Indicative Co-financing*		Total (\$) c = a + b
				(\$ a)	%	(\$ b)	%	
1. Co-Management of Coastal Fisheries	Investment, TA, STA	Increase in average size of key fish species caught in targeted areas Reduction of fishing pressure in targeted areas	8 Local Fishers' Committees (CLPs) legally established to manage the fisheries 8 communities and CLPs establish co-management agreements with Gov. 4 local fisheries management plans are approved by the relevant Local Artisanal Fishers' Councils (CLPAs) and implemented	2.65	33	5.5	67	8.15
2. Rehabilitation of Ecosystems Essential for Coastal Fisheries	Investment, TA, STA	Restoration of key habitats for fish species in targeted areas	2 Protected Fishing Zones (ZPPs) are created and legally established (covering over 6 communities) At least 2 artificial reefs are submerged and co-managed with the local communities	2.85	47	3.2	53	6.05

¹ Project ID number will be assigned initially by GEFSEC.

² Select only those focal areas from which GEF financing is requested.

			<p>Fishing access rights are introduced in at least two key fisheries</p> <p>At least 1 fishery is eligible for eco-certification according to the criteria of the Marine Stewardship Council</p> <p>Feasibility study and consensus on a sustainable financing mechanism for the recurrent costs of ZPPs</p>					
3. Alternative Livelihoods and Accompanying Social Measures	Investment, TA	Reduced fishing effort and capacity, new jobs created in targeted communities	<p>At least 8 communities receive grants, credit for alternative livelihoods to fishing</p> <p>20% of women in participating communities are benefiting from micro-credit to develop activities outside the fisheries sector.</p>	0	0	3.5	100	3.5
4. Institutional Strengthening for Fisheries Management, Project Management and Monitoring and Evaluation	Investment, TA	Strengthened national fisheries management planning, project management, M&E	At least 2 national fisheries management plans developed, M&E system established, project management	0.5	7	6.7	93	7.2
4. Project management***				0.2		0.56		0.76
Total project costs				6.0		18.9		24.9

* List the \$ by project components. The percentage is the share of GEF and Co-financing respectively to the total amount for Cp.

** TA = Technical Assistance; STA = Scientific & technical analysis.

*** Project management costs are embedded in Component 4, and therefore the estimated PM costs shown are inclusive and should not be added on top of the total cost.

B. INDICATIVE FINANCING PLAN SUMMARY FOR THE PROJECT (\$)

	Project Preparation (a)		Project (b)	Total C = a + b	Agency Fee
	PDF-A/B	PPG			
GEF		256,740	6,000,000	6,256,740	563,106
Co-financing		126,000	18,900,000	19,026,000	
Total		382,740	24,900,000	25,282,740	563,106

C. INDICATIVE CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT PROJECT PREPARATION AND FOR PROJECT BY SOURCE and BY NAME (in parenthesis) if available, (\$)

Sources of Co-financing	Type of Co-financing	Project Preparation	Project	Total
World Bank	Co-financing	126,000	8,500,000	8,626,000
Gov. of Switzerland	Co-financing		500,000	500,000
Gov. of France	Parallel financing		700,000	700,000
European Commission	Parallel financing		9,200,000	9,200,000
Total co-financing		126,000	18,900,000	19,026,000

D. GEF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY (IES), FOCAL AREA(S) AND COUNTRY(IES)* -N/A

GEF Agency	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)			
			PPG** (a)	Project (b)	Agency Fee (c)	Total d=a+b+c
(select)	(select)					
Total GEF Resources						

* No need to provide information for this table if it is a single focal area, single country and single GEF Agency project.

** Input only if PPG request submitted with PIF; if no PPG requested, leave the column blank.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. STATE THE ISSUE, HOW THE PROJECT SEEKS TO ADDRESS IT, AND THE EXPECTED GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS TO BE DELIVERED: Despite the economic importance of Senegal’s fishery resources and the marine ecosystems that support them, the sector has been facing major difficulties in recent years due to overfishing of the most valuable commercial resources and uncontrolled expansion of the number of fishers, boats and gear, as well as land-based fish processing and preservation facilities. The sector has essentially faced the ‘boom and bust’ cycle common to many uncontrolled common property fisheries around the world, where rapid development and investment led to strong growth in catches and returns, as well as the number of fishers and fishing capacity. Then as the fisheries continued to grow in an uncontrolled environment beyond what the fish stocks and resource base could sustain, they started to contract, bringing down catch and growth rates.

In Senegal, fisheries production rose steadily until 1985, when catches began to level off and landings began to decline. Since then, small-scale fishing effort has continued to increase, although the number of industrial vessels has remained stable. Essentially, these small-scale vessels have continued to proliferate even as fish stocks and catches have declined, due in part to rising world prices and demand for food fish which helped offset declining catch rates, and by vessels going farther and farther up and down the coast of West Africa in search of fish, or constantly replacing overfished higher value species for lower value ones (i.e. ‘fishing down the food chain’).

The result of this uncontrolled growth in the small-scale fisheries is that many of the highest value coastal demersal stocks have been almost wiped out. According to a recent World Bank sectoral study (ESW) in 2004, these coastal demersal stocks were the most heavily targeted and are now in rapid decline throughout the country, and as a result the fisheries which rely on them (mainly the small-scale sector) are struggling. This is of significant concern because these coastal demersal species usually account for more than 25 percent (in volume terms) of the country’s total catch, and more than 50 percent of the total value of fishery exports.

The impacts of these problems on coastal rural poverty in Senegal, as well as food security and macro-economic growth are significant. The resource base for the fisheries which account for roughly a quarter of the volume of fish caught in the country by the some 52,000 people directly employed by the small-scale fisheries (and likely benefits a large portion of the some 600,000 people indirectly employed in the sector) and 50 percent of the value of fish exports, is heavily overfished and facing a collapse. As this resource declines, the costs for the thousands of small-scale and often rural fishers to continue to participate in the sector will only increase, and the costs of relocating or shifting into new careers will certainly have profound social impacts along the coast, as will the reduction in one of the country’s largest exports

Senegal’s coastal fisheries and environment are heavily overexploited by an artisanal fishing fleet that is responsible for approximately 85 percent of the total fish catch in the country’s waters, and has outgrown Senegal’s marine resources to migrate all along the West African coast. The project’s development hypothesis is that in order to address the poverty-

environment nexus driving these coastal fisheries and the excess artisanal fishing fleet, the local fishing communities should be empowered and where necessary organized (e.g. as legally recognized Local Fishers' Committees) to collaborate with government institutions to sustainably utilize and manage the globally-significant coastal fisheries resources. The idea is that households in coastal communities will have greater incentives to sustainably use the resources and to invest in their rehabilitation, if they have the responsibility and authority to control their use. This development hypothesis is being tested in the GIRMaC project, and targeted communities have clearly validated and embraced the co-management model, by putting forward concrete proposals for management of the resources and entering into legal agreements with the Government to do so. The project will seek to consolidate and expand these examples, not only by expanding the coverage of the Government's co-management initiative, but also by testing additional tools for rehabilitation of the coastal fisheries, such as co-managed protected fishing zones, market-based approaches to encourage sustainable resource management through eco-certification of fish products, and the establishment of artificial reefs, among others.

The global environmental benefits of the project are reflected through the following key indicators: (1) Increase (by %) in the average size of fish caught for targeted species in co-management sites; (2) reduction (by %) in the level of fishing effort for targeted species in co-management sites; (3) 70 percent of community members surveyed in participating communities are satisfied with project activities to rehabilitate coastal fish stocks; and (4) a 20 percent increase in revenues from the sale of key fish products to commercial purchasers is achieved in targeted fishing communities..

B. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH NATIONAL PRIORITIES/PLANS: This proposed project responds directly to the Government's Letter of Sector Policy and is a high priority for the government of Senegal. The Letter of Sector Policy emphasizes sustainable co-management of the coastal fisheries resources, as well as protection of the key ecosystems that underpin the health of the sector. Therefore, the support of the key ecosystems and rehabilitation of globally important fish stocks in Senegal is interlinked with the realization of the sector's potential as a driver of accelerated growth. The proposed GEF support has thus been developed together with IDA support to the sector.

C. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH [GEF STRATEGIES](#) AND STRATEGIC PROGRAMS: The sustainable fisheries management activities that will be supported by the project align with SO#1 and will contribute directly to the implementation of Strategic Program 1 of the International Waters Focal Area: Restoring and Sustaining Coastal and Marine Fish Stocks and Associated Biological Diversity. More specifically, the project will enable the country to work together with artisanal fishers to implement fisheries and habitat management reforms such as co-management plans and marine reserves, which will allow the country to address the overexploitation of both transboundary fisheries and fish stocks. The project would result directly in one of the four expected outcomes from this Strategic Program: institutions and reforms introduced to catalyze implementation of policies reducing overfishing and benefiting communities. The project's results framework is therefore directly in line with the implementation of this Strategic Program and the expected outcomes and indicators

D. OUTLINE THE COORDINATION WITH OTHER RELATED INITIATIVES: The project will support the Government of Senegal to help rehabilitate some of the most overexploited fish stocks in the Canary Current Large Marine Ecosystem (CCLME), serving as a pilot for the other countries participating in the GEF-funded CCLME Program. The project will work closely with the CCLME Program, to ensure that the lessons learned are replicated widely by the Program. The project will also be implemented in partnership with several other donors, in order to help the Government finance the action plan in the Letter of Sector Policy. More specifically, the project includes direct co-financing from the World Bank (through the IDA resources of the GIRMaC, and a trust fund with resources from the Government of Switzerland), and parallel financing from (i) the European Union (through the STABEX project), and (ii) the Government of France (through support for improved practices and technologies in the industrial shrimp fisheries, both of whom are co-financiers to the project. These different donors will all be working together to support the Directorate of Marine Fisheries (DPM) within the Ministry of Maritime Economy to implement the Letter of Sector Policy for the fisheries, as a first step towards an eventual sector-wide approach (SWAp). In addition, the project will coordinate closely with the Government of the United States (USAID) – funded Natural Resource Management Project Phase II, which is preparing a coastal component in the southern region of the country.

E. DESCRIBE PROJECT-RELATED ACTIVITIES ADDRESSING THE SOUND MANAGEMENT OF CHEMICALS; OR ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES THAT COULD BE PURSUED IF FINANCIAL SUPPORT WAS AVAILABLE (if applicable):

N/A

F. DISCUSS THE VALUE-ADDED OF GEF INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROJECT DEMONSTRATED THROUGH INCREMENTAL REASONING :

In the absence of GEF assistance under the baseline scenario, the project will be implemented without particular attention to (i) critical ecosystems that support the fisheries in the targeted central coastal region and rural communities, or (ii) to expanding models of collaborative fisheries management (i.e. co-management) to a larger scale to reduce fishing pressure and restore stocks. Rather the project would be implemented with an emphasis on economic growth and diversification in the targeted areas, and on maintenance of the four existing pilot sites for fisheries co-management with no broader replication.

With support from the GEF, an expanded program could be undertaken comprising activities focused on empowering communities and local governments to work together to reduce overexploitation of the targeted fish stocks, and to identify and conserve critical coastal habitats in parallel with rural community development and fisheries co-management efforts. Essentially, the GEF alternative would build fishing effort and overexploitation reduction efforts into the local economic development activities of the project Without this support to sustainably co-manage and protect the key coastal ecosystems, any efforts to rehabilitate the fisheries are unlikely to be successful.

The estimated baseline project cost for the project is US\$18.9 million, with contributions from IDA, EU, and the Government of France. The GEF alternative is estimated to be US\$24.9 million. Therefore the incremental cost for the project is estimated at US\$6.0 million to address the protection of the ecosystems essential to the health of the transboundary coastal fisheries.

G. INDICATE RISKS, INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE RISKS, THAT MIGHT PREVENT THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) FROM BEING ACHIEVED, AND IF POSSIBLE INCLUDING RISK MITIGATION MEASURES THAT WILL BE TAKEN:

Risks	Risk Mitigation Measures	Risk Rating with Mitigation
To project development objective		
Risk that the institutional difficulties in the management of the GIRMaC will impact the project’s implementation	The project has avoided the same institutional structure as the GIRMaC, and will ensure that the restructuring recommended during the Mid-Term Review is implemented, which returned management authority for the co-management initiatives to MEM.	S
Risk that the resource management measures necessary will create negative social impacts in targeted communities, as a result of reduced incomes and/or livelihoods	The project has designed component 3 to mitigate this risk, with an alternative livelihoods fund available to help compensate fishers and families for any losses, and to encourage alternative livelihoods to fishing	S
To component results		
Component 1: Risk of conflict between neighboring communities that share the same coastal fisheries, where one/some are willing to participate in project activities and are others are not	The project will ensure that Government creates and operationalizes the Local Artisanal Fishers’ Councils in targeted areas of intervention, as a forum to resolve disputes, etc. between neighboring communities and sites.	M
Component 2: Risk that the excess number of fishers	The project will ensure that MEM legally recognizes the site-based activities to	M

and fishing boats active nation-wide will impinge upon and jeopardize project-supported activities in targeted sites	restore the coastal fisheries being supported by the project, and provides enforcement support as needed to communities to ensure their management measures are respected by outside fishers.	
Component 3: Risk that there will be a low uptake of micro-finance because of high interest rate charges, and a high default rate on repayments by borrowers	The project will negotiate a lower interest rate for fishers accessing micro-finance under this project with a well-established and tested micro-finance institution. The selection of an experienced micro-finance institution will help lower the risk of high defaults because of the institution's prior experience in this area	M
Overall Risk Rating		Modest Risk

H. DESCRIBE, IF POSSIBLE, THE EXPECTED COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROJECT:

The design of the project is considered the most cost-effective in comparison to the following alternatives considered:

A project focused on large-scale, multi-sectoral marine parks or protected areas was considered, in order to support a national network of such areas. However, there is not yet a legal framework nor political consensus in the country on the establishment and management of such areas, which would permit the project to finance their implementation directly. Rather, given the success of the GIRMaC in catalyzing communities to take a greater level of responsibility in the management and rehabilitation of the coastal fisheries, the project will support the implementation of community-scale protected fishing zones in the context of co-management, under the legal framework of the 1998 Fisheries Code.

Additionally, in terms of replicating the experiences of co-management under the GIRMaC, the project considered enlarging the area of intervention to try to demonstrate models along the northern coast near St. Louis, as well as along the southern coast near the Casamance. However, given the limited amount of funds available and the benefits of scale from concentrating in one area, the project will focus geographically on the fisheries along the central coast of Senegal, between the Cap Vert Peninsula and (including) the Saloum River Delta. This will allow neighboring communities to collaborate and reinforce their efforts, as well as human and financial resources to be economized.

I. JUSTIFY THE COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE OF GEF AGENCY:

The project lies with the World Bank's comparative advantage. The World Bank's comparative advantage in supporting coastal fishing communities and fisheries in Senegal lies in: (i) quality economic and sector work (2004 Senegal Fisheries ESW), (ii) ongoing policy dialogue with our donor partners to facilitate the implementation of the needed reforms in the management of coastal fisheries; (iii) coordination to enable collaboration between multiple donors to parallel and co-finance complementary activities, as co-chair of the fisheries sector donor's group in Senegal; (iv) the convening power to bring together stakeholders from local and national levels to reach consensus for resolving competing demands on the coastal fish resources; and (v) a track record of investment and lessons learned through the GIRMaC, which though certainly not perfect, provides a sound body of experience upon which to support further implementation of reforms.

PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)


A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT (S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):

(Please attach the [country endorsement letter\(s\)](#) or [regional endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this template).

<i>(Enter Name, Position, Ministry)</i>	<i>Date: (Month, day, year)</i>
---	---------------------------------

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for project identification and preparation.

 Steve Gorman GEF Executive Coordinator The World Bank	Christophe Crepin, Regional GEF Coordinator Africa Region
Date: August 28, 2008	Tel. and Email: (202) 473-9727 / ccrepin@worldbank.org