GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR PROGRAMMATIC FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT*
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	**9060**		
Country/Region:	**Global (Regional, Cote d'Ivoire, Cabo Verde, Ecuador, Indonesia, Peru, Senegal)**		
Program Title:	**Coastal Fisheries Initiative (PROGRAM)**		
GEF Agency:	**FAO, WWF-US and UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
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-4 Program 9;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$0**	Program Grant:	**$33,731,193**
Co-financing:	**$201,500,000**	Total Program Cost:	**$235,231,193**
PIF Approval:	**April 28, 2015**	Council Approval/Expected:	**June 01, 2015**
Program Manager:	**Astrid Hillers**	Agency Contact Person:	**Jeremy Turner**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments
Program Consistency	1. Is the program aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	03/18/2015: The program is well aligned with the GEF IW and BD strategic objectives and result framework. The program will focus on achieving GEF objective IW-3:Enhance multi-state cooperation and catalyze investments to foster sustainable fisheries, restore and protect coastal habitats; and GEF objective BD-4: Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Seascapes and Sectors. Cleared.
	2. Is the description of the baseline scenario reliable, and based on sound data and assumptions? Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	03/18/2015: The baseline is informative and provide a good oversight of the current barriers and baseline activities. However, please address the following points: - Challenges and Global Environmental Problems: the GEF mandate is to address global environmental issues and ensure global environment benefits. Therefore, please include in this

[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)?

Program Design		chapter the current statuts of the marine and coastal ecosystems; including habitats (coral reef, sea grass) and key endangered species threatened by unsustainable fishing practices (e.g. sharks, turtles...). Please, also add one paragraph on climate change impact on marine and coastal ecosystems dynamics. - Root causes: the complexity and lack of transparency of the supply chain and the market have been identified as one of the root causes of fisheries unsustainability, please better develop this aspect in the paragraph. In the three priority geographies, it is unclear what the root causes are, please revise and make it more specific. - Barriers to sustainablity inventives in the value chain: while it is agreed that the potential to draw on the market forces hasn't been fully addressed, we consider that certification scheme is certainly not the silver bullet solution. Therefore, please further expand on the other barriers related to value chain sustainability (e.g. multiplicity of actors, bad financial incentive, underdeveloped local and regional markets, lack of local/artisanal professional governance structure...). - Barriers to institutional structures and process: First and foremost, the political will is the major barrier to fisheries sustainability. The lack of recognition of fisheries importance in food security issue, in marine environment wealth is missing in this chapter, please update accordingly. In the last paragraph referring to the interrelation between coastal and ABNJ fisheries, please also add the cross-national relations (e.g. straddling and migratory stocks). -Barriers referring to best practices: This chapter needs to better depict the current barriers, therefore, please revise the last paragraph to better highlight the lack of harmonized method for fisheries data collection and monitoring. It could be worth to mention the % of fisheries that FAO doesn't/cannot assess, highlighting the work that needs to be done in this field. A barrier that could also be added is that often the cost of the MCS is fully supported by the public sector, while investment from the private

		sector could be expected. - Baseline: as a general comment, the baseline should better depict what are the major on-going initiatives at global and regional levels outside the GEF network. For example, what EC, bilaterals, IFI, big fondations are doing in the coastal fisheries management field. Second general comment, CFI will target all kind of fisheries inside the EEZ, the baseline gives the wrong impression that CFI will focus on SSF only, please adjust accordingly. - Baseline to sustainability incentives: as already mentioned, certification isn't the only solution to supply chain improvement, please refer to other on-going initiatives to support better private sector governance, better ownership and market approach of fishermen, and on the post-harvest. In this context, ISSF, Fish 2.0, Packard, FARNET, Fishforever could be highlighted. - Baseline to institutional structures: please include the "international" dimension, for example, make reference to the SDG, the Blue Growth network, the African Union framework...In the first paragraph, please also add one reference to the on-going work on fisheries monitoring, assessment. As mentioned already, CFI isn't the vehicule for addressing SSF issues only, please develop the text to make it relevant to all coastal fisheries. P15. please add a reference to the Port States Measure Agreement. In the last paragraph, the mention of ICFA should better fit under the baseline of incentive for supply chain. - Baseline to best practise: please mention the existing plateforms, global collaborations that CFI will build on. Box 2 will better fit in the Alternative scenario chapter. - Incremental/ additional reasoning: it is not clear what CFI will bring on the top of the on-going GEF and other partners' investments. CFI seems to be an isolated program that will mainly continue suporting "business as usual" investment. In revisiing the text, respond to the following question: what would happen in the absence of any CFI investment?

		Once the baseline will be revised, highlighting the major initiatives beyond the GEF network, and the role of the private sector, it will be easier to strengthen the incremental reasoning. For example, the text should better explain how the program will help to strengthen the global momentum on working toward sustainable fisheries, how it will make a difference in the private sector engagement, how it will speed-up the reform process in the selected geographies and indirectly the global process. It is noted and welcomed that the program wants to promote an holistic, integrated approach to fisheries but the summary of the regional/national child projects failed to demonstrate how concretly CFI will implement it. Please revise related chapters accordingly. - Innovation, sustainability: There is numerous reference of innovative mechanism, method, initiative, actions but it is never explain why and how they are innovative nor their potential to succeed, to be scale-up. The information provided should be more specific or provide some concrete example. For example, how the challenge fund or the research activities are innovatives and will help the global agenda. 03/26/2015: Thanks for having addressed most of the comments. T The major remaining issue is the length of the PFD (54 pages). The PFD should not exeed 25/30 pages; please revise accordingly. The chapter on program justification (challenge, root causes, barrier, baseline) cannot be longer than the Program description (alternative scenario). In order to find a better balance, please significantly reduce the lenght of chapter II "programmatic justification". Below are some suggestions: - para 3: instead of making reference to the Code of Conduct, please summarize in two/ three sentences what CFI will achieve. - para 4 to 6: this introduction could be reduced to one para. - para 7 to 12: reduce to two para max, hightlighting the global

		environment problems. - para 13 to 17: reduce to two paragraphs. In addition, the 3 geographical description could be removed as the description goes beyond the routes causes. - para 18 to 33: instead of listing the barriers per components and facing some redundancy (e.g governance issues), one option could be to merge then three set of barriers and reduce this part to 4/5 para. Baseline: CFI partners agreed that CFI will cover all fisheries in the EEZ but will not adress aquaculture and inland fisheries sector. The PFD now reflected well this agreement. Same comment as above the lenght of the text needs to be reduced. Therefore, the baseline of the three components could be merged and be more concise. Please, consider the suggestions below: - Para 34 to 37: Please, focus on global initiatives or initiatives implemented in the CFI targeted regions (the EU support to IO could be omitted for example). These para should focus on non-GEF IA programs; especially because these initiatives are mentioned later in the text (e.g WARFP in para 38). Para 37 could be deleted. Para 35, it would be more relevant to focus on on-going initiatives. Please remove the reference of the WWF/FAO proposal for GEF consideration. - Please merge para 38, 39 in one single para - Para 40 to 42: para 40/Second sentence replace MCS by MSC. Merge the three para in one. - Please merge Para 46, 47, 48, and 50 in one para. - Para 46 and 56 on COFI are redundant. One option could be to remove the mention of COFI in para 56. Minor comments: - For the two regional geographies, instead of calling them Latin America and West Africa, please mention the countries involved (i.e for Latin America: Ecuador and Peru; for West Africa: Cabo Verde, Senegal, Ivory Coast). 04/07/2015: cleared at this stage.

	3. Is the program framework (Table B) sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve program objectives and the GEBs?	03/18/2014: - Table A: expected outcomes have to be copied and pasted from relevant GEF strategies. - Table B/ Part C: General comments: As mentioned in above items, the added-value of the CFI program should be better reflected. An brief introduction explaining what CFI will achieved, how it will help the global community to move toward sustainable fisheries should be developed. The rational behind the choice of the three geographic focus should be provided (e.g how are they representative of the "global" problem, why working in these regions is relevant for the global purpose; how the experience will feed other regions, partners...). The program is promoting an holistic/ integrated approach and this element doesn't appear as a strong element in the components' description. After the theory of change, please present a description and a schematic that convey the Theory of Change for the Program which frames why these five components, when implemented as described will have the desired outcomes we seek. Finally, SSF is not the only focus of CFI, please explain better how CFI will deal with coastal fisheries in general. - Table B: some indicators are cut offs, please revise accordingly. Please, confirm that the baseline, targets, indicators will be finalized during the PPG and updated accordingly. - Box3/first bullet point: While impleicit, please clearly state that decision-making processes will be transparent. - Component 1: Please further explain what is the incentive of right based approach for resource users. As already mentioned, innovative has to be explained, for example what are the innovative market incentives? The last paragraph on innovative PPP and promotion of collaboration with different partners is very general and doesn't help to understand what the program intends to do, please further detail/explain. - Component 2: it failed to explain how the program will support an integrated and holistic approach to institutional structures and processes, please be more explicit on what the program intends to do. As mentioned earlier, CFI is a program that complements on-

		going and long term initiatives, therefore capacity building, awareness should not be the core of CFI activities, please clarify. - Component 3: the budget split by component seems inappropriate to the program objective. It is not rational to allocate more than 26% of the GEF grant to component 3 on best practice, collaboration and performance assessment. CFI is an action-oriented program; building on existing initiatives, programs. Again, capacity at national, regional level should not be the core of CFI activities. - Box 4: when using innovative, please explain what is behind in concrete terms. From the regional/ national project summaries, it is unclear how the holistic/integrated approach will be mainstreamed and how the CFI activities will build on existing on-going other initiatives and what CFI will bring on the top of these programs. - p34/ 9. child selection criteria: information on the contirbution of the child projects to program impact has to be provided. 03/26/2015: Component 3: the budget reduction is welcomed. As mentioned, the CFI is a short term program and therefore should only fund very targeted, specific capacity building activities. The Indonesia child project proposal to support the establishment of sustainable coastal fisheries learning centres will be carefully considered at CEO endorsement stage. Please see below some suggestions for a more concise text: - Please remove box 2. - Para 60: please correct the few typos. - Para 62 can be deleted - Para 67: the Key guiding principles are in the Strategic Framework document, annexed to the PFD, therefore please remove the Box 3 from the text. - Para 68: please, name the 3 components. - Para 79 and 80: please put them at the beginning of the Component 1 description (before para75). Please do the same for

		component 2 and 3. Minor comments: - For the two regional geographies, instead of calling them Latin America and West Africa, please mention the countries involved (i.e for Latin America: Ecuador and Peru; for West Africa: Cabo Verde, Senegal, Ivory Coast). 04/07/2015: Cleared at this stage.
	4. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	03/18/2015: The socio-economic aspects and CSOs involvment in the program represent core pillars of the CFI. Comprehensive information is provided on the baseline and how the project will address these aspects. However, it may be helpful to map the key stakeholders and their prospective roles per Program Component. With regards to socio-economic benefits, the discussion on benefits to stakeholders is presented but the PFD would benefit by emphasizing this element more strongly here noting that the program will particularly seek to generate benefits-- tangible monetary and non-monetary-- that will accrue to local communities and those working on sustainable fisheries supply chain. At CEO endorsement, it is expected that the child projects provide specific and quantifiable information. 03/26/2015: Comment addressed. At CEO endorsement, it is expected that the child projects provide specific and quantifiable information. Cleared.
	5. Does the program 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)	03/18/2015: yes, a comprehensive description of the risk inherent in the Program and mitigation measures proposed are reasonable and rationale. Cleared.
	6. If there is a non-grant instrument in the program, is the GEF Agency(ies) capable of managing it?	03/18/2015: The program will not manage non-grant instrument. Cleared.
	7. Is the program coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	03/13/2015: As mentioned in previous items, it seems that CFI will evolve in silo, building on GEF agencies baseline but failing to coordinate, take advantage of other initiatives at global and

		regional levels. Please address this comment in the baseline and alternative scenario chapters. 03/26/2015: Comment addressed. Please try to be more concise. The lenght of this chapter 6 (from para 112 to 119) could be reduced, as most of the information has already been provided under component 3. 04/07/2015: Cleared at this stage.
	8. Is the program implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	03/18/2015:Yes, the execution arrangement sounds adequate and the PSC should further elucidate these arrangements at its first meeting. However, further information regarding the Global Reference Group would be appreciate. Please, better explain how this Group will be used to enhance the CFI profile and make it a international recognized initiative. 03/26/2015: Further details on the GRG have been provided. The ToR of the GRG and the SC will have to be submitted at CEO endorsement. Cleared.
	9. Does the program include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	03/18/2015: Yes, the program include an M&E plan and indicators are included. It is noted that the indicators and targets will be finalized during the PPG phase and results highlighted under the child project "Global Partnership". Cleared.
	10. Does the program have description of knowledge management plan?	03/18/2015: Yes, preliminary information is provided. It is noted that the program will build as much as possible on existing platform, initiative; such as IW-learn. It is also noted that a comprehensive KM management plan will be further developed during the PPG phase and presented under the child project: Global partnership. Cleared.
Resource Availability	11. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• the STAR allocation?	03/18/2015: The proposed grant is within the ressources of BD STAR allocation. The total allocation requested from STAR BD is US$7,8 million (without PPG). From the six countries involved in the Program, only two countries have allocated STAR (Indonesia and Peru). The allocation of STAR is a good indicator of country interest and ownership of the program proposal. It is therefore expected that more countries allocate STAR to the

		program, and at least to have one country per geographic area. Please provide an update of the on-going discussion with the related countries, and a timeline for receiving the LoE. In any case, LoE will be needed to include countries in this program. So far, LoE have been received for Indonesia, Ecuador, and Peru. 03/26/2015: The commitment from Ivory Coast is well appreciated. All the LoE have been received. Cleared.
	• the focal area allocation?	03/18/2015: The total allocation from IW focal area to the Program is US$30 million. The IW allocation will be used to implement global activities (i.e. The Challenge Fund and the CFI global partnership) and regional/national activities in the three geographic priorities of the program. The budget details will be reviewed once the comments made in the above items are addressed. 03/26/2015: Cleared at this stage. Adjustement may be requested when reviewing the endorsement package of the child projects.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?	03/18/2015: N/A
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	03/18/2015: N/A
	• focal area set-aside?	03/18/2015: N/A
PFD Clearance	**Is the PFD recommended for clearance to include in the work program?**	03/18/2015: The PFD cannot be recommended for clearance at this stage, many issues have been identified above that require revisions. 03/26/2015: The PFD cannot be recommended for clearance at this stage, please address the remaining issues, comments identified above. 04/07/2015: The PFD can be technically cleared. Adjustment may be requested when reviewing the endorsement package of the child projects. It is expected that the following information will be submitted at a later stage: - ToR of the GRG and the SC; - CFI SMART indicators, targets, and results; - KM plan fully developed.
Review Date (s)	Review*	March 18, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 26, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 07, 2015

*** 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.**