



# REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

**39514**

**GEFSEC PROJECT ID:**  
**IA/ExA PROJECT ID: P0 72202**  
**COUNTRY:** Regional: Comoros, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mozambique, Seychelles, South Africa, and United Republic of Tanzania  
**PROJECT TITLE:** Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Project  
**GEF IA/ExA:** World Bank  
**OTHER PROJECT EXECUTING AGENCY(IES):** UNDP (ASCLMES PROJECT), UNEP (WIO-LAB)  
**DURATION:** 5 years  
**GEF FOCAL AREA:** International Waters  
**GEF STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES:** *IW SP#2* – Expand coverage with foundational capacity building and targeted learning; and *BD SO#2*-Mainstreaming biodiversity in the production seascape and sector  
**GEF OPERATIONAL PROGRAM:** OP#8 – International Waters – Waterbody-based; and OP#2 - Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems  
**COUNCIL APPROVAL DATE: SEPTEMBER 2005**  
**COUNCIL APPROVED AMOUNT\*:** IW Focal Area : US\$ 9 million  
 Biodiversity Focal Area : US\$ 3million  
**CEO ENDORSEMENT AMOUNT\*:** IW Focal Area : US\$ 9 million  
 Biodiversity Focal Area: US\$ 3million

FINANCING PLAN (\$)			
		PDF	Project*
GEF	A	25,000	12,000,000
	B	350,000	<i>IW:</i>
	Supplemental B	350,000	<i>\$9,000,000</i>
	C		<i>BD:</i>
			<i>\$3,000,000</i>
<b>GEF Total</b>		725,000	12,000,000
<b>Co-financing</b>		(provide details in Section d): Co-financing)	
<b>GEF IA/ExA</b>		0	0
Government		\$200,000	10,520,000
Others		150,000 (FAO)	6,990,000 (FAO, France, SWIOFC, other)
<b>Co-financing Total</b>		\$350,000	17,510,000*
<b>Total</b>		\$1,075,000	29,510,000
<b>FOR JOINT PARTNERSHIP**:</b>			
Financing for Associated Activities If			
<b>GEF PROJECT COMPONENT (\$)</b>			
Any: US\$ 5,430,000, Baseline cost: 80.89			
(Agency Name)	(Share)	(Fee)	
(Agency Name)	(Share)	(Fee)	
(Agency Name)	(Share)	(Fee)	

For multi-focal area projects, indicate agreed split between focal area allocations  
 \*including an anticipated co-financing of 3million

Approved on behalf of the *WorldBank*.. This proposal has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the standards of the GEF Project Review Criteria for CEO endorsement.

Steve Gorman  
 Executive Coordinator, The World Bank  
 Date: January 19, 2007

**Project Contact Person:**  
 Christophe Crepin (World Bank)

Tel. and email: 202-473-9727,  
 ccrepin@worldbank.org

a) PROJECT COST

Component	Baseline Cost	SWIOFP Associated financing		GEF Alternative (SWIOFP project)			
				GEF Financing (OP 8+2)	Gov. Cont.	Other Co-Financing	Total GEF Increment
1: Data and Information Technology	2.3	0.65		1.9	1.6	0.3	3.8
2: Assessment and Sustainable Use of Crustaceans	14.1	0.95		2.88	1.5	0	4.38
3: Assessment and Sustainable Use of Demersal Fish	14.5	0.95		2.33	1.7	1.08	5.11
4: Assessment and Sustainable Use of Pelagic Fish	39.2	0.95		2.38	2.3	1.61	6.29
5: Mainstreaming biodiversity in national and regional fisheries management	5.3	1.60		0.51	0.65	0.3	1.46
6: Strengthening Regional Project Management	5.5	0.35		2.00	2.4	0.7	5.1
Monitoring of Fishing effort and Catch, existing value and exploitation conflicts	0	0		0	0.37	3.00 <sup>#</sup>	3.37
	<b>80.89</b>	<b>5.45</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12.00*</b>	<b>10.52</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>29.51 (including anticipated co-financing)</b>

<sup>#</sup>This is anticipated co-financing to be leveraged.

Explanation of the Baseline Scenario: The baseline scenario represents an assessment of the current national and international investment in areas complementary to the components of the ASCLMEs Project and SWIOFP. It has been calculated for both the ASCLMEs project and SWIOFP as the two projects are closely linked and build upon the same baseline activities (as presented at GEF work program entry). Therefore, the total baseline costs estimated at US\$80.89 million (associated with SWIOFP activities) are based on the assessment of ongoing and planned national and international efforts in marine and coastal research, monitoring, and management. The baseline cost and the associated financing are not part of the incremental cost calculations (Annex 15 of the GEF Project Document). The total cost of the SWIOFP project (GEF alternative) is US\$ 29.51 million, including the anticipated cofinancing of US\$ 3 million.

b) PROJECT MANAGEMENT BUDGET/COST

There are two levels of Project Management, namely: 1) regional coordination by consultants procured by the Government of Kenya (with input from the other SWIOFP countries), and; 2) country-level implementation-management. Project funds needed to support these two levels of management are costed in the following table.

Component	Estimated Staff weeks	GEF(\$)	Other Sources (\$)	Project Total (\$)
Locally recruited personnel <sup>1</sup>	<b>747</b>	<b>378,000</b>	<b>369,000</b>	<b>747,000</b>
Internationally recruited consultants <sup>2</sup>	<b>20</b>	<b>43,200</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>43,200</b>
Office facilities, equipment, vehicles and communications (for Regional Management Unit) (for national management units- 8 units)			<b>456,000</b>	<b>106,000</b> <b>350,000</b>
Travel and national operating budgets			<b>455,126</b>	<b>455,126</b>
Miscellaneous				
<b>Total</b>		<b>421,200</b>	<b>1,280,126</b>	<b>1,701,326</b>

Consultants working for technical assistance components: Non- Applicable

Component	Estimated Staff Weeks	GEF(\$)	Other Sources (\$)	Project Total (\$)
Personnel				N.A
Local consultants				N.A
International consultants				N.A
<b>Total</b>				<b>N.A</b>

**d) CO-FINANCING**

Name of Co-financiers (source)	Classification	Type	At Concept (\$)	At Work Program (\$)	At CEO Endorsement (\$)*
France (FFEM)	French GEF	Grant	-	1,000,000	1,000,000
Norway (research vessel)	Bilateral	Grant	-	3,000,000	-
FAO	Bilateral		Bilateral	250,000	2,270,000 <sup>#</sup>
Counterpart countries (contribution to research vessels from Seychelles only. Vessel contribution from Tanzania Mauritius and South Africa not included because too difficult to estimate until Data Gap analysis done and to avoid double counting with ASCLME)	Govt.	In-kind	-	4,000,000 (including S. Africa, Tanzania and Mauritius)	20,000
SWIOFC	Commission of counterpart countries	In kind	-	0	700,000
Government Contributions (Comoros, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mozambique, Seychelles, South Africa, Tanzania)	Counterpart Countries	Grants and in kind	-	2,600,000	10,520,000
Others				12,100,000	3,000,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>12,000,000 (estimated)</b>	<b>22,950,000</b>	<b>17,510,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> These are staff recruited for the Regional Management Unit based in Mombasa. Procurement will be by Quality and Cost Based recruitment, but it is anticipated they will come from SWIOFP countries.

<sup>2</sup> These are consultant advisors that will be hired by QCBS procurement and could be from any country

# Since WP entry the money that Norway will give is in the form of subsidized use of the R/V Dr. Fridtjof Nansen (a vessel that costs more than \$20,000/day to operate). Norway has turned over the Nansen Program's operation to FAO.

## 2. RESPONSE TO REVIEWS

### a) COUNCIL

#### Comments from Swiss Council

*Comment: According to PES Page 3, the following comparison needs special attention, namely: "Therefore there is a clear need .....including strengthened regional cooperation frameworks, and the maintenance or restoration of fish stocks on an urgent basis, and where possible by 2015".*

*There is no harm in learning from other successful projects and approaches, in this case BCLME. However, such a comparison, even if only for procedural purposes, should be used very cautiously. The reason is that there are vastly different conditions in the two regions (between the LMEs, state of knowledge, countries' disposition, political background etc). It would have been interesting indeed if in the project document (PES) such differences – or true similarities for that matter – had been enumerated and clearly defined.*

**Response: Lessons learnt from other projects have been taken into account in SWIOFP project design. The lesson learned from the BCLME was that regional integration should not be left to the end of the Project. The BCLME is only now trying to formalize regional management within a "stand-alone" body. Likewise, experience with the LVEMP-1 is that developing a mutually agreeable regional management body should be as important an exercise as the scientific work that forms the core of the investment. SWIOFP supports and strengthens the existing Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission by assigning it to perform its regional Project Policy and Steering functions (The Commission agreed to perform this function during its August 2006 meeting).**

*Comment: In Annex 6 of the GEF Project Brief, pp. 78, project "Implementation Arrangements" are explained. A three-level organizational structure of SWIOFP is given. Links to the WIO-LaB project are indicated. However, ASCLME project is absent from the graph named "Project Management Organigram" (Page 82) – or is it considered implicit in SWIOFP, as may be concluded from some of the text in the relevant annex? It is not our intention to outline to the World Bank how to organize a project. In the present case, however, much is mentioned about coordination between the various projects, but this is not explained in sufficient detail in the text, nor is it evident from the other related projects. There seems to be scope for improvement in this respect.*

**Response: The ASCLME's (UNDP-executed) and SWIOFP (World Bank-executed) are sister projects. GEF agreement on pipeline entry for these two projects stipulates that one cannot go forward for GEF Council and GEF CEO Endorsement without the other. The two projects have been prepared with this understanding and the preparation teams for the two projects participated in one-another's meetings. This is explained in the text of the GEF Project Document (which is coherent to the explanation in the ASCLME's Project Brief). The link to WIO-LaB (UNEP-executed) came later, as WIO-LaB preparation was stalled when the SWIOFP and ASCLME's Projects were discussed with the GEF and the preparation of these two projects initiated. The SWIOFP and ASCLMEs teams have**

integrated WIO-Lab retroactively into the overall LME study, which may be why there was some confusion in the text regarding the relationship between the three Projects. However, it is the intention of all three GEF Implementing Groups (UNDP, World Bank, and UNEP) that all these projects be implemented in an integrated manner under the “holistic framework” of the Large Marine Ecosystem approach.

*Comment: Under Outputs, Outcomes and Activities on Page 4 of the PES, it is stated that:*

*“The primary Project output will be..... More details on the components can be found in the GEF Project Brief Annex 4 and Section B, and in Annex B of this Executive Summary”.*

*We did expect that general outlines of both the future TDA and SAP could already have been given at this project stage (table of content, major expected issues), even though much relevant data are missing at this point in time. This even more so in view of the fact that BCLME similarities are being stressed in the PES (Page 3, see also above) as being evident. The argument is that data collection can proceed more effectively and goal-oriented when possible trans-boundary relationships have already been contemplated, and/or when typical, potential policy instruments have been defined*

**Response:** With the exception of large pelagics (SWIOFP does not concentrate on large pelagics as the Project recognizes the lead role taken in this fishery by the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission and only provides support and incremental additions to the existing IOTC scientific programs, such as the Tuna Tagging Project) almost nothing is known about the regional/straddling fish stocks in the Southwest Indian Ocean. This is in contrast to the BCLME situation where commercial fishing is much more prevalent and existing knowledge more extensive. The countries participating in SWIOFP don’t even know if formal SAP’s are necessary for demersal, crustacean and/or small pelagic fishes. The TDA’s will therefore start (under the initial coordination of UNEP and then switching to UNDP once the WIO-LaB Project finishes) following conclusion of the regional collection of existing data into a regional database. The TDA (and eventually SAP’s) will then be developed iteratively as SWIOFP and ASCLME’s research cruises yield new data.

### **Comments from German Council**

*Comment: The project proposal needs to better clarify and distinguish the two geographical regions WIO & SWIO.*

**Response:** More detailed maps have been included in the GEF Project Document to better clarify the geographical regions.

*Comment: There are no contributions by German Activities mentioned. However the project should try to link with the corresponding regional bilateral projects. It has to elaborate on the linkage of the project with related projects within the Southwest Indian Ocean to synergize and minimize overlapping activities.*

**Response:** The comment is appreciated and during project implementation the project will ensure that any possible complimentary linkages to ongoing projects will be looked into for synergies. It should be noted, however, that SWIOFP had, as part of its preparation activities, regular representation by the European Union, FAO, the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission, SADC, the Nairobi Convention, and the Indian Ocean Commission. Most bilaterals providing assistance in the Fisheries Sector do so through one of these regional bodies. To ensure we didn't miss purely bilateral activities in the sector, the Project hosted donor meetings in Nairobi, Dar es Salaam and Maputo where the meeting was particularly well attended.

*Comment:* Since local communities participate in the design of the project as consumers of results of the project, the project proposal should also mention in which way they will benefit from the outcomes of the project and how the anticipated results will be conveyed to them.

**Response:** A detailed Stakeholder Participation Plan (Annex 17) is included in the GEF Project Document which clarifies the roles, interests and benefits to the various stakeholders.

b) GEF SECRETARIAT

**Response to Comments in the Review Sheet of July 6, 2005.**

*Comment:* Stakeholder involvement plan should be ready by endorsement

**Response:** The Stakeholder Involvement Plan, including Products and Targets (attached to the present) has been completed and is now included as Annex 17 in the GEF project Document. Also, the draft Project Implementation Plan is finished and has been distributed to the Bank and the SWIOFP countries for comment.

*Comment:* M & E plan details and indicators ready at appraisal

**Response:** The Results Framework including the M&E Plan have been completed and included in the GEF Project Document.

*Comment:* Cofinance documented at time of endorsement.

**Response:** Letters of Co-financing commitment from France (French GEF) and Norway (from the FAO office that now runs the Dr. Fridtof Nansen Program) have been secured and are attached. Also letters confirming counterpart finance in the form of signed Minutes of Negotiations from Kenya, Comoros, Tanzania, Seychelles, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mozambique, and South Africa (all SWIOFP countries).

**Response to Comments in the Review Sheet of December 6, 2006.**

**Comment:**.... A Stakeholder Involvement Plan should as a minimum include a list of planned activities with associated products and timing. An example can be found in the Pro Doc for ASCLME pp. 39-41.

**Response:** The Stakeholder Involvement Plan, including Products and Targets (attached to the present) has been completed and is now included as Annex 17 in the GEF project Brief (see page 156). This is in line with the ASCLME project since the projects are interlinked. The “stakeholders” most closely and directly involved with SWIOFP are those related to commercial fisheries exploitation in the Southwest Indian Ocean. These are the existing Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) and the Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC). The SWIOFC has agreed to provide the regional policy and steering for SWIOFP (part of the Project cofinancing). SWIOFP also ties into the Tuna Tagging Program of the IOTC and is designed to augment the work of the IOTC Scientific Committee. The most recent (December, 2006) IOTC Scientific Committee Meeting recognizes the importance of SWIOFP and will be a partner in its execution. The following is extracted from the Minutes of that meeting to highlight the importance:

#### **“9. RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER REGIONAL BODIES AND PROJECTS**

85. FAO updated the SC with information on the Fisheries Global Information System (FIGIS) that now includes large information on tuna species, and the recent Methodological Workshop on the Management of Tuna Fishing Capacity (IOTC-2006-SC-INF22). FAO also requested that a representative from the Secretariat participate at the next meeting convened.

86. The SC thanked FAO for its work on capacity issues and requested that the Executive Secretary consider sending a representative if possible.

87. The EC informed the SC about the implementation of a large scale, multi-national research program on swordfish (Indian Ocean: Structure and characteristics of the Swordfish stock, IOSSS). The SC noted that the activities proposed in this program will address many of the research needs set for this species by the IOTC Working Party on Billfish. The SC encouraged all countries that catch swordfish in the Indian Ocean to contribute to this program.

88. The SC was informed about the South Western Indian Ocean Fisheries Project (SWIOFP) (IOTC-2006- INF05), a regional project being a component of the Agulhas-Somali Currents Large Marine Ecosystem Program partly funded by the Global Environment Facility. The SC welcomed this regional initiative and requested the Executive Secretary to work closely with SWIOFP and the South Western Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC) to ensure that the activities of IOTC, SWIOFP and SWIOFC are complementary.”

**Comment:** Co-financing needs to be confirmed and documented. ....The Agreed Minutes are signed only by the Government of Kenya, and it is specified in para. 1 that "the other [SWIOFP] countries' agreement to the negotiated documents will eventually be attached to these minutes of negotiation. If IA submits these attachments, this could suffice as confirmation of these countries contributions.

**Response:** The Agreed Minutes have now been signed by all 8 Governments of the SWIOFP participating countries: Comoros, Kenya, Madagascar, Mozambique, Seychelles, South Africa, Mauritius, and Tanzania. These were sent to GEFSEC earlier.

In addition, a new cofinancing commitment letter from FAO is attached (dated 12/19/2006), which has re-confirmed the availability of the R/V Dr. Fridtof Nansen for 220 days of vessel time as the co-financing to support the SWIOFP project.

- C) REVIEW BY EXPERT FROM STAP ROSTER (IF REQUIRED)  
STAP comments were addressed at WP Entry.

### 3. JUSTIFICATION FOR MAJOR CHANGES IN THE PROJECT, IF ANY<sup>3</sup>

**Justification for change in GEF Contribution to SWIOFP Finance Plan since Pipeline Entry:** SWIOFP was estimated to have an \$8-\$9 million contribution from the GEF, at pipeline entry. This estimate came out of the PDF-A meeting held in December, 2001. At that time, SWIOFP consisted of only 6 countries (Seychelles and Mauritius were only observers at this point) and the Project area did not extend further than the eastern coast of Madagascar. No technical work had been done other than to obtain endorsement of the first PDF-B grant request by the 6 participating countries. For a variety of reasons, preparation of a technical program did not start until late 2003, resulting in a science plan being drafted and presented at a plenary workshop in February 2004. It was only at this point that an estimate of actual/reasonable Project cost was possible. And SWIOFP had grown to 8 countries by this point, as Seychelles and Mauritius both asked to become full Project participants. This almost doubled the study area, but their addition was seen as essential if a realistic approach was to be taken in assessing and managing straddling and migratory fish stocks.

Once the SWIOFP countries had a chance to work as a complete unit and design a science plan, it became obvious that the amount proposed back in 2001 was not realistic and at least \$12 million GEF funding was needed and justified within a Project that had total cost (including contingencies) of about \$35 million. The biodiversity dimension of the project was always strong, as by-catch minimization and by-catch use, fishing impacts on non-associated species such as sea birds and marine mammals, and over-exploitation of some sensitive species of fish (fishing pressure on some sharks, tuna and bill-fish species, and slow-growing demersal fish, and by-catch impacts on turtles, marine mammals and seabirds has long been of concern at the national and regional levels). SWIOFP represents the first opportunity that all countries of the SWIO have had to address these biodiversity issues in concert. The justification for funding under the biodiversity focal area (instead of just the IW focal area) has been strengthened by including all biodiversity-related issues under Component 6 to better differentiate and respond to the different focal area priorities and Monitoring and Evaluation criteria. Thus the project was readjusted to seek funding under both the International Waters (OP#8) and the Biodiversity focal area (OP#2).

**Explanation for reduction in Co-financing contributions in the SWIOFP Finance Plan since WP Entry:** Since Work Program entry in July 2005, the Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Project has had to make some adjustments to overall project size. This is essentially because estimated bilateral co-financing was not realized by the time the preparation was completed and preparation funds completely spent (no money was available to the countries to follow-up with donors). As a result of a lack of formal commitments from various donors, cofinancing cost has been realistically reduced from US\$ 22.95 million to US\$ 17.51 million, which is a reduction of US\$ 5.44 million from the estimate made at pipeline entry. The cofinance that has been committed and verified consists of pledges including: a) \$10.52 million from participating Governments (an unusually high amount showing country commitment to the Project); b) \$1million from French GEF; c) \$2.27 million from FAO/Norway; d) \$0.02million from

---

<sup>3</sup> Provide justifications for any major amendments in the project, including an increase of project amount exceeding 5% from the amount approved by the Council. Justification for such amendments and the project document will be circulated to the Council for a four-week review period. For procedures to the approval for major amendments, refer to the Council paper: *Project Cycle Update: Clarification of Policies and Procedures for Project Amendment and Drops/Cancellations.* *GEF/C.24/Inf.5*

specific counterpart countries (contribution to research vessel from Seychelles), e) \$0.7 million from SWIOFC, and f) \$3million of anticipated co-financing that the Project expects to leverage once implementation starts and follow-up with interested donors becomes possible..

The revised total Project cost has been reduced from US\$ 35.11 million to US\$ 29.51 to account for the unrealized additional donor support (an estimated reduction of US\$ 5.44 million, all of which taken from base costs- non-GEF activities). The GEF amount remains the same at US\$ 12 million under OPs # 8 & 2.

Reduction in Project size was initially accommodated by dropping one component (which mainly included a seasonal assessment of overall fishing pressure in the combined SWIOFP study area – component 5, reducing the duration of several research cruises, and making more efficient use of existing skills and facilities that already exist in the government structure of countries participating in SWIOFP. These changes were made by research scientists from the Participating countries and then submitted to all countries for review and approval (which has been given). All fisheries research and management agencies participating in SWIOFP are confident that the original goals and objectives of the remaining components can be achieved under the existing budget envelope as presented.

It should be noted that SWIOFP countries did try to find additional bilateral support while funds from the PDF-B were still available. The countries, led by the Government of Kenya, held a series of donor conferences in Kenya, Tanzania, and Mozambique (February 7-13, 2006). And on the basis of these successful donor meetings , a financing of US\$ 3 million to establish a 1:2 GEF to donor funding ratio is expected to be achieved during the course of the project<sup>4</sup>. Therefore, the project team decided to include an anticipated co-financing of US\$3 million in the total Project cost that will be leveraged once the Project starts implementation. These additional bilateral funds, when leveraged, will finance the earlier dropped project component (see section below): Monitoring of Fishing Effort and Catch (see GEF Project Document, page 24 and Annex 3 Results Framework and Monitoring). This is also in line with the earlier bilateral discussions with GEF Secretariat.

The estimation of country contributions through participating country counterpart finance is underrepresented in the above tables. This is a result of difficulty in assessing and assigning counterpart contribution by the Government of South Africa between SWIOFP and the ASCLMEs Projects. These two projects are linked through Large Marine Ecosystem methodologies and were prepared in tandem (between the World Bank and UNDP). Both will be making use of South African research vessels that will be subsidized by the South African Government. However, until the two project management teams are formed and an integrated cruise schedule for the R/V Algoa (the research vessel most likely to be used by both SWIOFP and the ASCLMEs) adopted by the Marine and Coastal Management Division of the South African Department of Environment and Tourism (that allocates vessel time between SWIOFP and the ASCLMEs) there is a very high risk of “double counting” the counterpart contribution between the two projects. To avoid this issue, SWIOFP did not attribute any South African contribution to SWIOFP associated with the use of the R/V Algoa, even though the anticipated cruise schedule as presented in the SWIOFP PAD makes heavy use of this vessel both in South African waters and elsewhere in the Project study area. And as ship cruises are not scheduled to start until 2010, it is too soon to obtain a reliable estimate of the true value of vessels to be supplied from Tanzania and Mauritius to the Project. Estimates made of the value of these contributions to the Project were kept extremely conservative.

Finally, the original ICA does not include counterpart costs associated with personnel, use or facilities and support staff of Project countries. These non-ship counterpart contributions are substantial (an estimated \$3 million) and were included as cofinance, but not in the ICA assessment to ensure the ICA was a measure of “fiscal contribution”..

---

<sup>4</sup> The existing counterpart to GEF funding ratio is 1.5 to 1, which is much greater than the 1:1 ratio agreed with GEFSEC at Program Entry and is exactly the same as the funding ratio of the ASCLME (the SWIOFP sister project) that has already been Endorsed

Thus, to hinder any further delay in the project schedule, and to maintain the momentum gained during Project preparation, the World Bank is proceeding with the CEO endorsement. This is particularly important as our “sister project”, the ASCLMEs Project supported by UNDP, has just received GEF CEO Endorsement and is due to start implementation soon. Given the nature of the linkages of both the projects, and the likely need to share vessel time between the two projects, the team is keen to proceed with parallel implementation of the ASCLMEs and SWIOF projects.

**Explanation for Modifications to Project Components:** To match the change in the financing plan (as explained above), in the initial stage component 5 (as at WP entry) which was to be funded through IDA support and GEF cost of 1 million was dropped. The total costs in the various components were also readjusted to accommodate the reduction in co-financing. However following donor meetings and further discussions (as explained above) on leveraging additional co-financing, further adjustments were made to the scope of the project activities where Component 5 (as at WP entry) has now been redesigned to be considered as an additional component (Monitoring of Fishing Effort and Catch) which will be implemented subject to the co-financing which the Task Team will help leverage during the course of the project (see Table below).

**Table: Comparison of GEF Components at WP entry and CEO Endorsement**

<b>Components at Work Program</b>	<b>Components at CEO/Board</b>
<b>Component 1: Data and Information Technology</b>	<b>Component 1: Data and Information Technology</b>
Total cost: US\$ 4.61      GEF US\$ 2.4	Total cost: US\$ 3.8      GEF US\$ 1.9
<b>Component 2: Assessment and sustainable utilization of crustaceans</b>	<b>Component 2: Assessment and sustainable utilization of crustaceans</b>
Total cost: US\$ 7.73      GEF US\$ 3.0	Total cost: US\$ 4.38      GEFUS\$ 2.88
<b>Component 3: Assessment and sustainable utilization of demersal fish (excluding crustaceans)</b>	<b>Component 3: Assessment and sustainable utilization of demersal fish (excluding crustaceans)</b>
Total cost: US\$ 8.1      GEF US\$ 3.0	Total cost: US\$ 5.11      GEFUS\$ 2.33
<b>Component 4: Assessment and sustainable utilization of pelagic fish</b>	<b>Component 4: Assessment and sustainable utilization of pelagic fish</b>
Total cost: US\$ 3.8      GEF US\$ 1.0	Total cost: US\$ 6.29      GEFUS\$ 2.38
<b>Component: Monitoring of fishing effort and catch, existing value, and exploitation conflicts</b>	<b>* Additional component- The redesigned activities of this component are expected to be funded by the anticipated co-financing of \$3 million which is to be leveraged during the course of the project.</b>
Total cost: US\$ 4.17      GEF US\$ 1.0	Total cost: US\$ 3.37      GEFUS\$ 0
<b>Component 5: Fisheries impacts on non-consumptive/endangered resources</b>	<b>Component 5: Fisheries impacts on non-consumptive/endangered resources</b>
Total cost: US\$ 2.25      GEF US\$ 0.5	Total cost: US\$ 1.46      GEFUS\$ 0.51
<b>Component 6: Strengthening regional and national fisheries management capacity</b>	<b>Component 6: Strengthening regional and national fisheries management capacity</b>
Total cost: US\$ 4.45      GEF US\$ 1.1	Total cost: US\$ 5.1      GEFUS\$ 2.0

<b>Total Cost: US\$ 35.11 (GEF US\$ 12.0)</b>	<b>Total Cost US\$ 29.51<sup>#</sup> (GEF US\$ 12.0)</b>
---------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------

\* see justification section above and Pg 23-24 in the GEF Project document for details.

# This includes the anticipated co-financing of \$3million.

#### **4. REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS**

- a) Project Appraisal Document
- b) Confirmed letters of commitments from co-financiers (with English translations)
- c) Agency Notification Template on Major Project Amendment and provide details of the amendment, if applicable.

wb262782

C:\Documents and Settings\wb262782\Desktop\CEO Memo SWIOFP- 1-17-07.doc

01/17/2007 4:45:00 PM