

Document of  
The World Bank

Report No: ICR00002459

IMPLEMENTATION COMPLETION AND RESULTS REPORT  
(IDA-45450 TF-93654)

ON A

CREDIT  
IN THE AMOUNT OF SDR2.3 MILLION  
(US\$3.5 MILLION EQUIVALENT)

AND A

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL FACILITY GRANT  
IN THE AMOUNT OF US\$6.0 MILLION

TO THE

REPUBLIC OF SENEGAL

FOR A

SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF FISH RESOURCES PROJECT

February 5, 2013

Environment and Natural Resources Management Unit 3 (AFTN3)  
Sustainable Development Department  
Country Department 1 (AF1)  
Africa Region

## CURRENCY EQUIVALENTS

(Exchange Rate Effective June 30, 2012)

Currency Unit = CFA Franc

CFAF500 = US\$1.00

US\$1.00 = SDR0.66

FISCAL YEAR

[January 1 – December 31]

## ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AFD	<i>Agence Française de Développement</i> – French Agency for Development
CAS	Country Assistance Strategy
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CCLME	Canary Current Large Marine Ecosystem Project
CLP	<i>Comité Local de Pêcheurs</i> / Local Fishers' Committee
CLPA	<i>Conseil Local de Pêche Artisanale</i> / Local Council of Artisanal Fishers
CMS	<i>Crédit Mutuel du Sénégal</i> /Credit Union of Senegal
CNCPM	<i>Conseil National Consultatif de Pêches Maritimes</i> / National Consultative Council for Marine Fisheries
COMO	<i>Cellule Opérationnelle de Mise en Oeuvre</i> /Project Implementation Unit
COREMAP	<i>Coral Reef Rehabilitation and Management Project</i>
CPUE	<i>Catch-per-unit effort</i>
DDI	<i>Direction de la Dette et de l'Investissement</i> /Directorate for Debt and Investment
DPM	<i>Direction des Pêches Maritimes</i> /Directorate for Marine Fisheries
DPSP	<i>Direction de la Protection et de la Surveillance des Pêches</i> / Directorate for Fishing Protection and Surveillance
EOP	End of Project
ESW	Economic and Sector Work
FRAP	<i>Fonds de Reconversion des Artisans Pêcheurs</i> /Alternative Livelihoods to Fishing and Poverty Reduction Fund
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GDRH	<i>Projet de Gestion Durable des Ressources Halieutiques</i> / Sustainable Management of Fish Resources Project
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIRMaC	<i>Projet de Gestion Intégrée des Ressources Marines et Côtières</i> /Integrated Marine and Coastal Resource Management Project
IAT	<i>Institution d'Appui Technique</i> / Technical Assistance Institution
IDA	International Development Association
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
LSP	Letter of Sector Policy
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MCS	Monitoring, Control and Surveillance

MFMA	Ministry of Fisheries and Maritime Affairs (previously Ministry of Maritime Economy) / <i>Ministère de la Pêche et des Affaires Maritimes</i>
MFI	Micro Finance Institution
PNI	<i>Programme National d’Immatriculation</i> /National Registration Program
UNCLOS	United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea
ZER	<i>Zone d’Exploitation Réglementé</i> /Controlled Fishing Zone
ZIP	<i>Zone d’Interdiction de Pêche</i> /Prohibited Fishing Zone
ZPP	<i>Zone de Pêche Protégée</i> /Protected Fishing Zone

Vice President: Makhtar Diop

Country Director: Vera Songwe

Sector Manager: Magdolna Lovei

Project Team Leader: John Virdin

ICR Team Leader: John Virdin

**SENEGAL**  
**Sustainable Management of Fish Resources Project**

**CONTENTS**

**Data Sheet**

- A. Basic Information
- B. Key Dates
- C. Ratings Summary
- D. Sector and Theme Codes
- E. Bank Staff
- F. Results Framework Analysis
- G. Ratings of Project Performance in ISRs
- H. Restructuring
- I. Disbursement Graph

1. Project Context, Development and Global Environment Objectives Design .....	1
2. Key Factors Affecting Implementation and Outcomes .....	5
3. Assessment of Outcomes .....	12
4. Assessment of Risk to Development Outcome and Global Environment Outcome ..	16
5. Assessment of Bank and Borrower Performance .....	17
6. Lessons Learned .....	19
7. Comments on Issues Raised by Borrower/Implementing Agencies/Partners .....	21
Annex 1. Project Costs and Financing .....	22
Annex 2. Outputs by Component .....	25
Annex 3. Economic and Financial Analysis .....	39
Annex 4. Bank Lending and Implementation Support/Supervision Processes .....	40
Annex 5. Results Framework Analysis .....	42
Annex 6. Summary of Borrower's ICR and/or Comments on Draft ICR .....	46
Annex 7. Comments of Cofinanciers and Other Partners/Stakeholders .....	73
Annex 8. List of Supporting Documents .....	74

**I N S E R T**  
**D A T A S H E E T**  
**H E R E**

AFTER APPROVAL BY COUNTRY DIRECTOR  
AN UPDATED DATA SHEET SHOULD BE INSERTED  
MANUALLY IN HARD COPY  
BEFORE SENDING A FINAL ICR TO THE PRINT SHOP.

NOTE: The Data Sheet is generated by the system  
using the information entered in the Operations Portal  
each time you use “Send Draft”, “Print” or “Submit Final” functions.

## **1. Project Context, Development and Global Environment Objectives Design**

*(this section is descriptive, taken from other documents, e.g., PAD/ISR, not evaluative)*

### **1.1 Context at Appraisal**

*(brief summary of country and sector background, rationale for Bank assistance)*

Senegal and its neighbors are endowed with some of the richest fishing grounds in the world and its coastal marine fish resources play a critical role in the economy. Fishing and the associated activities are estimated to provide more than 600,000 jobs. Fisheries makes a significant contribution to food security, constituting about 70 percent of animal protein consumption in the country, and fish products accounted for about 32 percent of the country's exports.

At appraisal, the sector was experiencing overfishing and uncontrolled expansion of fishers, boats and gear, as well as land-based fish processing and preservation facilities. Fish catch and growth rates were experiencing variable growth and decline and although the number of industrial vessels has remained stable, small-scale fishing effort has increased since 1985 while fish stocks and catches declined. This was due, in part, to rising world prices and demand for fish which offset the declining catch rates, and by vessels fishing along the coast of West Africa or replacing overfished higher value species for lower value ones. As a result, high value coastal demersal stocks, which accounted for over 25 percent of the country's total catch volume, and more than 50 percent of the total value of fishery exports became severely depleted<sup>1</sup>. Small-scale fishery migrated to neighbouring waters and over 30 percent of the coastal demersal species landed in Senegal by small-scale fishers are caught outside came from the neighbouring countries of The Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania, and Guinée. Overexploitation of the coastal fisheries and declining fish resources impacted the livelihood of thousands of small-scale fishers and also the country's largest exports.

***Government Response to Key Sector Issues and Constraints.*** The Government of Senegal named the fisheries sector as one of the key drivers of the "creation of wealth" pillar in the fight against poverty in the first Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (2003-2005) and second Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (2006-2010). Senegal's Accelerated Growth Strategy also named fisheries as one of the five sectors of the national economy with high economic potential and driver of accelerated economic growth.

The Government's 2008 Letter of Sector Policy emphasized sustainable management of fish resources, in which it proposed a two-pronged approach: (i) implement systems of collaborative

---

<sup>1</sup> Gert van Santen, Moubarak Lo, John Viridin, "Republic of Senegal, Fishery Sector Strategy," May 19, 2005. The report confirmed Senegal's "fisheries sector is in crisis and requires effective governance"...meaning: rebuilding of fish stocks, the Government will need to more effectively the fish resources for which it is responsible, an effective process to design and administer the restructuring of the sector to accommodate reduction in fishing effort and the introduction of new management systems, a target of zero percent growth of demersal fish production from the country's Exclusive Economic Zone with stable annual catch levels of other species, and annual fisheries management plans, restructure the sector and create a new management system.

or co-management for the coastal fisheries, to devolve more of the responsibility for managing these overfished resources to the users, to support them to implement needed reforms, and (ii) introduce a system of fishing access rights to fishers (including offshore fishers) as a tool to offset the reduction of fishing capacity and the recovery of the stocks.

To address the introduction of fishing access rights, the Government was working with eight neighboring countries to prepare a regional initiative that would be co-financed by the World Bank and GEF, the West Africa Regional Project for Fisheries (WARFP), which would support the introduction of rights on a large scale, in complement to the co-management initiatives of the Integrated Marine and Coastal Resource Management Project (*Projet de Gestion Intégrée des Ressources Marines et Côtières (GIRMaC)*) and this Project, the Sustainable Management of Fish Resources Project (*Gestion Durable des Ressources Halieutiques (GDRH)*). The Government was also participating in the GEF-funded Canary Current Large Marine Ecosystem Project (CCLME), which addresses transboundary concerns on declining fisheries, biodiversity and water quality through governance, and investment and management programs. It was also managed by the Ministry of Maritime Economy (now the Ministry of Fisheries and Maritime Affairs) in order to ensure synergies across programs.

***Country Eligibility for GEF Co-Financing.*** Senegal ratified the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) in October 1984 and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in June 1994. GEF co-financing helped the Government of Senegal address the International Waters focal area of the GEF (unsustainable exploitation of fisheries and protection of fisheries habitats) and helped Senegal respond to the first, second and third Conferences of the Parties (COP) to the Biodiversity Convention, which stresses the importance of *in situ* conservation of marine and coastal ecosystems. It responded specifically to the Jakarta Mandate approved by COP2, in that it supported the sustainable use and conservation of vulnerable habitats and species. The proposed GEF co-financing was also to assist the Government of Senegal in meeting the targets set by the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg in 2002, both for (a) sustainable fisheries to be achieved by 2015, and (b) a network of representative marine protected areas to be implemented by 2012.

***Rationale for Bank Involvement.*** The Bank's agriculture and rural development strategy, *Reaching the Rural Poor* (2002), together with its Fisheries Approach Paper, *Saving Fish and Fishers* (2004), provided the rationale for the Bank's support to the management of the coastal fisheries reforms piloted through the GIRMaC, and expanded in this Project.

The two projects, the GDRH with the IDA credit of the GIRMaC, were to support community-based fisheries management reforms in the central coastal region of the country, and serve as pilots for the investments in the country's fisheries through the WARFP. The package of operations was to support the implementation of the first objective of the Government of Senegal's 2008 Letter of Sector Policy (LSP) and formed part of a multi-donor program to assist the Government implement the LSP. The Government also expected that the two projects would provide lessons for the larger CCLME project in Senegal. The aim was to ensure sustainable management and restoration of the fish resources and their habitats, so that the sector can realize its potential as a pillar of economic growth for the country, as planned in the Accelerated Growth Strategy. The Project also supported alternative livelihoods to fishing in targeted communities in

order to reduce pressure on resources and address key social issues through a ‘fishers’ reconversion fund.’

The Project is in line with the *Strategic Partnership for Africa’s* eligibility criteria and consistent with the Partnership’s 10 operating principles.

### **1.2 Original Project Development Objectives (PDO) and Key Indicators (as approved)**

The combined development PDO/GEO of the project was 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), by: (i) promoting co-management of the coastal fisheries, (ii) contributing to the rehabilitation of the essential ecosystems for the coastal fisheries, and (iii) supporting alternative livelihoods and accompanying poverty reduction measures in targeted poor fishing communities.

The Key Indicators for the Project were:

- An increase in the average size of fish caught for targeted species in co-management sites;
- A reduction in the level of fishing effort for targeted species in co-management sites;
- Eight new co-management sub-project proposals are approved as legal agreements with the Government and successfully implemented by end-of-project (EOP);
- 70 percent of community members surveyed in participating communities are satisfied with project activities to rehabilitate coastal fish stocks (Zone de Pêches Protégées (ZPPs), artificial reefs, ecolabelling);
- Each community targeted by the project has access to a system of micro-credit, and project-supported poverty reduction measures are implemented in at least the four initial pilot sites, by EOP.

### **1.3 Original Global Environment Objectives (GEO) and Key Indicators (as approved)**

As above.

### **1.4 Revised PDO (as approved by original approving authority) and Key Indicators, and reasons/justification**

The PDO was not revised.

### **1.5 Revised GEO (as approved by original approving authority) and Key Indicators, and reasons/justification**

The GEO was not revised.

### **1.6 Main Beneficiaries,**

*(original and revised briefly describe the "primary target group" identified in the PAD and as captured in the PDO/GEO, as well as any other individuals and organizations expected to benefit from the project)*

***At the departmental and local levels,*** the primary beneficiaries were the members of the fishing communities in the 12 project sites (the 4 initial pilot sites of Ouakam, Ngaparou, Foundiougne, and Betenty, and the eight additional sites of Soumbédioune, Bargny, Yenne, Mballing, Nianing,



Pointe-Sarène, Mbodiène, and Fimela-Ndangane). The Local Fisher Committees (CLPs) representing the fishing communities, and the Local Artisanal Fisheries Council (CLPAs) members as the project seeks to reinforce their structure and capacity to guide the CLPs in the selection process and evaluation of sub-projects, were supported under the Project. The departmental or regional representatives of the Government administration, community facilitators were beneficiaries of project funding, having been trained and employed as consultants under the Project.

*At the national level*, the beneficiaries, as direct recipients of capacity-building, technical assistance and training support, and provisions of equipment and materials were the personnel of the Ministry of Fisheries and Maritime Affairs (previously the Ministry of Maritime Economy) involved in the Project, the Senegalese agency for fisheries monitoring, control and surveillance (DPSP), the personnel of the *Direction des Pêches Maritimes*' Implementation Unit (*Cellule Opérationnelle de Mise en Oeuvre (COMO)*), the *Conseil National Consultatif de Pêche Maritimes (CNCPM)*, the National research institutions such as the *Centre de Recherches Océanographiques de Dakar-Thiaroye (CRODT)(GIRMaC)*. In terms of consultancies, firms included the World Wildlife Fund (WWF WAMER) was contracted to implement Component 2- Rehabilitation of Ecosystems activities of the Project; the *Crédit Mutuel de Sénégal (CMS)* was the banking institution responsible for managing the grant funds for communities' micro-credit funds, the technical assistance institution, SEN Ingénierie Consult, contracted for the technical aspects of implementation and management of the micro-credit fund with the communities for Component 3. Individual consultants hired under the project for technical and advisory services included those for M&E, and co-management, as well as for fiduciary responsibilities.

### **1.7 Original Components (as approved)**

**Component 1: Co-management of Coastal Fisheries (US\$2.0m IDA-GIRMaC project, US\$2.66m GEF, US\$2.60m EU, US\$0.34m Government of Senegal).** The objective of this component was to implement co-management systems to improve the governance of the coastal fisheries for a more sustainable use of the resources, through the following sub-components:

- 1.1 Promotion of local co-management initiatives in four pilot sites (\$2.00m IDA GIRMaC project);*
- 1.2 Consolidation and strengthening of coastal fisheries co-management (\$2.36m GEF, \$0.30m Government); and*
- 1.3 Institutional support for a system of local fisheries governance (\$0.30m GEF, \$2.60m EU, \$0.04m Government).*

**Component 2: Rehabilitation of Ecosystems Essential for Coastal Fisheries (US\$2.4m GEF, US\$0.5m IDA-GIRMaC project, US\$1.5m EU, US\$0.5m Switzerland, US\$0.4m Government).** The objective of this component was to contribute to the rehabilitation of ecosystems essential to the coastal fisheries, by establishing Protected Fishing Zones (*Zones de Pêches Protégées (ZPPs)*) in association with artificial reefs, in order to help regenerate the natural resources, and by creating market mechanisms to encourage sustainable management of the ecosystems through the following sub-components:

- 2.1 *Protected fishing zones (\$0.9m GEF, \$0.15m Government);*
- 2.2 *Artificial reefs (\$0.8m GEF, \$0.13m Government);*
- 2.3 *Introduction of access rights and associated management instruments (\$0.1m GEF, \$0.5m IDA-GIRMaC project, \$1.5m EU, \$0.5m Switzerland); and*
- 2.4 *Market incentives for sustainable management for targeted fisheries (\$0.6m GEF, \$0.12m Government).*

**Component 3: Poverty Alleviation Measures for Fishing Communities and Alternative Livelihoods for Fishers, Fish Processors, and Fish Transporters (*mareyeurs*) (US\$3.5m IDA, US\$0.46m Government).** The objective of this component was to offset any negative socio-economic impacts for targeted fishing communities resulting from co-management initiatives or management plans (including the introduction of instruments such as ZPPs, artificial reefs, eco-labels, etc.), through the following sub-components:

- 3.1 *Poverty alleviation initiatives in Project-targeted communities (\$2.0m IDA, \$0.25m Government);*
- 3.2 *Support for alternative livelihoods to fishing (\$1.0m IDA, \$0.1m Government); and (3) Capacity building, monitoring and evaluation, and communications (\$0.5m IDA, \$0.11m Government).*

**Component 4: Institutional Strengthening for Fisheries Management, Project Management and Monitoring and Evaluation (US\$2.5m IDA-GIRMaC project, US\$0.94m GEF, US\$5.1m EU, US\$0.15m Government).** The objective of this component was to support the Ministry of Maritime Economy to manage and implement the project in the context of the Letter of Sector Policy, and to monitor and evaluate results, through the following sub-components:

- 4.1 *Development of a fisheries code and support for the implementation of fisheries management plans (\$0.9m IDA-GIRMaC project, \$4.4m EU, \$0.28m GEF, \$0.04m Government);*
- 4.2 *Project management, monitoring and evaluation (\$1.6m IDA-GIRMaC project, \$0.7m EU, \$0.6m GEF, \$0.11m Government); and*
- 4.3 *Replication of project activities at the sub-regional and regional level (\$0.06 m GEF).*

### **1.8 Revised Components**

The components were not revised.

### **1.9 Other significant changes**

*(in design, scope and scale, implementation arrangements and schedule, and funding allocations)*

There were not changes.

## **2. Key Factors Affecting Implementation and Outcomes**

### **2.1 Project Preparation, Design and Quality at Entry**

*(including whether lessons of earlier operations were taken into account, risks and their mitigations identified, and adequacy of participatory processes, as applicable)*

**Lessons Learned.** The Project design was based on sound economic and sector work<sup>2</sup>, and lessons from global best practice (JICA in co-management and GTZ study on ecolabelling of fish products) and other Bank operations in the sector. It expanded and scaled up the fisheries resources co-management model which was piloted successfully with fishing communities under another Bank operation ongoing at the time (GIRMaC Project). It also took into account synergies with other programs of the Bank (GIRMaC, WAFRP) and in country (CCLME) and collaborated closely in the preparation and design phase with other donors to ensure synergies in the sector<sup>3</sup>. The Project was designed to be part of a larger program of donor interventions in the fisheries sector in order to respond to the Government's 2008 Letter of Sector Policy, and to be consistent with the Government's sector strategy.

**Project Design and Quality at Entry.** The Project's objectives were clearly defined combining both the PDO and GDO of empowering communities to take measures to reduce pressure on fish resources. However, the design and scope of activities packaged into the three-year timeframe was overly ambitious and the decision taken by both the Government and the Bank to keep this timeframe was a shortfall in project design. It would have been more suitable for a long-term timeframe.

Past experience with the GIRMaC showed that establishing co-management initiatives and getting sub-projects approved, along with the supporting structure for the four pilots sites took, on average, two years from the time the CLPs are created or established, to the time sub-projects are approved and validated by the authorities at the local and central levels. The Project was designed to coincide with the timeframe of the GIRMaC (originally June 1, 2010, later extended to May 1, 2012), and possibly the EU's STABEX project which was to be implemented over a 36-month period beginning in December 2008 (actual closing date March 31, 2010). At the time of preparation, the Bank team originally proposed a more realistic four-year time frame for implementation but accommodated the Government's request for three-years because of concern over additional counterpart funding for operating costs. It was implemented on the premise that the Project could be extended if needed.

However, the GDRH's design was efficient in that it used the existing institutional structure to avoid creating or involving additional implementing agencies. The decision to place the project within the MFMA's DPM was an appropriate choice since it was also responsible for managing other fisheries initiatives in Senegal. Detailed implementation planning was reflected in the PAD (albeit too ambitious for the project timeline), as well as a preliminary Monitoring and

---

<sup>2</sup> Gert van Santen, Moubarak Lo, John Viridin, "Republic of Senegal, Fishery Sector Strategy," May 19, 2005.

<sup>3</sup> JICA (co-management experience in central coast at Nianing); the EU (STABEX Project which supports the design and implementation of management plans for artisanal fisheries and the strengthening of the management capacity of the MFMA and local stakeholders), and AfDB (industrial and artisanal capacity reduction, including buyback of vessels and compensation for the affected population (after a registration and licensing system was established)).

Evaluation (M&E) plan. Under the GEF Project Preparation Grant<sup>4</sup>, most the necessary preliminary work was carried out; a few studies, such as the M&E design and information systems study was dropped, possibly because other donors were funding similar work, e.g., the EU STABEX project which contained activities to build the capacity of the MMA in M&E. Required reviews at preparation were carried out for guidance purposes, including a QER on April 23, 2003.

***Government Ownership and Participatory Processes*** were adequate. The Project was designed with substantial input from the fisheries specialists on the Government preparation team, who also proposed the activities for the PPG. The Project was then prepared with strong donor collaboration from the EU, AfDB, JICA, and the Spanish Corporation in the context of donor interventions to support the Government in implementing the 2008 Letter of Sector Policy. The new communities were implicated in the consultation process through best practice examples and dissemination of results obtained from the GIRMaC Project, and consultation workshops were held to launch the preparation process for all stakeholders. The Government also took the lead in deciding the content and scope of the project design (target sites, timeline, scope of project activities, scope of protected areas, number of agencies involved in implementation).

***Identification and Mitigation of Risks.*** The PAD correctly identified a number of critical risks for the Project, particularly the risks to component results regarding conflict between neighboring fishing communities sharing the same resources. The corresponding mitigation measure (using co-management and Information, Education and Communication (IEC)) is adequate, although if resolution needed to be escalated beyond community level, local authorities and the legal system would need to be involved. This was to be addressed in the revised Fisheries Code which is pending approval by the Government.

Some of the risks never materialized, e.g., low uptake of micro-finance and high default rate, because project activities did not start or could not be completed by EOP to test the mitigation measures.

---

<sup>4</sup> The PPF (\$256,740, of which \$245,890 disbursed) funded the following studies:

1. Feasibility study for establishment of a donor coordination unit (institutional audit, government scorecard/sector strategy),
2. Feasibility study for establishment of a sustainable fisheries management fund,
3. Feasibility study for phasing out fishing fuel subsidies,
4. Preparation of alternative fishing technologies sub-component,
5. Preparation of eco-certification pilots,
6. Environmental Assessment and Process Framework,
7. Preparation of reports, studies to design marine reserves, artificial reefs sub-components,
8. Preparation activities for coordinator to draft Project documents, the operational manual, and costs for preparation management.

The following were to be funded initially under the PPG but were later dropped:

1. Study on replication of co-management pilots,
2. Study to develop a Code of Conduct for Fisheries, support to participation in the CCLME,
3. Study to establish information system, M&E.

The risk to the PDO from institutional difficulties (unstable project management) of the GIRMaC was correctly identified but not appropriate for the PDO/GDO. It would have been a more appropriate risk identified for Component 4 – *Institutional Strengthening for Fisheries Management, Project Management and Monitoring and Evaluation*. The Project did not identify the fiduciary risks (mismanagement of funds and slow procurement due to lack of capacity), nor did it anticipate project mismanagement which stalled project implementation.

## **2.2 Implementation**

*(including any project changes/restructuring, mid-term review, Project at Risk status, and actions taken, as applicable)*

No major changes the project design and scope was made following Board approval. However, implementation was slow due to several factors: (a) an ambitious scope of activities and timeline (mentioned above); (b) delays in procurement processing for two major consultant contracts affecting the implementation of Components 2 (Ecosystems Rehabilitation) and 3 (Alternative Livelihoods), (c) weak capacities and project mismanagement at the central level.

***Delays in Procurement.*** The Project started slowly during the first year of implementation due to delays in the recruitment of the firm responsible for assisting in implementing activities for Components 2 (Rehabilitation of Ecosystems) and 3 (Poverty Alleviation and Alternative Livelihoods). The delays were caused by the implementing agency missing a step in complying with the country's procurement procedures, specifically the Procurement Code, although it complied with the Bank's procurement procedures and was ready for signing. As a result, the National procurement agency cancelled both contracts although the Bank had already given its no-objection and the process had to be re-launched costing an additional eight months or more in implementation time. Since the Bank was piloting the Use of Country Systems at the time and Senegal was being piloted, the implementing agency was obliged to comply with two systems. While Bank supervision was able to provide timely procurement support throughout implementation, it is not clear whether the country systems was able to provide the same guidance to the implementation unit. Once the procurement delays were resolved, however, the project was quickly back on track as of early 2011, and faced an ambitious work program for the remaining year of implementation.

***Project Management.*** By August 2011, progress on agreed actions from the June mission had slowed down significantly and came to a standstill in December 2011. A preliminary financial management review around that time confirmed that, not only did actions agreed in the previous mission not get implemented but ineligible expenses were also incurred. Financial management was downgraded to "unsatisfactory" from a "satisfactory" rating previously. Although a Mid-Term Review was planned for November 2011, it could not be carried out. Similarly, an 18-month extension of the closing date had also been discussed earlier but was no longer possible given the reported lack of progress.

The team made several attempts to discuss and resolve the issues but received no response from the Project Coordinator. It was concluded that the problems were due to a disagreement on unacceptable clauses contained in the consultant contracts for the technical experts in the Project implementation Unit to which the Bank refused to give its no-objection. Subsequently, the Project Coordinator stopped implementing the Project activities. The Task Team took

appropriate action and flagged the Project as “at risk” in February 2012 with an “unsatisfactory” rating overall, with a view to closing the project after attempts to resolve the issues brought no results. Management commended the team on its candid reporting<sup>5</sup> and agreements were reached with the Government on an action plan which included closing the Project, the reimbursement for ineligible expenditures, return of remaining undisbursed funds for the unutilized line of credit, justification for expenses, and a proposal to transfer activities and reallocate the remaining IDA funds to the ongoing WARFP in the sector.

Even though it had an “unsatisfactory” rating, the Bank agreed to an extension of the closing date by three months to allow for the completion of certain activities: contracts for community facilitators, the technical firm supporting alternative livelihoods to fishing, and technical experts in the Project’s implementation unit. The extension period also allowed the Bank to discuss and agree with the Borrower on the transfer of specific activities to the WARFP and its restructuring. The Project was closed with an “unsatisfactory” rating on June 31, 2012, two years and seven months into implementation.

*Weaknesses in M&E* (details given below) also contributed to delays in implementation for to the reasons summarized below.

### **2.3 Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Design, Implementation and Utilization**

The key indicators were clearly defined and a detailed M&E arrangement was included in preparation, outlined in the PAD, and agreed upon during negotiations. The PCU prepared the original M&E plan included reporting and coordination system, impact and performance indicators during project preparation. The reporting system was based on the actual system used by the DPM and other government agencies such as the DNP, DMF, and the CRODT. However, the targets were both difficult to achieve and measure within a three-year project implementation period, particularly if unforeseen delays occur, as was the case in the recruitment of consulting firms responsible for the implementation of Components 2 and 3. Delays in the sequence of activities affected the chain of interdependent activities, e.g., approval/endorsement of sub-projects by authorities was necessary before any activities could begin. Within a longer project timeframe, the targets would likely be achievable since many of the indicators could be collected at local level by, e.g., facilitators.

The M&E system did make a good start in the beginning of the project. The COMO-DPM produced a detailed report of baseline indicators for each of the eight new co-management sites of the Project<sup>6</sup> soon after effectiveness, and as required in the PAD. The report also outlined training to be conducted in the field, data collection techniques, and sample data collection sheets to be distributed at the local levels. This indicated a clear understanding by the COMO of the key performance indicators and the monitoring needs.

---

<sup>5</sup> As reported in the desktop ISR of February 29, 2012.

<sup>6</sup> “Etat de référence des indicateurs de performance du GDRH, Saison sèche (mars 2010),” Ministère de l’Economie Maritime, de la Pêche et des Transport Maritimes, Direction des Pêches Maritimes, Cellule Opérationnelle de Mise en oeuvre (COMO-Pêche), Avril 2010.

As the Project progressed, however, a system was never established for monitoring to be operational. Data was not collected on a regular basis for it to be consolidated into the trimester reports needed for monitoring project results. The oversight on M&E for the Project was carried out in a piecemeal manner and lacked follow-up, particularly at the community level where positive results on fish catch and rejuvenation of resources were observed. Some local data collected under the Project were officially validated by the MFMA at the regional and central levels, but still need continued support to sustain the effort. In addition, the DPM was inadequately staffed with qualified personnel for M&E, although a specialist in M&E was recruited for the Project.

#### **2.4 Safeguard and Fiduciary Compliance**

*(focusing on issues and their resolution, as applicable)*

**Procurement.** As mentioned above, non-compliance with the country's Procurement Code caused delays for two important consulting contracts which affected the pace of implementation of Components 2 and 3 of the Project. The contracts took a year to reach signature stage before they had to be re-launched, adding a further 8 months to the process until the contracts were signed in early 2011<sup>7</sup>.

Procurement delays during the early part of project implementation was partly due to the Bank's decision to pilot the use of country systems for Senegal at that time. However, this doubled the burden of compliance with procurement procedures for project staff, compounded by the absence of a full-time procurement specialist for the Project. Temporary personnel filled in until a full-time procurement specialist was recruited in November 2010. This was a decision taken during preparation by both the Government and the Bank to reduce operating costs by putting in place a part-time procurement specialist during the first year of implementation. However, the volume of procurement needed during the first year of project implementation and the cumbersome procedures for some contracts required the availability of a full-time procurement specialist.

**Financial Management.** Financial Management Reports were received in a timely manner and on the whole were considered *satisfactory* in terms of quality of reporting. However, the overall performance of financial management for the Project was rated *unsatisfactory* for the following reasons:

---

<sup>7</sup> The longest time was taken by the Project's implementation agency (selection of firm for Component 2, short list preparation and call for proposals took 5 months (end July-Dec 2009); another two months to review the proposals (end January – end March 2010); the proposals were received end May 2010; bids were opened in beginning July 2010; the final report reviewing technical proposals finalized in August 2010, and was submitted late to the national level control, the DCMP, and for Bank review. (i.e., the process took about one year).

- (a) Ineligible expenses amounting to CFAF 8.7 million, and expenses for which insufficient documentation was provided estimated at CFAF 68 million;
- (b) The recruitment of three persons with IDA funds at a cost of CFAF 5.04 million without the Bank's authorization and which were not budgeted under the Project; two of the persons recruited were for the Ministry of Maritime Economy (now the Ministry of Fisheries and Maritime Affairs);
- (c) Monthly supplements of CFAF 1 million to the Project Coordinator's salary charged to the Project even though he was a in civil service post;
- (d) Operating costs which exceeded by 13 percent the budget limit set for the project implementation period, despite delays in implementation of project activities;
- (e) Long delays in implementing the micro-credit activities, with funds amounting to CFAF 550 million (over US\$1 million) disbursed under IDA and deposited at the *Crédit Mutuel du Sénégal* (CMS) for over a year without activity.

The review team also noted that project implementation slowed considerably since August 2011 and that disbursements amounts were low. As of March 2012, disbursements rates for the IDA credit was 52 percent of total financing, and for the GEF Grant, 32 percent, which would not have reached a satisfactory implementation level for the Project.

## **2.5 Post-completion Operation/Next Phase**

*(including transition arrangement to post-completion operation of investments financed by present operation, Operation & Maintenance arrangements, sustaining reforms and institutional capacity, and next phase/follow-up operation, if applicable)*

The GIRMaC and the GDRH, together with the WARFP<sup>8</sup>, formed the Bank's program of support to the fisheries sector in Senegal. It addresses the constraints of open access in specific pilot sites from local management of fisheries to the national and regional levels. The WARFP is a nine-country regional program which supports sustainable increase in the economic returns to the region from marine fisheries, by strengthening governance arrangements to address the constraints posed by open access to the resources, to increase surveillance of the fisheries to reduce illegal fishing and enhance compliance with strengthened governance, and, once these two steps are completed, to support increased local value added to healthier fisheries, via infrastructure and skills investments. WARFP investment would support expansion of the co-management pilots to the national level, national licensing for fisheries, reduction of the industrial fleet, increased surveillance of the fisheries and infrastructure.

The WARFP has been restructured to support the following activities transferred from the GDRH:

- Implementation of Sub-projects and Co-management initiatives for the eight additional co-management sites;
- Rehabilitation of coastal ecosystems and contract with the WWF WAMER;
- Three consolidated fisheries management plans for the initial pilot sites of the GIRMaC;

---

<sup>8</sup> The ongoing WARFP was approved in April 2008 and spans seven countries with US\$15.0 million allocated to Senegal. The WARFP has been effective in Senegal since June 2010.



- Creation and establishment of the 2 Protected fishing zones (ZPPs);
- Expansion of two artificial reefs;
- Definition and legal establishment of access rights for 2 fisheries under co-management;
- Completion and transfer of the PNI to the MFMA administration; and
- Feasibility study on the sustainable financing mechanism for the recurrent costs of ZPPs.

### **3. Assessment of Outcomes**

#### **3.1 Relevance of Objectives, Design and Implementation**

*(to current country and global priorities, and Bank assistance strategy)*

The objectives, design, and implementation of the Project remain relevant to country and global priorities as they supported diversification of the agricultural sector and sustainable development and management of natural resources, through methods used to promote sustainable management of fisheries resources. The Project also supported increased access to social services and creating opportunities for poor and vulnerable groups through facilities designed to provide access to micro-finance and opportunities for alternative livelihoods. The design of local co-management initiatives remains relevant since it focuses on artisanal fisheries, a sector which plays a major role in poverty alleviation as a major contributor to employment for the rural sector. These were in line with the country and sector priorities outlined in the Bank's Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) of May 2007 and Senegal's Poverty Reduction Strategy, as well as in the Letter of Sector Policy.

The Project's objectives and design regarding ecosystems rehabilitation and management are still relevant to current global priorities and regional priorities in the context of the GEF focal areas. They also are relevant to Strategic Partnership for Africa's priorities which is targeted to transboundary fishermen and fish stocks, as well as sustainable fisheries management issues within countries (in Africa) designed as country-level projects.

However, the sector is risky and difficult to regulate and donor support would require a long-term timeframe for reforms and interventions to take hold. Issues of sustainability of operating costs, support for funding infrastructure and investments, and sustaining reforms and local level initiatives, attention to sustainability of livelihood promotion to alleviate overfishing and poverty, identification of capacity building needs, remain important challenges.

#### **3.2 Achievement of Project Development Objectives and Global Environment Objectives**

*(including brief discussion of causal linkages between outputs and outcomes, with details on outputs in Annex 4)*

The Project has only partially achieved its PDO/GDO and is rated unsatisfactory. Under the GIRMaC and the GDRH, communities have been empowered through the successful piloting of the co-management model. Through these operations, the successes and failures of co-management have been demonstrated and made available to other targeted communities and lessons were disseminated that were used for replication. Another positive indicator of sustainability is that the four initial pilots have been able to implement income-generating proposals and keep them operating, indicating community ownership and a positive response to

initiatives. The high community participation rate in measures introduced to rehabilitate or conserve coastal resources (cleaning of sea beds, demarcation of restricted fishing zones, surveillance patrols, compliance with biological rest periods, compliance with not using harmful fishing gear and methods, etc.) has resulted in visible benefits such as increased fish catch volume, and average catch size at the four pilot sites.

Unfortunately, the project timeline was too short to allow for full replication to the eight additional sites due to delays in project start-up of certain activities, and due to poor project management which derailed the project. However, the targeted communities were empowered in that they were able to submit eight sub-project proposals for approval by local and central authorities.

### **3.3 Efficiency**

*(Net Present Value/Economic Rate of Return, cost effectiveness, e.g., unit rate norms, least cost, and comparisons; and Financial Rate of Return)*

From the PAD, indicative cost-benefit analysis was given as proxies to illustrate the basis for deciding on the merits of the project. At the ICR level, the same approach is used but it should be noted that at this level, no concrete data are available to carry out a cost-benefit analysis. However, as these new co-management sites and initiatives are implemented based on the same model and results from the GIRMaC in the same area for the fishing communities, it can be argued that these new ones could have similar results but over a longer timeframe.

With respect to the pilot co-management initiatives, such co-management measures (including the implementation of ZPPs) can result in an increase of the CPUE (Catch-per-unit-Effort) and in a stock recovery as in a higher quality fisheries products. As the implementation of such measures may negatively impact some groups in the communities, they will need support for alternative livelihoods to mitigate that risk. Therefore, although the project has not been able to demonstrate real results at this stage, the positive results which have been obtained from the pilot sites would justify the continued expansion of the area of co-management along the central coast of the country.

### **3.4 Justification of Overall Outcome and Global Environment Outcome Rating**

*(combining relevance, achievement of PDO/GEOs, and efficiency)*

**Rating: Unsatisfactory.**

The Project has only partially achieved its stated PDO/GDO. Out of the five KPIs for the combined PDO/GDO outcome, none have been fully met (see Annex 5 – Results Framework analysis).

The Development Objective Indicator was partially met. Data on increases in average fish catch size and reduction in fishing efforts have been validated for the four pilot sites only and were not replicated to the eight additional sites.

The Co-management of coastal fisheries was partially met with the eight sub-project proposals finalized and submitted to authorities for approval, but were not approved by EOP.

The rehabilitation of coastal ecosystems indicator was not met.

With regards to the alternative livelihoods to fishing indicator, access to a system of micro-credit was introduced, but did not disburse, whereas poverty reduction measures at the four pilot sites are established but need further analysis to determine their future profitability and sustainability.

### **3.5 Overarching Themes, Other Outcomes and Impacts**

*(if any, where not previously covered or to amplify discussion above)*

#### **(a) Poverty Impacts, Gender Aspects, and Social Development**

**Poverty Impact.** The artisanal fisheries sector is an important source of employment for the rural sector where most of the fishing methods are traditional. Women's groups are involved mainly in the processing of fish products. The Project's objectives are focused on poverty reduction and the sustainability of local resources, by targeting small-scale, labor-intensive fisheries. This is carried out through support to the organization of fishers and the allocation of user rights, the promotion of alternative livelihoods, and the establishment of restricted fishing areas. The protection of fisheries resources at the local, small-scale level remains important for providing food security for the poor fishing communities which depend on them for their livelihood. Where income-generating activities have been successfully managed (fishing goods and supplies stores, refrigerated truck, household goods stores) they have also generated a modest increase in employment and income for the communities.

Through the Project, the co-management initiatives used to gain the support of communities have been successful in controlling unsustainable fishing methods and reducing overfishing at the four pilot sites while ecosystems rehabilitation initiatives have raised awareness and increased capacity of communities to also manage the use of natural resources on which they depend. Relevant sector policies and regulations finalized under the Project provide support and strengthen the level of contribution of local fishing and harvesting activities to poverty alleviation and food security.

**Gender Aspects.** Although the participation of women in fisheries is mostly in processing and post harvesting activities, the provisions for identifying the impact of project initiatives on women were in the preparation of sub-projects and local fisheries management plans. In some activities, such as the management of *Cymbium (Yeet)*, post harvesting processing is traditionally carried out by women.

Women's interest groups were well represented in CLPs (e.g., posts of president of women's associations) and participated in the drafting of these co-management proposals. The Project provided support for women's groups involved in fish processing and marketing (e.g., Betenty shrimp processing women's group were able to access additional markets), and made micro-credit funds available for micro-projects. The Project also funded the construction and equipping of a household goods and cooking utensils store (Foundiougne), procured the goods and materials, provided technical advice and training in small business skills for beneficiaries.

In terms of *social development*, the cohesion of groups targeted by the Project were strengthened through the co-management initiatives, and existing associations were supported with funding and procurement of goods.

Funds generated from the construction of fishing goods and supplies stores in support of income-generating activities have enabled the CLP of Foundiougne to distribute essential food items (rice and sugar) to families during imposed biological rest periods, reinforcing group cohesion in the area. In Ngaparou, income generated from a similar store enabled the CLP to fund several social activities for their communities (assistance for the sick, payment of school fees for families in need, assistance for baptisms and funerals, among others).

**(b) Institutional Change/Strengthening**

*(particularly with reference to impacts on longer-term capacity and institutional development)*

The MFMA was strengthened with technical assistance provided by national and international consultant services, training programs, workshops, office equipment and software, as well as vehicles and budget for operating costs during the life of the project. The Bank teams provided substantial support and inputs into national level strategic, legal and regulatory documents such as the Fisheries Code revisions and the Letter of Sector Policy, as well as sector studies and strategies for relevant sectors, and provided technical inputs into the preparation and implementation of fisheries programs. In this context, the MFMA was strengthened to provide support and influence to changes in policy in the fisheries sector at the national level, and at the local level, changed the perception of local communities as partners and modified the traditional top-down approach. Local communities also changed their perception of Government as partners.

In an important area, the establishment of the *Programme National d'Immatriculation (PNI)* for registering small-scale fishing vessels provided Senegal with an effective means to control fishing effort in-country, with the potential for further collaboration with neighboring countries. The PNI was a key policy priority for the MFMA and a key action listed in the 2008 Letter of Sector Policy and one of the major instruments for introducing access rights to fisheries resources. Although implemented with delays, the PNI was also a key achievement of the Project and a performance indicator for Component 2.

The Project also presented an opportunity to strengthen the capacity of non-governmental organizations such as the WWF and the national technical assistance firm responsible for ecosystems rehabilitation activities of component 2.

**(c) Other Unintended Outcomes and Impacts (positive or negative)**

A positive development was that two of the CLPs have evolved into a type of social fund. In Ngaparou, the CLP uses funds from several sources, including membership fees, revenues generated from the fishing goods and supplies store, to carry out social activities including: finding fishing vessels in difficulty, providing assistance for baptisms and funerals in the community, providing assistance to the sick, subsidies to the sports association (*Association Sportive Culturelle*) for members, and assistance with school fees.

In Foundiougne, funds generated from the fishing goods and supplies store have been able to provide essential food items (rice and sugar) to families in need during biological rest periods which were imposed on the area by the community itself to allow small shrimp and juvenile fish to regenerate.

### **3.6 Summary of Findings of Beneficiary Survey and/or Stakeholder Workshops**

*(optional for Core ICR, required for ILI, details in annexes)*

No survey or stakeholder workshops were carried out.

## **4. Assessment of Risk to Development Outcome and Global Environment Outcome**

**Rating: High**

The Government has initiated important sectoral reforms and legislation in the fisheries sector which has provided a conducive policy environment for promoting the co-management model for artisanal fisheries management and for sustainable fisheries management in Senegal. However, since the co-management model is not yet replicated successfully across Senegal, the risks remain high because, essentially, it remains at pilot stage. Encouraging developments have taken place, however, at the initial four pilot sites, but their implementation period has been much longer, which is a good indicator of the time required to implement such initiatives successfully.

In addition, because Senegal shares its fisheries resources with neighboring countries, Mauritania, The Gambia, Guinea, and Guinea-Bissau, a regional approach to fisheries management would be necessary to ensure sustainability on the larger scale, while local resources use is tackled at the community level using the co-management model. Because of the scale of challenges facing the fisheries sector, from industrial to artisanal levels, donor coordination and collaboration is crucial to ensure synergies and maximum impact on a country level and on a regional level.

Institutional capacity within the MFMA is weak and implementing similar projects will require the necessary resources, both in terms of personnel and budget, to implement the reforms outlined for the sector, and to cover the geographical territory required to promote the co-management model in numerous communities along the coast. A more thorough analysis of institutional capacity would have allowed better targeted assistance, with identification of needs, type of assistance, and accompanying budget needs or constraints, to strengthen capacity effectively.

## **5. Assessment of Bank and Borrower Performance**

*(relating to design, implementation and outcome issues)*

### **5.1 Bank Performance**

#### **(a) Bank Performance in Ensuring Quality at Entry**

*(i.e., performance through lending phase)*

**Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory**

Project preparation benefitted from strong and quality fisheries expertise, micro-finance guidance, and management guidance (including a Quality Enhancement Review held on April 23,

2008) at all the stages of preparation. There was good coordination and consultation with other donors involved in the sector (JICA, EU, AfDB, FAO) which obtained the support and inclusion of the EU for its STABEX project. Preparation through to effectiveness also ensured that the Government played a leadership role in preparation and project launch (e.g., Government experts outlined PPG activities, provided technical input into project design; Government decision to drop large-scale marine protected area network for local ecosystem rehabilitation for coastal fisheries; the 3-day launch workshop organized by the Government team) including the appropriate staffing of the Government's implementation unit team within the MFMA, which also had strong fisheries expertise on the team.

However, the project design was too ambitious and the timeframe too short to carry out the range of activities required by the Project. The Task Team initially proposed a four-year timeframe, but finally agreed to three years to accommodate the wishes of the Government to contain counterpart funding for operating costs. Preparation time was about two years from concept review to appraisal, but from Board to effectiveness took longer than average (about 11 months), due to the number of effectiveness conditions. The assumption that the Project could be extended if needed was an indication that project activities could take more time to implement. The size of the scaling up could have been reduced to reflect the following: timing and preparation for scaling up (i.e., more preparation before project launch), staffing shortages or requirements for scaling up while maintaining momentum at the four pilot sites (phasing), and implementation timeframe (longer term/programmatic approach).

**(b) Quality of Supervision**

(including of fiduciary and safeguards policies)

**Rating: Moderately Satisfactory**

In order to provide quality support during supervision, the Bank placed in the country office a full-time, local fisheries specialist to provide implementation support to the Borrower. The Task Team carried out implementation assistance missions at regular intervals of about every six-eight months with an appropriate skills mix and focused on fisheries assistance. Documentation and reporting were of good quality. Management commended the team on the quality of reporting. Financial Management missions lagged supervision missions somewhat, but its supervision was strong. When project activities stalled, the team made repeated attempts to resolve the issues before taking the decision to close the Project. The project closing date was extended by three months to allow for completion of local level consulting contracts, and to hold discussions on the transfer of remaining activities to the WARFP. This ensured that adequate transition arrangements are in place after the Project closes.

However, Bank implementation assistance could have been stronger in providing timely guidance and expertise on M&E aspects as this was noted to be a weak point in the GIRMaC as well as in the GDRH reporting. Even with the recruitment of an M&E specialist, the system was collecting data in a piecemeal manner and guidance from donors as well as the Bank on how to operationalize the system to track donor interventions and results would have been timely.

### **(c) Justification of Rating for Overall Bank Performance**

#### **Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory**

The Project was prepared with a balanced mix of local level innovations, local development and environment initiatives appropriate for community development and natural resource management projects, supported by institutional reforms (through co-financing from the GIRMaC Project). The Government took a leadership role in project preparation. Detailed implementation arrangements were outlined in the PAD. However, an important shortcoming was that the design was too ambitious for a three-year timeframe so that scaling up of a successful co-management model could not be completely replicated and implemented by the end of project. Although the combined PDO and GDO were clearly defined, relevant and important to the sector, they would likely have been achievable in a longer term timeframe.

Supervision was carried out with adequate resources and skills mix and on a regular basis until problems with Project management began in August 2011. The decision to close the Project was timely and supported by Bank management.

### **5.2 Borrower Performance**

#### **(a) Government Performance**

##### **Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory**

The Government took a strong leadership role in the preparation of the Project by providing the necessary fisheries expertise to design the proposals for the PPG and for the initial project design. It also provided a conducive environment for implementing the sectoral reforms and initiatives in the fisheries sector through the 2008 Letter of Sector Policy and the revised Fisheries Code. The PNI was also successfully carried out, although with long delays; over 85 percent (about 18,900) of small-scale fishing vessels are now registered. This was an important breakthrough and a key success for the Government in implementing resource management reforms.

However, Ministerial interference in the Project's implementation seriously jeopardized the Project's prospects to contribute to the country's sectoral reform agenda. In addition, the country's demanding Procurement Code established with the national procurement agency has added to the burdens of day-to-day project management for the implementation teams, particularly if not consistent with donor procurement procedures. This caused long delays in implementing two important consultant firm contracts under the Project which could have been avoided through an agreement or a harmonizing of the two systems before requiring project teams to comply to both.

#### **(b) Implementing Agency or Agencies Performance**

##### **Rating: Unsatisfactory**

There were important achievements at the local level by MFMA staff. Its DPM staff, including the COMO unit, succeeded in providing the necessary support to the communities to submit sub-project proposals through the proper recruitment and placement of qualified facilitators at project sites to enable them to work productively with the newly formed CLPs. The DPM also supervised the completion of studies and research works as well as mobilized the CLPAs and

CNCPM to support the validation process for sub-projects, both for the GIRMaC and for the GDRH.

However, the Project was implemented with long start-up delays, due to the relaunching of two important consulting firm contracts, lacked a full-time procurement specialist at the implementation unit to assist with procurement contracts, and suffered from the disruption of poor project management (August 2011). As result, project implementation stalled and mismanagement eliminated the possibility of extending the closing date which could have made a difference in outcome. M&E was particularly weak, even after a specialist was recruited; it lacked clarity and commitment and an operational system was never designed. Annual reporting of progress was overlooked. Key performance indicators and physical targets were partially met or not met.

### **(c) Justification of Rating for Overall Borrower Performance**

#### **Rating: Unsatisfactory**

The Government has provided an environment conducive to implementing sectoral reforms. The national small-scale fishing vessels registration program has been implemented for the first time in Senegal successfully and has put in place a surveillance tool for managing artisanal fisheries in the sector. However, many of the targets set for the Project were not been met and the operation has seriously taxed, in terms of resources and morale, the capacity of the implementing agency due to Ministerial imposition and poor management of the Project. M&E was important for both the GIRMaC and the GDRH but was particularly weak and did not improve with a specialist recruited for the task. Actions which derailed the Project were within the control of the Ministry and the implementing agency and detracted from the efforts (technical and operational) and results achieved in the field.

## **6. Lessons Learned**

*(both project-specific and of wide general application)*

### ***Implementation***

- M&E was weak and lacked attention on the part of the implementing agencies and the Bank did not sufficiently monitor progress. M&E arrangements should be included in the Project's implementation plan with realistic targets and timelines. This is better achieved through obtaining agreements on clear, measurable indicators and targets through joint formulation of indicators (at project preparation workshops); implementation of the M&E system should followed up closely for early identification of constraints (e.g., institutional capacity, knowledge gaps, budget and time, technical); up-front/re-fresher M&E training should be given to project teams before implementation begins and repeated as necessary (in cases of staff turnover).
- Strong donor collaboration is essential for coordinating support and for ensuring greater impact through better synergy and to avoid duplication of efforts, waste of resources, and lost opportunities. Donor collaboration during preparation of the GIRMaC and GDRH was strong, aided by the sectoral reforms in place.



- The slow process of implementation caused by procurement delays in the early phases of project implementation due to cumbersome procurement regulations. Piloting the use of country systems in cases where the capacity is already weak places additional burdens on project teams and results in costly delays for both the Government and the Bank. Agreements on harmonizing the procurement rules and procedures should be reached between the Borrower and the Bank before they are imposed on projects and should be accompanied by sufficient support during implementation.
- For a short project implementation timeframe, a longer preparation phase would have been necessary to ensure that the project begins implementing without delay. Up-front preparation could include: completing the site selections, the training of facilitators, selection of existing CLPs, and beginning the consultation process with communities, prior to project effectiveness.
- The design and scope of project activities were overly ambitious for the timeline and should have been reduced to a more realistic level. The scaling up of sites for replication could have been phased in to take into account the staffing requirements and capacity of the DPM and MFMA. However, such a phasing would be more realistic with a longer term programmatic approach and timeframe. Preparation of the Project's costs and budget for counterpart funding should include regional and local level administration staff implicated in the implementation of the Projects. This was overlooked both for the GIRMaC and the GDRH.
- Stakeholder or beneficiary assessments are important requirements for assessing the success of community development projects in terms of social impact, ownership, cohesion and satisfaction as indicators of their sustainability and should not be overlooked
- The Bank could not have predicted the level of ministerial interference in project activities nor the sudden downturn in the project's management. This should be escalated to the higher levels of dialogue between Bank management and Government once the team has attempted to resolve the problems without success.

### *Institutional*

- Community empowerment and involvement ensures greater sustainability of sectoral reforms. The fisher community involvement at all levels of the GIRMaC and the GDRH's implementation greatly increased the success rate of the co-management model being piloted. To be effective, they should also be accompanied by a vigorous IEC campaign tailored to the local level concerns. When effectively carried out (as in the case of Ngaparou's reputation which was well-known to neighboring communities), local fishers/community members can be formidable partners in promoting reform if it concerns their interests.

- Institutional strengthening needs to be adequately assessed during preparation to determine the current capacity of the implementing agency, the demands of the project on the agency, and which strengthening support would be required. Monitoring and evaluation of performance should be included in the project's implementation plan, e.g., an indicator for the successful establishment of an operational M&E system.

### *Technical*

- For the co-management model to become truly sustainable and fully address the fundamental constraint of open access to the resources, the legal and institutional framework will need to provide local users and associations not just the authority to manage (i.e. regulate) targeted fisheries, but also to limit access. Unless there is some scope for control of access to these fishing grounds that are locally managed, their success will also be their downfall – as improved fisheries and higher catch rates will only attract more fishers from neighboring waters, so that overall exploitation increase to the point that the stock sizes and catch rates decrease to pre-project levels. In fact, in a number of the pilot sites fishing activity has increased as a result of the success of local management measures, and this threat will become larger in the future. Essentially, creating and allocating the right to manage targeted fisheries has been a very successful first step, but the country will need to take the next step to create and allocate rights to access the fisheries, in order for this progress to be maintained.
- Greater community involvement in identifying issues and solutions ensured greater ownership of initiatives, enhancing prospects for sustainability of new approaches. Formalizing the co-management proposals through legal agreements between community associations and government gave communities a voice and shared accountability with decision-makers. However, the sustainability of certain activities launched under the Project such as operating costs for MCS activities, technical advice or assistance for marketing and market access, needs to be addressed in follow-up operations.
- As benefits are being made known and fish resources show improvements, the need for MCS will also increase and the number of infractions will rise. Viabile options for funding and sustaining local efforts at MCS need to be found urgently to prevent loss of momentum to local efforts at MCS.

### 7. Comments on Issues Raised by Borrower/Implementing Agencies/Partners

#### **(a) Borrower/implementing agencies**

n.a.

#### **(b) Cofinanciers**

n.a.

#### **(c) Other partners and stakeholders**

*(e.g. NGOs/private sector/civil society)*

n.a.

## Annex 1. Project Costs and Financing

(a) Project Cost by Component (IDA, GEF, Government) (in USD Million equivalent) (as of June 30, 2012)

<b>Sustainable Management of Fish Resources - Total Project Costs (IDA, GEF, Government)</b>			
<b>Components</b>	<b>Appraisal Estimate (USD millions)</b>	<b>Actual/Latest Estimate (USD millions)</b>	<b>Percentage of Appraisal</b>
<b>1. Co-management of Coastal Fisheries</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>0.71</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>2. Rehabilitation of Ecosystems</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>0.48</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>3. Alternative livelihoods and Accompanying Social Measures</b>	<b>4.03</b>	<b>0.85</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>4. Institutional Strengthening for Fisheries Management, M&amp;E</b>	<b>1.03</b>	<b>0.80</b>	<b>78%</b>
<b>Total Baseline Cost</b>	<b>10.66</b>	<b>2.84</b>	<b>27%</b>
Physical Contingencies	0.10	0.00	0%
Price Contingencies	0.09	0.00	0%
<b>Total Project Costs</b>	<b>10.85</b>	<b>2.84</b>	<b>26%</b>
<b>Total Financing Required</b>	<b>10.85</b>	<b>2.84</b>	

<b>Sustainable Management of Fish Resources - P105881 - IDA</b>			
<b>Components</b>	<b>Appraisal Estimate (USD millions)</b>	<b>Actual/Latest Estimate (USD millions)</b>	<b>Percentage of Appraisal</b>
<b>1. Co-management of Coastal Fisheries</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>2. Rehabilitation of Ecosystems</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>3. Alternative livelihoods and Accompanying Social Measures</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>0.85</b>	<b>24%</b>
<b>4. Institutional Strengthening for Fisheries Management, M&amp;E</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Total Baseline Cost</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>0.85</b>	<b>24%</b>
Physical Contingencies	0.00	0.00	0%
Price Contingencies	0.00	0.00	0%
<b>Total Project Costs</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>0.85</b>	<b>24%</b>
<b>Total Financing Required</b>	<b>3.50</b>		

<b>Sustainable Management of Fish Resources - P092062 /TF93654– GEF</b>			
<b>Components</b>	<b>Appraisal Estimate (USD millions)</b>	<b>Actual/Latest Estimate (USD millions)</b>	<b>Percentage of Appraisal</b>
<b>1. Co-management of Coastal Fisheries</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>0.81</b>	<b>32%</b>
<b>2. Rehabilitation of Ecosystems</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>0.49</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>3. Alternative livelihoods and Accompanying Social Measures</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>4. Institutional Strengthening for Fisheries Management, M&amp;E</b>	<b>0.94</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>96%</b>
<b>Total Baseline Cost</b>	<b>5.84</b>	<b>2.20</b>	<b>38%</b>
Physical Contingencies	0.07	0.07	100%
Price Contingencies	0.09	0.09	100%
<b>Total Project Costs</b>	<b>6.00</b>	<b>2.36</b>	<b>39%</b>
<b>Total Financing Required</b>	<b>6.00</b>		

**(b) Financing (as of June 30, 2012)**

<b>IDA - P105881 - Sustainable Management of Fish Resources</b>				
<b>Source of Funds</b>	<b>Type of Financing</b>	<b>Appraisal Estimate (USD millions)</b>	<b>Actual/Latest Estimate (USD millions)</b>	<b>Percentage of Appraisal</b>
Borrower	Counterpart	0.53	0.13	24%
International Development Association (IDA)	Credit	3.50	1.23	24%
<b>Total</b>		<b>4.03</b>	<b>1.36</b>	<b>34%</b>

GEF - P092062 - Sustainable Management of Fish Resources				
Source of Funds	Type of Financing	Appraisal Estimate (USD millions)	Actual/Latest Estimate (USD millions)	Percentage of Appraisal
Borrower	Counterpart	1.35 <sup>9</sup>	0.00	0%
EC: EU - European Agency for Reconstruction (EAR)	Parallel Financing	9.20	n.a.	n.a.
Global Environment - Associated IDA Fund	Grant	8.50	6.30	74%
Global Environment Facility (GEF)	Grant	6.00	1.99	33%
Govt. of Switzerland (Except for FOFEA)	Grant	0.50	0.47	89%
<b>Total</b>		<b>25.54</b>		

N.B.: As of July 2009, the EU's *COM STABEX Pêche (Stratégie d'Aménagement des Pêcheries du Sénégal/SAGPS)* showed a total commitment of Euros 6.0 million, of which Euros 0.5 million (about \$0.76 million) (8%) was paid as of December 31, 2008, and about Euros 4.1 million (68%) was pending. The team has not been able to obtain 2009 disbursement figures.

The project was signed initially in February 2008, with a planned implementation period of 36 months, but due to delays and lack of progress, project activities ceased in December 2009 and the project was closed in March 31, 2010<sup>10</sup>.

Other Funding:

	Type of Financing	Approval Date	Signed Amount (USD)	Disbursed Amount (USD)	Cancelled Amount (USD)
TF 90576	PPG Grant	April 18, 2007	256,740	245,890	10,849

<sup>9</sup> Includes estimated Government of Senegal contribution of \$530,000 for IDA-funded activities and \$820,000 for GEF-funded activities.

<sup>10</sup> EU Annual Report for 2008, "RAC 2008", Version finale Juillet 2009.

## **Annex 2. Outputs by Component**

The Sustainable Management of Fish Resources Project (*Projet de Gestion Durable des Ressources Halieutiques* (GDRH)) was designed as a complementary project to the Integrated Marine and Coastal Resources Management Project (*Gestion Intégrée des Ressources Marines et Côtières* (GIRMaC)), and the two projects, together with the West Africa Regional Fisheries Program comprised the Bank's support to the fisheries sector in Senegal and contributed to the Government's implementation of the 2008 Letter of Sector Policy (LSP).

The GDRH Project was to build on the successes and lessons of the GIRMaC Project and replicate the co-management model for consolidating fisheries resources management along the central coast of Senegal across eight additional sites. The initial four pilot sites of Ouakam, Ngararou, Foundiougne and Betenty, which spanned the coastline of Senegal from Cap-Vert Peninsula in the north to the Saloum River Delta in the south near the border with the Gambia, successfully implemented most of the co-management initiatives, planned by the LFC (CLP) which comprised each site's sub-project financed under the IMCFRM. Co-management agreements, approved by the CLPA and CNCPM, were signed between the CLP and the Minister of Maritime Economy (now the MFMA), who issues a legal decree to support the implementation of the co-management initiatives, thus providing legal backing for the initiatives. The project also supported the CLPAs representing a geographic area of targeted CLPs, to prepare consolidated local fisheries management plans for that area. Together, the co-management agreements and the consolidated local fisheries management plans were to provide the framework for various management measures (such as fisheries conservation areas, artificial reefs, eco-labeling) to be implemented.

**Component 1: Co-management of Coastal Fisheries** (US\$2.0 m IDA-GIRMaC project, US\$2.66 m GEF, US\$2.60 m EU, US\$0.34 m Government of Senegal).

The objective of this component was to implement co-management systems to improve the governance of the coastal fisheries for a more sustainable use of the resources.

The component's key indicator for the establishment of eight new CLPs have been satisfactorily met. The second indicator was not met, although three have been prepared under the GIRMaC and this Project. It is expected that the three local fisheries management plans will be approved and implemented under the WARFP which has been recently restructured to incorporate many of the activities which could not be completed under this Project.

### **Promotion of local co-management initiatives in four pilot sites**<sup>11</sup>.

The promotion of local co-management initiatives in the four pilot sites (Ouakam, Ngararou, Foundiougne, and Betenty) was funded by the GirMAC Project. It was successfully carried out

---

<sup>11</sup> For additional details, please refer to the Implementation Completion and Results Report (ICR) for the Integrated Marine and Coastal Resources Management Project, Report No.: ICR 2377, dated October 30, 2012, p. 37.

for the most part and formed the key successes of this project. By the end of the project, sub-projects were successfully implemented in three pilot sites, while in the fourth, Ouakam, one conservation activity (placement of artificial reefs) was ongoing at the time the project closed, a result of delays in project start-up. The process of selection and placement of facilitators into local communities was also successful: no facilitators were rejected by the communities and all remained at their posts until the end of their contracts; facilitators helped the CLPs to successfully prepare and implement their sub-projects; and local facilitators from communities were subsequently trained and worked with the project facilitators. Local communities were actively engaged in the design and implementation of sub-projects (comprised of several co-management initiatives) and demonstrated strong ownership of agreed initiatives. Benefits were visible in terms of reduced fishing, increase in catch/landings, and in the average size of catch, surveillance patrols and teams were formed and operational (although the financing of operating costs was a concern), and under financing from the GDRH, marketing and commercialization sub-projects were being proposed which were to improve production quality and quantity.

In terms of impact, the co-management approach built strong local community ownership and participation in national fisheries resource management and conservation efforts and in building partnership between local communities and Government authorities. It fostered shared decision-making and accountability, and contributed to improved local governance of coastal and fisheries resources in the co-management areas.

Monitoring, control and surveillance supported under the GirMAC were successful in soliciting the support of local fishing communities in carrying out periodic surveillance patrols (by CLP members) of pilot sites with minimal conflict. Data collected at the pilot sites by CLPs and validated by the MFMA showed encouraging results in average size and catch volume as a result of co-management initiatives and conservation methods which were being piloted (sanctioning the use of unsustainable fishing gear and fishing methods, improved monitoring, control and surveillances, legal backing for local initiatives, fisheries resources management through the creation of restricted fishing zones, imposed biological rest periods, conservation management methods including setting artificial reefs, cleaning of sea beds, and supportive measures including procurement of goods and materials, and training and technical assistance.)

CLPs of the pilot sites were active in sharing information, lessons, and results of their experience to neighboring villages. The CLPAs associated with the pilot sites also contributed to the expansion of the initiatives through local fisheries management plans. Recently, each of the two pilot sites of Foundiougne and Betenty have proposed a new co-management initiative to support the ongoing efforts to sustainably manage coastal shrimp resources which demonstrated their willingness to move towards sustainably managing shared fisheries resources.

**Change in Catch Volume and Market Price over time in co-management pilot sites  
(2005-2007)**

<b>Ouakam</b>		<b>Year</b>						
<b>Targeted species</b>		<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
“Thiof” Epinephelus aenus	Quantity of catches (Kg)	N/A	N/A	10,100	13,960	22,200	17,200	23,300
	Commercial value (FCFA)	N/A	N/A	38,020,000	52,431,000	76,250,000	55,540,000	85,511,000
	Average price/unit (FCFA/Kg)	N/A	N/A	3,670	3,980	3,380	3,620	4,500
<b>Ngaparou</b>		<b>Year</b>						
<b>Targeted species</b>		<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
Green Lobster	Quantity of catches (Kg)	770	700	1,575	1,561	1,645	2,835	4,095
	Commercial value (FCFA)	5,075,000	4,515,000	11,200,000	11,161,500	11,322,500	13,272,000	28,962,500
	Average price/unit (FCFA/Kg)	4,900	6,000	6,270	6,850	5,727	5,700	6,725
<b>Betenty</b>		<b>Year</b>						
<b>Targeted species</b>		<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
Coastal shrimp	Quantity of catches (Kg)	365,700	336,200	340,700	328,900	296,900	237,200	229,400
	Commercial value (FCFA <sup>12</sup> )	146,280,000	184,910,000	204,420,000	197,340,000	207,830,000	213,480,000	183,520,000
	Average price/unit (FCFA/Kg)	400	550	600	600	700	900	800

Source: Data collected at the pilot co-management sites by the fishing communities in partnership with the local fisheries administration, and data validated by the Fisheries Authorities at regional or central level.

<sup>12</sup> The total commercial value of coastal shrimp caught in Betenty has declined by a small amount from 2010 and 2011 due to the drop in the number of active fishermen targeting this species (from 693 fishermen in 2010 to only 649 in 2011).



**Bétenty: Detailed Catch Data for Shrimp and fishing vessels (2005-2011)**

Year	Catch ('000 kg)	No. of Fishermen	Price (FCFA)	Market Price (CFAF)	Shrimp count/kg	No. of fishing vessels
2005	365.7	831	400	146,280,000	226	65
2006	336.2	768	550	184,910,000	179	59
2007	340.7	784	600	204,420,000	184	62
2008	328.9	672	600	197,340,000	175	53
2009	296.9	727	700	207,830,000	144	57
2010	237.2	693	900	213,480,000	138	51
2011	229.4	649	800	183,520,000	141	59

N.B.: A majority of shrimp harvesters work on foot; those on boats normally are two to a boat. Prices quoted are landing price/kg for fresh shrimp.

**Ngaparou: Fishing vessels (2005-2011)**

Year	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Local fishing vessels	103	140	83	90	103	105	103
Seasonal fishing vessels	88	46	34	35	29	43	40
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>143</b>

Year	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Local fishermen	410	558	330	360	410	418	410
Foreign fishermen	350	184	136	140	114	172	160
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>760</b>	<b>742</b>	<b>466</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>524</b>	<b>590</b>	<b>570</b>

**Foundiougne: Catch Volume Data for Various Species (2007-2011)**

	Shrimp	Ethmalose	Mullet	Tilapia	Barracuda	Total
<b>2007</b>	343,370	770,650	212,050	193,500	10,250	1,529,820
<b>2008</b>	287,190	742,400	292,550	275,250	10,700	1,608,090
<b>2009</b>	362,835	630,300	180,450	171,350	22,600	1,367,535
<b>2010</b>	274,232	815,660	252,521	307,336	44,622	1,694,371
<b>2011</b>	431,625	631,940	416,780	709,530	140,830	2,330,705

**Market Prices**

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>Landing Price (CFAF)</b>	473,341,600	486,081,000	449,300,836	476,866,035	982,549,250

**Fishing Vessels**

<b>No. of fishermen</b>	1,600	1,700	1,710	1,750	2,650
<b>No. of vessels</b>	127	120	142	160	300

**Average Shrimp Count/kg**

	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
<b>Number of shrimp (count) / kg</b>	178	96	92	88	115

**Change in Average Market Price (CFAF) at landing for Various Species**

	<b>Shrimp</b>	<b>Ethmalose</b>	<b>Mullet</b>	<b>Tilapia</b>	<b>Barracuda</b>
<b>2007</b>	600	100	300	350	900
<b>2008</b>	600	100	300	350	950
<b>2009</b>	550	100	250	300	1,000
<b>2010</b>	500	100	300	200	1,750
<b>2011</b>	750	150	300	200	2,000

**Consolidation and strengthening of coastal fisheries co-management**

Under this sub-component of the GDRH Project, the successful co-management experience of the initial four pilot sites of the GirMAC was to be scaled up into eight new sites along the central coastline of Senegal, between Cap-Vert and the Saloum River Delta. The eight new sites selected were:

- Soumbédioune, Bargny and Yenne (ongoing management of artificial reefs), for the Dakar region,
- Mballing, Nianing, Pointe Sarène and Mbodiène, for the Thiès region, and
- Fimela-Ndangane for the Fatick region.

The eight sites selected were the same as those selected during preparation except for Soumbédioune and Fimela-Ndangane. The Fambine site, selected during preparation, was merged/linked with the CLP for Foundiougne to provide a critical mass for the creation of a protected fishing zone as part of the site's co-management initiative.

Community facilitators were recruited early in implementation through a participatory process, trained and successfully placed at the eight new sites. Eight new Local Fisher Committees (*Comité Local des Pêcheurs (CLP)*) were formed with the help of the facilitators, and legally established at each of the eight new sites. The CLPs worked with the facilitators to identify co-management initiatives with communities and finalize sub-project proposal for each of the eight sites which have been submitted to the local and central authorities (DPM, CLPs, CLPAs, and the CNCPM) for approval. Accompanying measures such as MCS, IEC, and M&E were also included in the sub-project proposals. Co-management initiatives focused on the fisheries species which were considered economically important and representative of each site. In the Dakar region, co-management initiative targeted the white grouper (*Epinephelus aenus*) and related species. Initiatives selected by the Petite-Côte included the octopus (*Octopus vulgaris*) et the cymbium (*Cymbium spp.*) initiated by an earlier JICA-funded project.

By end of project, the sub-project proposals had not yet been approved. Following validation, it is expected that implementation would be supported under the ongoing WARFP.

**Institutional support for a system of local fisheries governance.**

This sub-component was also financed in parallel by the European Union's COM STABEX – Fisheries Project (total commitment Euros 6.0 million) which included a component on “Capacity Building of Local Governance (establishment of new CLPAs, EIC tools, outlining and monitoring of local and national management plans, reinforcement of coastal surveillance, management of marginalization caused by co-management)”. As of end 2008, about Euros 0.5 million was disbursed.

**Support to the CNCPM and the CLPAs** was limited to implicating the organizations in the validation process for community sub-projects and local consolidated fisheries management plans.

Over one year into implementation, the CLPAs were not yet established in the central region. Organization and motivation were the main challenges with implicating the CLPAs in the sub-project validation process, along with other issues facing the CLPAs:

- their role in fisheries management not clearly defined;
- an evaluation study on CLPAs based on experience with 4 pilots found that CLPAs lacked motivation, their organization needed to be restructured (some CLPAs were very spread geographically), and their missions redefined;
- as of 2010, most were not functioning;
- the structure of CLPAs were administrative (CLPs were private organizations), and therefore accountability of the main actors was unclear, and CLPAs lacked resources; and
- other development programs besides the EU STABEX are working with CLPAs; some have created consultative groups in parallel with the CLPAs creating confusion at the base.

**Support to the CLPs** included capacity-building and the provision of technical assistance from Government fisheries administration staff and consultants, including facilitators, to form the CLPs, train and organize its members to contribute to the participatory process of identifying and finalizing co-management initiatives and sub-project proposals. It gave the communities the means of representation and a voice in the decision-making process and a role in the management of fisheries resources directly affecting their community.

**Component 2: Rehabilitation of Ecosystems Essential for Coastal Fisheries.** (US\$2.4 m GEF, US\$0.5 m IDA-GIRMaC project, US\$1.5 m EU, US\$0.5 m Switzerland, US\$0.4 m Government).

The objective of this component was to contribute to the rehabilitation of essential coastal fisheries ecosystems, by establishing Protected Fishing Zones (*Zones de Pêches Protégées*

(ZPPs)) in association with artificial reefs, in order to help regenerate the natural resources, and by creating market mechanisms to encourage sustainable management of the ecosystems.

The small-scale fishing vessels under the *Programme National d'Immatriculation (PNI)*, was a key achievement of the Project, although it was implemented with delay. The PNI was key policy priority for the MFMA and a key action listed in the 2008 Letter of Sector Policy and one of the major instruments for introducing access rights to fisheries resources.

Except for the registration of small-scale fishing vessels under the PNI, the remaining key performance indicators for this component were partially met. Other activities on the rehabilitation of ecosystems including the legal establishment of ZPPs and artificial and their related activities began but could not be completed due to the delayed recruitment of the consulting firm (World Wildlife Fund - West Africa Marine Eco-region (WWF-WAMER)) responsible for providing technical assistance to component activities. The activities on artificial reefs were also delayed for the same reason. Both of the initiatives received strong support from communities and will be transferred for funding under the restructured WARFP.

### **Protected fishing zones (Zones de Pêche Protégées (ZPPs)) and Artificial Reefs.**

Two ZPPs were identified by July 2010. Although they have not been legally established, initiatives which would facilitate the establishment of such areas have been introduced in certain sites. In Ouakam, a controlled fishing areas (*Zone d'exploitation réglementé – ZER, and Zone d'interdiction de pêche - ZIP*) has been created and managed by the fishing community, while Ngaparou, alternate closures to fishing has been introduced. Both have received strong support from their communities although there are some difficulties with managing them were reported by CLPs. In Ngaparou, ongoing incursions from fishermen of neighboring villages (Rufisque and Bargny) have created problems for the placement of artificial reefs which just beginning to take place; in Ouakam, the efforts to define and delimit ZERs and ZIPs met with resistance from neighboring communities (buoys which were placed at sea would disappear or are removed). Protected fishing zones would need to be ensured in order to attract fish and enforcement would need support from the DPSP and the local authorities (police).

**Technical Assistance and Recruitment of Firm.** The Project suffered from delays in recruiting the firm to lead the implementation of Component 2 activities. Although documents were prepared well ahead of time, the contract was cancelled in early 2010 by the national Central Procurement Agency due to non-compliance by the Government team with the Procurement Code, even though the Bank's no objection had been given to go ahead with the contracts. The recruitment process had to be re-launched causing further delays to a process which had already cost the project eight months of implementation time.

By the time the contract was signed (Feb. 2011) with the WWF-WAMER as technical assistance agency providing implementing Component 2 activities, work was not expected to begin until June 10, 2011, which gave the agency nine months to the first closing date to carry out a demanding work program (establishment of ZPPs, immersion of artificial reefs, and obtaining eco-certification for certain fisheries species piloted). By EOP, WWF/WAMER had managed to complete an IEC plan and activities to increase the awareness of communities on issues of

marine ecosystems rehabilitation. The remaining activities were transferred for funding and support under the WARFP.

**Introduction of access rights and associated management instruments**

The introduction of access rights in selected fisheries conservation areas, ZPPs and artificial reefs could not be carried out for the reasons mentioned above.

**Implementation of the Small-Scale Vessel Registration Program (*Programme National d’Immatriculation* (PNI)).** The PNI was key policy priority for the MFMA and a key action listed in the 2008 Letter of Sector Policy and one of the major instruments for introducing access rights to fisheries resources. The successful registration of small-scale fishing and transport vessels for the central coastal region was a key performance indicator for the project and has been met.

The objective of establishing a functional nationwide registration system for small fishing vessels was to provide a system for the government to control fishing efforts and reduce fishing over time, by location, for the long-term management and sustainability of fisheries resources.

At the time of appraisal, all industrial vessels in Senegal were locally registered and licensed, but not the artisanal pirogues and their fishermen owners. To date, about 18,900 small vessels have been registered. The PNI in Senegal began as a two-year program from 2006-2008 with the objective of registering an estimated 10,000 artisanal fishing boats (pirogues). Over the years since the PNI began, the number of fishing boats seemed to grow, partly because no census had been taken since the one conducted by the *Centre de Recherches Océanographiques de Dakar-Thiaroye* (CRODT) in 1986; therefore, the beginning estimate was not accurate. In addition, the number of boats fluctuated as new boats were being constructed and as fishermen moved from one neighboring country to another while the registration was being carried out.

The PNI received funding totaling CFAF 1,948 million from various sources:

<b>Source of Funds</b>	<b>(CFAF million)</b>
Swiss Corporation	239
EU	132
World Bank	489
Spanish Corporation	260
Government of Senegal	420
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,948</b>

Funding from the Swiss Corporation in the form of a Trust Fund (TF90534) of \$526,829 (of which \$468,516 was disbursed) from 2005-2010 was managed by the World Bank. The Bank supported the program through three projects in various amounts: the GIRMaC (2004-2012), the GDRH (2008-2012), and the WARFP (ongoing – 2014).

The PNI has been in implementation for six years and its closing date was extended four times from 2006 to January 2011. It experienced technical difficulties and resource constraints resulting in considerable delay to its completion.

The technical constraints were:

- Locating itinerant fishermen (migration to the interior of the country and to neighboring countries), reaching areas with limited access such as Fatick and Ziguinchor;
- fading or disappearance of registration markings (lettering and numbering) through voluntary removal by the fishermen, normal wear and tear, or use of poor quality paint;
- difficulty reaching fishing areas bordering another country, e.g., St. Louis region, near Mauritania; limited means for personnel to travel to remote areas to follow-up on registration;
- certain types of boats (*senne tournante*, *Moudjass*) which navigate in deep seas are more difficult to mark because of high water levels;
- registration data issues such as equipment malfunctions and data entry management affecting reporting quality, shortage of registration number templates and materials; faulty placement of registration numbers on the boat; and
- refusal by some fishermen to use certain assigned acronyms.

Administrative constraints were:

- the lack of familiarity with the fishing boat sites/*parc piroguier* (inaccurate statistical data),
- wrong application of registration procedures, non-compliance with administrative procedures for building new boats, and
- lack of procedures and standardized sheet to delete non operating vessels from the database.

Financial constraints were:

- insufficient compensation and delays in payments to the Economic Interest Groups responsible for marking the boats; and
- frequent shortage of materials and supplies for printing the plastic registration cards.

Human resources constraints were: staffing personnel involved in the registration program include one Coordinator, 15 information technology professionals initially (five resigned since 2006), 58 Economic Interest Groups, and 60 technical field visit teams (including the DMF station chief, fishermen representatives, carpenter) spread across Senegal and one team per fishing port.

Some fishermen's groups who were concerned about the administrative and fiscal implications initially rejected any form of registration. However, this has improved in most fishing sites where fishing communities have been organized into co-management units under the Project. At such sites as the Senegal River Delta where the fishing population is more mobile (moving between Mauritania and Senegal) and groups diverse and less cohesive, registration has been more difficult.

**Other Issues.** The PNI changed coordinators in 2010. Under the Swiss TF, the cost of the contract for the national consulting firm consumed half of the fund’s resources, the quality of its data reporting was judged to be unsatisfactory by the PNI coordinator, and as result of the disagreements, the firm has not been paid. The TF closed in December 2010. In terms of donor funds, some were consumed quickly because of the ease of access to the funding. Among the easiest donor accounts to access was the Spanish Corporation funds which was held at a commercial bank (CNCS). Withdrawals required the signatures of the Director and the Project Coordinator, whereas access to the other donor funds were managed by the financial management unit of the COMO. By late 2009, most of the CFAF1,948 million had been spent, whereas the CFAF420 million in counterpart funding never materialized.

Another factor causing delays in the program’s implementation was the management problems at the COMO in July 2011 which stopped all project activities. As a result, no field work or follow-up was carried out just as the program was about to move into its data consolidation phase.

Since August 2010, the PNI has been receiving funding support from the World Bank’s WARFP until 2014 when it is expected to complete the registration and transfer the process from the COMO to the MFMA’s administrative services. The next steps include completing the registration for the remaining boats, nationally and sub-regionally (Mauritania), consolidating the results of the program, ensuring the sustainability of the program, and progressively transferring the activities of the PNI to the local administration services by end 2014.

To date, about 18,900 fishing boats covering the seven maritime regions of Senegal have been registered electronically (registration numbers distributed to owners). Of these, 16,207 have been manually embossed. The cost of marking a boat is estimated at CFAF3,000/boat. The fishing boats of the continental fishing areas have not been included. A data base for the registration program has been established by the MFMA at ([www.bdpni.gouv.sn](http://www.bdpni.gouv.sn)) as well as a website ([www.dpm-pni.com](http://www.dpm-pni.com)) containing details on program. The following is the list of registrations by region as of July 2012:

<b>Name of Region</b>	<b>Total No. of canoes</b>	<b>No. of canoes registered electronically</b>	<b>No. of canoes embossed manually</b>	<b>No. of canoes to be embossed</b>	<b>% of Canoes embossed</b>
Dakar	4,119	4,119	3,619	500	87.86
Thies	5,876	5,876	4,895	911	84.50
St. Louis	3,210	3,210	2,186	1,024	68.10
Louga	223	223	163	60	73.09
Fatick	2,105	2,105	2,051	54	97.43
Kaolack	201	201	137	64	68.16
Zinguichor	3,166	3,166	3,086	80	97.47
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>18,900</b>	<b>18,900</b>	<b>16,207</b>	<b>2,693</b>	<b>85.75</b>

### **Market incentives for sustainable management for targeted fisheries**

The creating of conditions necessary for eco-certification of one co-managed coastal fishery could not be carried out due to the late recruitment of the consulting firm, WWF-WAMER for the reasons mentioned above.

### **Component 3: Poverty Alleviation Measures for Fishing Communities and Alternative Livelihoods for Fishers, Fish Processors, and Fish Transporters (*mareyeurs*) (FRAP)** (US\$3.5 m IDA, US\$0.46 m Government).

The objective of this component was to offset any negative socio-economic impacts for targeted fishing communities resulting from co-management initiatives or management plans (including the introduction of instruments such as ZPPs, artificial reefs, eco-labels, etc.).

The Key Performance Indicator for the project related to alternative livelihoods to fishing was partially met in that the communities targeted had access to a system of micro-credit (although it did not disburse for the reasons mentioned below) and poverty reduction measures (through income-generating activities) were implemented in the four initial pilot sites; none were completed for the eight new sites due to slow start-up and insufficient time for implementation.

The indicators for the participation of women in micro-credit was not met, although about 1,703 eligible beneficiaries were selected by the technical assistance firm as eligible for micro-credit loans, out of which about 1,430 were requests from beneficiaries who were women. However, of this number, only 20 women had micro-project proposals which were considered viable and ready to be funded by the CMS. Unfortunately, by EOP, none were able to be implemented due to the lack of time.

For the eight additional co-management sites, seven of the eight income-generating activities proposed for the fishing communities were approved by the Bank on August 2011 but could not be implemented by EOP due to the Project management problems which stalled project implementation at that time. The poverty alleviation sub-projects (micro-credit activities) will be transferred for support under the restructured West Africa Regional Fisheries Project.

### **Poverty alleviation initiatives in Project-targeted communities.**

In support of poverty alleviation and support to marketing and commercialization of fish products, the Project funded the construction of stores for fishing gear and supplies (at Ngaparou and Foundiougne); the purchase of a refrigerated truck (Ngaparou); household goods and cooking utensils store for a group of about 36 women shrimp processors (Foundiougne); a poultry farm (Ouakam); and a tourist camp at Betenty. These have been completed and operating since early 2010. Accompanying measures included organizing beneficiaries into small economic interest groups, providing technical assistance to the projects and relevant training, and monitoring progress.



Rates of return analysis at the time the ventures were proposed showed high Internal Rates of Return (IRR) varying from about 27 percent for the tourist camp and poultry farm, to around 47 to 59 percent for the stores. Although the CLPs at the sites have been keeping a detailed log of revenues, costs, cash flow, etc., a financial analysis including estimated and projected operating costs, amortizations, funds flow, and IRR will need to be carried out to determine whether the ventures are profitable.

### **Support for Alternative Livelihoods to Fishing.**

Access to micro-finance was made available through a protocol agreement signed at effectiveness between the Government (Department of Fisheries (DPM)) and the CMS (a national private micro-finance institution) for the establishment of the alternative livelihood fund. However, the fund did not disburse for the reasons mentioned below.

A necessary accompanying measure, the recruitment of a qualified consulting firm for providing technical assistance to fishers to use the “reconversion fund” was seriously delayed. Its contract was cancelled early in 2010 by the national Procurement Agency of the Government due to a failure to follow the country’s Procurement Code (although it was in compliance with Bank procedures and had the Bank’s no-objection to sign the contract). The recruitment had to be re-launched resulting in an additional delay of eight months. The whole process took about a year to finalize until the contract was signed in early 2011 with work expected to begin around mid-2011. By EOP, the firm was not able to complete the activities due to the short time remaining until the project closed and the line of credit was not used. The CMS was to reimburse the Bank the total amount of the line of credit (about \$1.1 million).

The problems and constraints encountered by the pilot sites in the use of the reconversion fund and the micro-credit facility included:

- slow start-up of the activities;
- difficulty in finding a profitable income-generating activity suitable for reconversion (either the conditions were not right at the time proposed, or cohesion was insufficient for using the micro-credit fund);
- amount of the micro-credit was too low to motivate fishers to convert;
- lack of experience of fishers in other domains/activities;
- free access to fishing; and
- children of fishers were overlooked in reconversion (i.e., limited vision of the reconversion fund; reconversion should target children of fishers, not the age group specified by the fund).

However, the establishment of the fund and system of micro-credit did accomplish the following:

- the endorsement of eligibility criteria for the beneficiaries,
- a bank account opened with CMS for the community,
- the communities were able to deposit a guarantee fund at the CMS,
- community facilitators were placed to strengthen the CLPs’ capacity,

- recruitment of a technical assistance consulting firm to assist the CLPs (although some sites noted that the firm did not visit the community).

### **Capacity-building, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Communication.**

In terms of support to the DPM specialists who were to manage and monitor component activities, including FRAP specialists within DPM, the Project funded the procurement of office equipment and supplies, technical assistance contracts, training, workshop expenses, operating costs, and the cost of promotional materials and publication materials for IEC and dissemination activities.

**Component 4: Institutional Strengthening for Fisheries Management, Project Management and Monitoring and Evaluation** (US\$2.5m IDA-GIRMaC project, US\$0.94m GEF, US\$5.1m EU, US\$0.15m Government).

The objective of the component was to support the Ministry of Maritime Economy (now the MFMA) to manage and implement the project in the context of the Letter of Sector Policy and to monitor and evaluate results.

### **Development of a fisheries code and support for the implementation of fisheries management plans**

Under the GIRMaC, the national fisheries management plans were not completed although substantial preparation was carried out. They will be supported in the restructured WARFP.

The project supported capacity-building for the MFMA through the provision of technical experts and guidance through international and national consultant services. The Project funded training programs, workshops, office equipment and software, specialized equipment for the national boat registration program, vehicles, and a budget for operating costs during the life of the project. The Bank teams provided substantial inputs into national level strategic, legal and regulatory documents such as the Fisheries Code revisions and the Letter of Sector Policy, as well as sector studies and strategies for relevant sectors, and provided technical inputs into the preparation and implementation of fisheries programs.

### **Project management, monitoring and evaluation**

Support for establishment of an M&E system was not successful. Although the COMO issued an initial report on baseline values for monitoring the key performance indicators, they were not able to be translated into an operational M&E system as none were designed nor established.

### **Impact of the Projects**

However, in terms of overall impact, significant results have been obtained in the sector through the contributions of the complementary GIRMaC and GDRH projects. Although the designs reflected higher expectations than could be accomplished in the time span of the projects, progress has been made in the sector and in Senegal compared to when the projects began. The

pilots were an opportunity to test new approaches and replicate them in Senegal in order to provide viable options to fisheries resources management and biodiversity conservation and build sustainable strategies for the future.

The gaps and weaknesses in the management of the fisheries sector, including governing and management structures has been narrowed due to: (a) the direct involvement of the MFMA and its agencies at the central, regional and local levels involved in the implementation of the projects; (b) the institutional strengthening of the *Direction des Pêches Maritimes* (DPM) through the implementation of the projects, experience with project management and monitoring, (c) increased government interaction with local communities; and (d) direct involvement of ministry technical personnel providing input into the revisions of sector legislation in Senegal.

The knowledge base for policy decision making and accompanying measures has been strengthened through the revisions to the Fisheries Code which has been submitted to Parliament for approval, and the Letter of Sector Policy revisions in 2008. The revisions to the Fisheries Code, once approved, is expected to address the difficult issues of access rights to fish resources. The legislations demonstrate Government engagement at the national level and is an important step linking improved fisheries management with the sectoral policy framework. These will also provide a channel for more effective aid and aid coordination in the fisheries sector in the future.

The successful establishment of a nationwide system for registering small fishing vessels is an important step towards regulating artisanal fisheries for the government; historically, government regulation of artisanal fisheries has had little success and has been met with strong resistance from boat owners. By end of project, however, boat owners are increasingly complying with the registration program and the number of boats registered have almost doubled over the number estimated at appraisal.

### **Annex 3. Economic and Financial Analysis** *(including assumptions in the analysis)*

From the PAD of the Project, indicative cost-benefit analyses of representative examples of these investments were presented for each component of the project to illustrate the basis for deciding the merits of the project. At EOP stage, i.e., less than three years after effectiveness, the status of implementation of the co-management initiatives and the establishment of marine protected areas as the support for alternative livelihoods in fishing communities is not sufficient to be able to provide concrete results. The reasons are already highlighted in the paragraphs on assessment of outcomes, i.e., more time is needed to implement and demonstrate results in such community-based projects. However, as insufficient data is available to conduct a thorough analysis with real data, an analogy with the four pilot co-management initiatives from GIRMaC can be used to justify the rationality of the project.

**Co-management activities in Component 1.** Based on the results from the first co-management initiatives from the GIRMaC Project, the implementation of these initiatives yielded encouraging results at the site level and in terms of increase of the CPUE (Catch-per-unit-effort) and of stock recovery indicators. For example, after the implementation of fisheries co-management measures, from 2005 to 2011, the CPUE of green lobster fisheries in Ngaparou has increased from 7 kg through 40 kg per vessel, and in Ouakam, the same CPUE has increased from 10 kg to 34 kg between 2007 and 2011 and the CPUE of Thiof has reached 166 kg per vessel (against only 75 kg per vessel in 2007) during the implementation of co-management fisheries measures for the declining stock of these species in these areas. And in Betenty, for example, the number of individual shrimp per sample increased by 38 percent from 2005 through 2011, i.e., the average size of individual shrimp has increased, an indicator of higher quality fisheries product). Given that the new co-management initiatives for the GDRH should be implemented based on the same model as the initiatives from the GIRMaC and in the same area (Central coastal area of the country), these new ones could have the similar results also.

**Establishment of protected fishing zones (ZPPs) in Component 2.** The activities under this component, closure of key habitats and spawning areas to fishing by communities, would reduce pressure on the fisheries resources and allow fish stocks to recover; as such they would contribute to increasing the CPUE for the targeted species and increase the profitability of the fishery species targeted. However, these results would need more than the three years of implementation under the Project to yield data from such community initiatives.

The implementation of the co-management initiatives (including the establishment of the ZPPs) will result also, in the short term, in a loss of production, and as a result, a decrease of revenue for some groups in the communities. Consequently, alternative sources of income are needed to mitigate these negative impacts of the initiatives and support for alternative livelihoods in fishing communities is crucial and justified under the Project.

## Annex 4. Bank Lending and Implementation Support/Supervision Processes

### (a) Task Team members

Names	Titles	Unit	IDA P105881	GEF P092062
<b>Lending</b>				
Balde, Demba	Sr Social Development Spec	AFTCS	✓	✓
Kloppinger-Todd, Renate	Rural Finance Specialist	ARD	✓	✓
Elisabeth Mekonnen	Program Assistant	LCC3C	✓	✓
Prevost, Yves André	Environmental Advisor	PA9SS	✓	✓
Sarno Francesco	Procurement Specialist, (Consultant)		✓	✓
Strengerowski-Feldblyum, Liba C.	Operations Analyst	AFTN3	✓	✓
Talla, Takoukam. Patrice	Counsel		✓	✓
Vaselopoulos, Virginie	Language Program Assistant	AFTN1	✓	✓
Vincent, Xavier F.P	Senior Fisheries Specialist	AFTN1	✓	✓
Viridin, John	Sr Natural Resources Mgmt. Spec. (TTL)	ENV	✓	✓
Winter, Carolyn	Sr Social development Specialist	AFTCS	✓	✓
<b>Supervision</b>				
Boisrobert, Cedric	Fisheries Specialist (Consultant)	AFTEN	✓	✓
Chu, Jingjie	Natural Resources Economist	AFTN1	✓	
Follea, Salimata D.	Operations Analyst	AFTN1	✓	
Hume, Andrew Christer	Junior Professional Associate	GEFNR		✓
Fam, Mbow Maimouna	Sr. Financial Mgt Specialist	AFTFM	✓	✓
Ioniirilala, Radonirina	Fisheries Specialist (ET Consultant)	AFTN3	✓	✓
Kanungo, Gayatri	Environmental Specialist	AFTN3		✓
Monnet, Marguerite	Social Devel. Specialist (Consultant)	AFTHW	✓	✓
Romao, Osval	Financial Mgt. Specialist	AFTFM	✓	✓
Sarno Francesco	Procurement Specialist (Consultant)		✓	✓
Sanoussi, Rahamane Ibrah	Procurement Specialist	AFTPC	✓	✓
Strengerowski-Feldblyum, Liba C.	Operations Analyst	AFTN3	✓	
Tran, H.G. Lucie	Consultant, ICR	AFTN1	✓	✓
Traore, Cheick	Procurement Specialist	AFTPC	✓	✓
Tynan, Ellen J.	Sr. Environmental Specialist	AFTEN	✓	✓
Vincent, Xavier F.P	Senior Fisheries Specialist	AFTN1	✓	✓
Viridin, John	Sr. Nat. Resources Mgmt. Spec., (TTL)	ENV	✓	✓
Winter, Carolyn	Sr. Social development Specialist	AFTCS	✓	✓

**(b) Staff Time and Cost**

Stage	Staff Time and Cost (Bank Budget Only)	
	# Staff weeks	USD Thousands (Including travel and consultant costs)
<b>Lending</b>		
FY09	2.68	19,239
Subtotal:	<b>2.68</b>	<b>19,266</b>
<b>Supervision/ICR</b>		
FY09	0.00	0.00
FY10	16.78	84,595
FY11	30.26	97,243
FY12	8.23	56,557
FY13	0.00	23,023
Subtotal	<b>55.27</b>	<b>261,418</b>

## Annex 5. Results Framework

Combined PDO/GEO:	Key Performance Indicators	Status at EOP
<p>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).</p>	<p><b>Development Objective Indicators:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in the average size of fish caught for targeted species in co-management sites;</li> <li>• Reduction in the level of fishing effort for targeted species in co-management sites</li> </ul>	<p>Partially met for the 4 pilot sites under the IMCFM (GIRMaC) Project. Not met for the 8 additional sites for which sub-project proposals have been prepared and submitted to authorities but not yet approved as legal agreements with the Government; therefore sub-projects could not be implemented by EOP.</p>
	<p><b>Co-management of coastal fisheries indicator:</b> 8 new co-management sub-project proposals are approved as legal agreements with the Government and successfully implemented by EOP.</p>	<p>Partially met. 8 new sub-project prepared and submitted to local and central level authorities for validation and are awaiting approval. Following approval, implementation of the sub-projects will be supported under the restructured WARFP.</p>
	<p><b>Rehabilitation of coastal ecosystems indicator:</b> 70 percent of community members surveyed in participating communities are satisfied with project activities to rehabilitate coastal fish stocks (ZPPs, artificial reefs, ecolabelling).</p>	<p>Not met. Due to long delays in the procurement process, the firm (WWF-WAMER) was recruited in early 2011, one year late, and by project closing was able to carry out activities for 12 months out of a 30 month contract awarded on the premise that the Project would be extended. Remaining activities will be funded under the WARFP.</p>
	<p><b>Alternative livelihoods to fishing indicator:</b> Each community targeted by the project has access to a system of micro-credit, and project-supported poverty reduction measures are implemented in at least the four initial pilot sites, by EOP.</p>	<p>Partially met. Funds (about \$1.1 m) were made available through deposit made with the micro-finance institution, CMS. However, the Project implementation period did not allow sufficient to use the funds which were returned to the Bank.</p> <p>Poverty reduction measures being implemented at 4 initial pilot sites (fishing gear and supplies</p>

		stores, women's household goods store, tourist camp, poultry farm). However, rate of return analysis is needed to determine profitability of ventures.
<b>Short-Term Outcomes</b>	<b>Short-Term Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>Status at EOP</b>
<b>Component 1: Co-Management of Coastal Fisheries.</b>  A system of local coastal fisheries governance based on co-management that is coherent, well understood and institutionally strengthened, is established.	8 new CLPs legally established in the central coastal region, within the first 18 months of implementation	Met satisfactorily. CLPs established by end of first year of implementation.
	4 consolidated local fisheries management plans are approved by the relevant Local Artisanal Fishers' Councils (CLPAs) within 24 months of project implementation, and implemented by EOP.	Not met. However, under the WARFP, three consolidated fisheries management plans will be approved and implemented around the 4 initial pilot sites.
<b>Component 2: Rehabilitation of Coastal Ecosystems.</b>  Critical habitats for key coastal fish species are protected in a participatory manner, through the establishment of ZPPs, the immersion of artificial reefs, the introduction of access rights to targeted fisheries, and efforts towards eco-labeling of small-scale fish products.	2 protected fisheries zones (ZPPs) are created and legally established and their management plans prepared.	Not met. Delay of 12-months in recruiting the consulting firm (WWF-WAMER) which led to delays in implementing the activities. Activities have transferred for implementation by the same firm under the restructured WARFP.
	At least 2 artificial reefs are expanded/ submerged and co-managed with the local communities by EOP.	Not met for the same reasons as above.
	Access rights are defined, legally recognized and introduced in 2 of fisheries under co-management.	Not met due to delays in the implementation of co-management activities, ZPPs and placing of artificial reefs. These activities have been transferred to the restructured WARFP.
	All small-scale fishing and transport vessels originating from within the central coastal region are registered by the National Registration Program (PNI) within the first six months of project implementation.	Met satisfactorily, with delay. However, with additional funding from the WARFP, about 17,500 small vessels (85%) are confirmed by the DPM to be registered. The remaining 15% of the small fishing vessels fleet are made up of vessels from



		neighboring countries where they fish most of the year.
	At least 1 fishery is eligible for eco-certification according to the criteria of the Marine Stewardship Council by EOP.	Not met. Activities transferred to the restructured WARFP.
	Feasibility study and consensus on a sustainable financing mechanism for the recurrent costs of ZPPs.	Not met. Activity transferred to the restructured WARFP.
<p><b>Component 3: Alleviation Measures for Fishing Communities and Alternative Livelihoods for Fishers, Fish Processors, and Fish transporters (<i>mareyeurs</i>).</b></p> <p>Alternative revenue generating activities are developed for fishers and their families areas targeted by the project, within the fisheries sector though better access to higher value markets, or outside of the sector with training and cash support (micro-finance) from the project for communities to compensate for the loss of fishing effort and income, and to invest in alternative livelihoods.</p>	Percentage of women in participating communities that are benefiting from micro-credit to develop activities outside the fisheries sector.	Not met. According to the last quarterly report (02-04/2012) from the TA institution, 1,703 eligible beneficiaries were selected, of which 1,430 requests for micro-credit for women candidates. Of these, only 20 women had micro-projects outlined and ready for funding from the CMS (MFI). By EOP, none of the women benefitted from Project funding.
	Percentage of targeted fishing communities receiving micro finance, and number of families in targeted communities that are entering new commercial markets.	IGAs (poultry farm, fishing gear/supplies store, tourist camp, funds for groups of women processors) and marketing support (grants, cold storage truck, collection points for shrimp), implemented in 4 initial pilot sites of the GIRMaC.

	Percentage of alternative livelihoods undertaken by fishers receiving micro finance access and small-enterprise training from the project, sustained profitably at EOP.	Not met. However, according to the TA firm's report (February/April 2012), 1,703 eligible beneficiaries were selected, of which 273 were requests for the reconversion fund. 22 beneficiaries had viable micro-projects which could have been financed by the CMS. No reconversion project was financed by EOP.
<b>Component 4: Institutional Strengthening for Fisheries Management, Project Management and Monitoring and Evaluation.</b>  Efficient management, monitoring and evaluation of project and dissemination of implementation results.	Annual M&E reports with all data on results indicators and M&E plan completed.	Not met. Some baseline data available. However, no operational M&E system has been established.
	Participating communities receive information on key indicators in a timely manner.	Not met for the reasons mentioned above.
	Annual audit opinion has been unqualified.	Met. Audits were unqualified.

## Annex 6. Summary of Borrower's ICR and/or Comments on Draft ICR

### REPUBLIQUE DU SENEGAL

*Un Peuple - Un But - Une Foi*

\*\*\*\*\*



### MINISTERE DE LA PECHE ET DES AFFAIRES MARITIMES

\*\*\*\*\*

### DIRECTION DES PECHEES MARITIMES

-----

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>RAPPORT D'ACHEVEMENT DU PROJET DE GESTION DURABLE DES RESSOURCES HALIEUTIQUES (GDRH)</b></p>
--

#### **PREFACE: Identification du projet**

#### **1. Contexte du projet, conception de l'objectif de développement et de l'objectif global environnemental**

Le projet de Gestion Durable des Ressources Halieutiques (GDRH) vise à favoriser l'exploitation durable des ressources halieutiques démersales côtières au Sénégal qui sont essentielles pour la réalisation des objectifs de la stratégie de croissance accélérée (Grappe des produits de la Mer) à travers la Lettre de politique sectorielle ainsi que son plan d'action 2008–2010.

En dépit de l'importance socio-économique des ressources halieutiques et des écosystèmes marins dont elles dépendent, le secteur de la pêche maritime a été confronté à des difficultés majeures pendant les dernières années en raison de la surexploitation des espèces à forte valeur commerciale, de l'expansion non réglementée du nombre de pêcheurs, de navires, d'engins de pêche et d'unités de transformation et de conservation dans les sites de débarquement.

Cette croissance incontrôlée, notamment de la pêche artisanale, a eu pour résultat une grave surexploitation des stocks d'espèces démersales côtières à forte valeur marchande dont les contributions macroéconomiques au développement du pays (emplois, exportations, valeur ajoutée...) sont aujourd'hui en net recul depuis quelques années.

La surexploitation des pêcheries côtières du Sénégal a des impacts importants sur la pauvreté rurale, la sécurité alimentaire et la croissance macro-économique.

Les impacts sociaux se reflètent déjà dans le nombre de pêcheurs sénégalais qui vont grossir les rangs des émigrants sénégalais (y compris de jeunes pêcheurs) qui regagnent l'Espagne et l'Europe en général par mer.

Le présent projet qui vise à s'attaquer aux menaces pesant sur la pêche et les stocks halieutiques côtiers du Sénégal a été conçu pour être complémentaire au projet de Gestion Intégrée des Ressources Marines et Côtières (GIRMaC) ainsi que les initiatives d'autres bailleurs de fonds tels que le Japon et l'Union Européenne. Pour freiner la surexploitation des ressources, le projet vise à reconstituer les stocks d'espèces démersales côtières, par l'extension de la cogestion des pêcheries côtières et par la mise en place de divers instruments de réhabilitation des écosystèmes marins côtiers dégradés (implantation de récifs artificiels, promotion de Zones de Pêche Protégées) dont dépendent les stocks exploités ainsi que

des mécanismes d'incitation commerciale tels que l'éco-certification des pêcheries et la labellisation des produits halieutiques.

### **1.1. Contexte à la phase de conception et d'évaluation préalable**

Le projet « Gestion durable des ressources halieutiques du Sénégal », complémentaire du projet GIRMaC, permettra : i) d'aider le gouvernement à procéder aux importants remaniements de politique engagés dans le cadre du projet GIRMaC, en travaillant avec d'autres bailleurs de fonds pour aider les pouvoirs publics à appliquer la Lettre de politique sectorielle récemment adoptée, et ii) d'élargir la portée des activités pilotes de cogestion des pêcheries côtières exécutées au titre du projet GIRMaC. Ce projet permettrait en outre à la Banque mondiale d'aider le gouvernement à promouvoir d'autres moyens de subsistance dans certaines communautés de pêcheurs afin de soulager les pressions exercées sur les ressources et de remédier à certaines des graves difficultés sociales que connaît le secteur en constituant un «fonds de reconversion des pêcheurs». Ce fonds, initialement prévu par le projet GIRMaC, n'a pu être créé faute de financements suffisants sur les fonds IDA; la Banque mondiale s'est donc engagée à financer ces activités (pour permettre au gouvernement de respecter les principes de sauvegarde applicables au projet GIRMaC) qui constitueraient un projet parallèle de développement communautaire. Ce projet n'a pas été réalisé comme initialement prévu, d'où les retards dans l'acheminement des aides.

Le secteur de la pêche côtière au Sénégal se situe à l'intersection de la lutte contre la pauvreté et de la protection de l'environnement étant donné que les stocks halieutiques et les écosystèmes qui les abritent sont surexploités et dégradés. En conséquence, les communautés côtières de pêcheurs qui en dépendent pour leur subsistance sont confrontées à une précarité croissante. Cette association étroite constitue l'un des piliers de la stratégie de développement agricole et rural de la Banque mondiale pour réduire la pauvreté en zone rurale (2002). Cette stratégie a justifié l'appui initialement apporté par la Banque aux réformes de la gestion des pêches côtières du Sénégal au moyen des activités pilotes du projet GIRMaC, comme elle légitime aujourd'hui la consolidation et l'expansion de ces réformes par le GDRH. Encouragé par les résultats obtenus par le projet GIRMaC, le gouvernement a fait de la cogestion des pêcheries côtières l'un des objectifs premiers de sa récente Lettre de Politique Sectorielle de la Pêche et de l'Aquaculture signée en 2008. Le projet proposé, en plus du GIRMaC, permettra au gouvernement sénégalais de promouvoir les objectifs de cogestion des pêcheries côtières dans toute la zone centrale du littoral, de la péninsule depuis le Cap-Vert jusqu'au delta du Saloum. Il l'aidera à appliquer et à développer les réformes amorcées par le GIRMaC pour instaurer la cogestion et contribuer à la restauration des ressources halieutiques côtières de la zone d'intervention. Le projet proposé sera donc aussi une activité pilote qui pourra être reproduite à plus grande échelle dans toute la zone couverte par le projet Gestion du grand écosystème marin du courant des Canaries (projet CCLME).

Le Gouvernement du Sénégal et la Banque Mondiale ont en conséquence décidé de renforcer le programme de Gestion Intégrée des Ressources Marines et Côtières (GIRMaC) au triple plan spatial (extension de la cogestion), social (mise en place d'un Fonds Social commun au GIRMaC et au GDRH) et environnemental (réhabilitation des habitats dégradés des zones côtières qui sont essentiels pour les ressources démersales ciblées).

L'hypothèse de développement du projet, que reflète également la Lettre de Politique Sectorielle de la Pêche et de l'Aquaculture du gouvernement sénégalais, est que l'on ne peut s'atteler à la double problématique de la pauvreté et de la dégradation des ressources halieutiques côtières qu'en dotant les communautés côtières des capacités nécessaires et, éventuellement, en les aidant à s'organiser (par exemple en Comités Locaux de Pêcheurs officiellement reconnus) pour participer, aux côtés des organismes publics (Services de pêche et ou de surveillance), à la gestion et à l'utilisation durable des pêcheries côtières. L'idée de base est que les ménages des communautés côtières seront plus motivés pour exploiter durablement les ressources et investir dans leur régénération s'ils en sont responsables et s'ils ont le pouvoir de contrôler leur exploitation.

## 1.2. Objectif de développement du projet et les indicateurs clés de performance

L'objectif double environnemental et de développement du Projet est d'habiliter les communautés de pêcheurs dans la réduction de la pression de pêche sur les ressources halieutiques qui supportent les pêcheries de la côte centrale du Sénégal (de la péninsule du Cap Vert au delta du Saloum). Le projet devait atteindre ces objectifs par : **i)** la promotion de la cogestion des pêcheries côtières ; **ii)** la contribution à la réhabilitation des écosystèmes dont elles dépendent ; et **iii)** l'aide octroyée aux pêcheurs pour qu'ils s'orientent vers de nouveaux métiers et les mesures de réduction de la pauvreté au sein des communautés cibles.

Les indicateurs de performance des résultats du projet sont définis comme suit :

- La taille moyenne de capture des espèces ciblées dans les sites mettant en œuvre des initiatives de cogestion a augmenté.
- Le niveau de l'effort de pêche pour les espèces ciblées dans les sites mettant en œuvre des initiatives de cogestion a baissé.
- Huit (8) nouvelles propositions de sous-projets de cogestion sont approuvées sous forme d'accords légaux avec le Gouvernement et sont mises en œuvre avec succès avant la fin du projet
- 70% des villages interrogés dans les communautés associées se disent satisfaits des activités mises en œuvre par le projet pour reconstituer les stocks halieutiques côtiers (via les Zones de pêche protégées, les récifs artificiels et l'éco-certification).
- Chaque communauté cible a accès à un système de microcrédits et des mesures d'appui à la réduction de la pauvreté sont mises en œuvre au moins dans les 4 sites pilotes initiaux.

## 1.3. Principaux bénéficiaires

Les bénéficiaires du Projet sont les pêcheurs et leurs familles ainsi que les autres usagers des ressources halieutiques des sites d'intervention (mareyeurs, transformatrices ...), des agents des pêches et ou de la surveillance, etc. Pour ce qui concerne spécifiquement la pêche industrielle, les bénéficiaires indirects sont les agents économiques de l'ensemble de la filière démersale côtière qui vont bénéficier des effets de la baisse de la pression de pêche artisanale en zone côtière et de la réhabilitation des écosystèmes côtiers dont dépendent les ressources exploitées plus au large.

Les bénéficiaires peuvent également être impliqués ou impactés à travers leurs organisations professionnelles (GIE, Groupement, associations, comités, fédérations, etc.) ou leurs structures administratives (DPM, DPSP, CRODT, etc).

## 1.4. Composantes du projet

Le projet GDRH est structuré en quatre composantes comme suit :

**La Composante 1 « Cogestion des pêcheries côtières »** qui a pour objectif de mettre en œuvre des systèmes de cogestion locale, afin d'améliorer la gouvernance des pêcheries côtières en vue d'assurer une exploitation durable des ressources halieutiques. Cette composante est constituée des trois sous-composantes suivantes :

- La promotion des initiatives locales de cogestion dans les quatre sites pilotes ;
- L'extension géographique et la consolidation de la cogestion locale des pêcheries côtières ;
- L'appui institutionnel pour la mise en place d'un système de cogestion locale des pêcheries ;

**La Composante 2 « Réhabilitation des écosystèmes essentiels pour les pêcheries côtières »** qui a pour objectif de contribuer à la régénération des écosystèmes essentiels pour les pêcheries côtières, par la mise en place de Zones de Pêche Protégées (ZPP) associées à des Récifs Artificiels, et de mesures d'incitation commerciales contribuant à encourager la gestion durable des écosystèmes. Cette composante comprend des quatre sous-composantes suivantes :

- Zones de Pêche Protégées (ZPP) ;
- Récifs Artificiels ;

- Introduction de Droits d'Accès et Instruments de Gestion Associés ;
- Mesures d'incitation commerciales en vue de la gestion durable des pêcheries ciblées.

**La Composante 3 « Mesures d'atténuation de la pauvreté pour les communautés de pêcheurs et appui à la reconversion des pêcheurs, des femmes transformatrices et mareyeurs »** qui a pour objectif de mettre en place des mesures destinées à atténuer la pauvreté des communautés de pêcheurs ciblées et à compenser toute incidence négative sur elles, des initiatives locales de cogestion ou réhabilitation des écosystèmes marins. Cette composante comprend des trois sous-composantes suivantes:

- Initiatives d'Atténuation de la pauvreté dans les communautés ciblées par le Projet ;
- Appui à la Reconversion des Pêcheurs, des Femmes transformatrices et Mareyeurs ;
- Renforcement des Capacités, Suivi-Evaluation et Communication.

**La Composante 4 « Appui institutionnel pour la gestion des pêcheries, la gestion de projet et suivi et évaluation »** qui a pour objectif d'aider le Ministère en charge de la pêche à gérer et exécuter le Projet conformément à la Lettre de Politique Sectorielle de la Pêche et de l'Aquaculture et d'assurer le suivi et l'évaluation des résultats. Cette composante comprend des trois sous-composantes suivantes :

- Elaboration d'un Code de la Pêche Maritime et appui à la mise en œuvre de plans nationaux d'aménagement des pêcheries ;
- Gestion, Suivi-Evaluation du Projet ;
- Articulation du Projet avec les activités sous-régionales et régionales.

## **2. Facteurs affectant la mise en œuvre du Projet**

### **2.1. Préparation du projet, Conception et Qualité de la préparation**

Le processus de préparation du projet a largement bénéficié des leçons tirées du GIRMaC. La Banque et le Gouvernement ont ainsi mis en place deux équipes de préparation. Celle du Gouvernement a permis à l'Unité de Coordination du projet GIRMaC et la COMO-Pêche de travailler en étroite collaboration avec les responsables de la Direction des Pêches Maritimes (DPM). Le processus de préparation a englobé plusieurs étapes : (i) la préparation par le Gouvernement d'une Note Conceptuelle approuvée par la Banque, (ii) la requête du Gouvernement au FEM (31 janvier 2007) et d'un projet pour le financement d'un PDF Bloc B sur les ressources additionnelles du Fonds pour l'Environnement Mondial (FEM) inscrites dans le Partenariat Stratégique FAO-WWF-Banque Mondiale pour la pêche, (iii) la conduite de 9 études (Annexe 1.5.) pour appuyer la préparation (pré-évaluation, évaluation) du projet GDRH. L'Agrément du Don FEM (GEF PPG Grant TF 090576), d'un montant de **256 740 US\$**, a été approuvé par le Gouvernement en août 2007 pour une durée de 12 mois.

Le projet GDRH a été jugé conforme avec les critères d'admissibilité du Partenariat Stratégique et satisfait les 10 principes opérationnels dudit Partenariat.

La mise en vigueur initiale, fixée au 12 septembre 2009, a été effective le 09 novembre 2009 suite à une demande de prorogation faite par le Gouvernement en raison du retard dans l'obtention à temps de l'Avis juridique sur l'Accord Subsidaire entre l'Institution de Microfinance (CMS) et le GDRH.

La préparation technique du projet a été faite selon un processus participatif avec les acteurs de la pêche artisanale dans les sites potentiels et l'administration déconcentrée des pêches et de la surveillance. Cette démarche a été renforcée avec les ateliers de partage des études préparatoires réalisées et les visites de sites (Petite Côte, région de Dakar, etc.). Les risques d'impacts négatifs du projet ont été identifiés et les mesures de mitigation définies et prises en considération. Le GDRH tire les enseignements du projet GIRMaC, et affine l'hypothèse de développement fondée sur la cogestion des ressources par les communautés côtières pour aider les pouvoirs publics à développer la contribution du secteur halieutique à la croissance économique et enrayer la surpêche et les graves dégradations environnementales prévalant dans certaines zones. Il devrait permettre de consolider et d'étendre les succès du GIRMaC en matière de cogestion mais également de procéder à l'essai de nouveaux outils visant à restaurer les pêcheries côtières, tels que la création d'aires de conservation pour la pêche, des démarches fondées sur le jeu du marché

pour promouvoir la gestion durable des ressources (éco-certification/labellisation des produits de la pêche), l'implantation de récifs artificiels, et d'autres encore. Comme le projet GIRMaC, le GDRH utilisera un fonds de reconversion professionnelle mis en place par le gouvernement pour attribuer des subventions globales et des micro-financements à des communautés sélectionnées, aider les pêcheurs intéressés à se tourner vers des métiers nouveaux et atténuer ainsi les pressions exercées sur les ressources.

## **2.2. Mise en œuvre**

Le projet GDRH n'a pas connu de revue à mi-parcours comme le GIRMaC. Toutefois, les principaux changements intervenus dans l'expertise technique de la COMO-Pêche concernent (i) le recrutement d'un spécialiste national en cogestion (SCOPE) avant la date de mise en vigueur du projet en remplacement du spécialiste international (SICOPE) qui a démarré le processus de cogestion dans le cadre du GIRMaC, et (ii) le recrutement d'un nouveau spécialiste en suivi-évaluation dès janvier 2010.

## **2.3. Conception, mise en œuvre et utilisation du système de suivi-évaluation (S&E)**

Le projet GDRH, jusqu'à sa clôture, n'a pas bénéficié d'un système de suivi-évaluation conçu, validé et mise en œuvre. La principale conséquence est le manque de suivi des indicateurs du projet, notamment dans les sites initiaux où se sont poursuivies les activités de cogestion initiées dans le cadre du projet GIRMaC.

## **2.4. Conformité et respect des procédures fiduciaires et de sauvegarde.**

### **2.4.1. Problèmes rencontrés dans les procédures fiduciaires**

La passation des marchés du GDRH a connu des contreperformances handicapantes, liées notamment à une mauvaise option du Gouvernement et de la Banque Mondiale, de démarrer la mise en œuvre du projet, avec un Spécialiste en Passation de Marché recruté à temps partiel, et dont la durée de l'intervention (1 jour par semaine) était sans commune mesure avec le volume des marchés à pourvoir, surtout au tout début du projet, à la fois pour satisfaire les conditions de mise en vigueur, les conditions de décaissement, et les engagements datés. Malheureusement, le GDRH a cheminé avec cette option durant huit mois, à compter de la date de mise en vigueur du projet, coïncidant avec la période de démarrage où les besoins en passation des marchés sont énormes et se posent quotidiennement. Ce temps de présence trop limité du Spécialiste en Passation de Marché combiné aux lourdeurs consécutives à la double application des procédures nationales et de la Banque Mondiale, se sont traduits dans la passation des marchés, par des lenteurs qui ont gravement perturbé la bonne mise en œuvre du Projet GDRH.

Par ailleurs, pour un projet qui a seulement trois années d'existence, le GDRH a connu deux (2) spécialistes en passation des marchés (SPM), deux coordonnateurs de projet et deux responsables fiduciaires (Directeur des Pêches Maritimes). Ce faisant, les délais de sélection et de remplacement des spécialistes en passation des marchés (SPM) ont beaucoup freiné l'évolution du projet.

La sélection de l'Institution d'Appui Technique (IAT) illustre toutes ces difficultés. En effet, la sélection de l'IAT, condition de mise en vigueur du projet GDRH, n'a été effective qu'en juillet 2011 avec l'approbation du contrat par la DCMP et le Ministère de l'Economie et des Finances de la République du Sénégal. Pourtant, c'est en janvier 2009 que la procédure de sélection de l'IAT a débuté avec la publication de l'Avis général de passation des marchés dans le DG Market et une sollicitation de manifestations d'intérêt parue dans le quotidien national « Le Soleil » du 15 janvier 2009. Mais, une fois conduite à terme, cette première procédure a été rejetée par la Direction Centrale des Marchés publics (DCMP) pour violation des articles 29 et 138 du Code des marchés publics, puis annulée par une Décision (N° 012/010/ARMP/CRD du 02 février 2010) de l'Autorité de Régulation des Marchés publics (ARMP), suite à une demande de régularisation introduite par la DPM le 1<sup>er</sup> décembre 2009, par courrier n° 1425/DPM/MGN/YB. Ce faisant, la procédure de sélection de l'IAT a été reprise une seconde fois avec une nouvelle sollicitation de manifestations d'intérêt (Quotidien « Le Soleil » du 29 avril 2010).

Avec le recrutement d'un nouveau spécialiste en passation des marchés à temps plein, en novembre 2010, le contrat de l'IAT a pu être approuvé en juillet 2011.

De manière générale, l'avènement du Code des marchés publics et les cadres institutionnels chargés de sa mise en œuvre (DCMP, ARMP, Commissions et Cellules de passation des marchés, etc.), s'est traduit par la mise en vigueur de procédures nationales de passation des marchés avec l'intervention de cellules de passation qui ne maîtrisaient pas toujours les procédures applicables. Le respect des procédures nationales et celles de la Banque Mondiale rallongent encore les délais de contractualisation, notamment dans le cas des firmes. La contractualisation de la firme WWF WAMER a ainsi connu un retard énorme (12 mois): elle a eu lieu en mai-juin 2011 au lieu de mai-juin 2010 comme initialement planifié dans le projet.

Les procédures de gestion financière, y compris les DRF, ont occasionné moins de contraintes et sont plus régulièrement améliorées que la passation des marchés.

#### **2.4.2. Problèmes rencontrés dans les procédures de sauvegarde environnementale et sociale**

Pour la prise en charge des mesures de sauvegarde sociale dans le Projet de Gestion Durable des Ressources Halieutiques (GDRH), une composante 3 intitulée « Mesures d'atténuation de la pauvreté pour les communautés de pêcheurs et Appui à la Reconversion des Pêcheurs, des Femmes Transformatrices et Mareyeurs » a été instituée. Financé par un Fonds de Reconversion des Artisans Pêcheurs (FRAP) d'un montant de 3 500 000 \$ US (soit 1575 000 000 F CFA), cette composante devait mettre en œuvre, dans 12 sites de cogestion ciblées, y compris dans les 4 sites pilotes initiaux qui n'avaient pas bénéficié de mesures de sauvegarde sociale, quatre catégories d'activités à caractère social (i) des activités génératrices de revenus (AGR), (ii) des activités d'appui à la commercialisation d'espèces halieutiques cogérées, (iii) des mesures sociales intérimaires en faveur des femmes affectées par la cogestion de la crevette côtière dans le Delta du Saloum, et (iv) des activités de microcrédits pour la reconversion des acteurs de la pêche et l'entrepreneuriat féminin.

Hormis les réalisations effectuées dans les 4 sites pilotes, où des sous-projets d'AGR (ferme avicole, quincailleries maritimes, campement touristique), des sous-projets d'appui à la commercialisation (fonds d'appui à la commercialisation, camion frigorifique, point de collecte de la crevette) et des mesures sociales intérimaires (appuis à des groupements de femmes vendeuses de produits halieutiques transformés) ont été concrètement mis en œuvre en faveur des communautés de pêcheurs, aucune de ces mesures de sauvegarde sociale, n'a pu être effectivement implantée dans les 8 sites du GDRH à la fin du projet, quand bien même les processus structurants les concernant ont-ils été bouclés depuis. Cela s'explique par les diverses raisons suivantes :

**Pour les AGR**, les sous-projets identifiés et élaborés en faveur des 8 sites du GDRH (Soumbédioune, Bargny, Yenne, Nianing, Pointe Sarène, Mballing, Fimela, Mbodiène) ont obtenu l'avis de non objection de la Banque Mondiale (BioMarine 379) depuis juillet 2011, mais leur mise en œuvre était suspendue au déroulement du processus de gestion locale, qui n'avait pas beaucoup évolué dans ces sites.

**Pour le fonds de microcrédits** d'un montant de 600 000 000 F CFA (dont 50 millions de F CFA d'appui institutionnel à la DPM), il avait été mis à la disposition du Crédit Mutuel du Sénégal (CMS) en janvier 2011 sur la base d'un protocole de partenariat signé le 26 mai 2010. Cependant, du fait des problèmes rencontrés dans les procédures de passation des marchés pour la sélection de l'Institution d'Appui Technique (IAT) en entrepreneuriat et en gestion de micro-entreprises (*voir paragraphe sur les problèmes rencontrés dans les procédures fiduciaires*), aucun microprojet de reconversion ou d'entrepreneuriat féminin n'a pu être financé à la fin du projet. Même si, entre octobre 2011 (date de son installation effective sur les sites) et mars 2012 (période qui correspond à la tenue de la revue fiduciaire de la Banque Mondiale ayant recommandé le recouvrement du fonds de microcrédit des livres du CMS pour un montant global de 735 526 000 F CFA), l'IAT a eu à mener tout une série d'activités (formation et installation des animateurs de l'IAT, installation et formation des Comités locaux de microcrédit, sensibilisation et information des acteurs, enquêtes sur les créneaux porteurs, sélection de 1703 bénéficiaires éligibles) ayant abouti à l'élaboration, au profit des bénéficiaires éligibles, de près de 42 dossiers de microprojets à soumettre pour financement au niveau des caisses du CMS.



**Pour l'appui à la commercialisation des espèces cogérées,** l'identification et l'élaboration des sous-projets devaient être réalisées avec l'appui d'un consultant spécialisé dans la commercialisation des produits agro-alimentaires. Cependant, ce consultant n'a jamais été sélectionné, parce qu'il devait intervenir après l'élaboration des sous-projets de cogestion locale, pour accompagner leur mise en œuvre dans les 8 sites du GDRH. Alors que ces sous-projets en question, n'ont jamais été validés.

### **2.5. Opération post-achèvement/Phase suivante.**

La Banque Mondiale a donné un avis favorable pour l'intégration des activités de la composante 2 du GDRH, relative à la réhabilitation des écosystèmes côtiers, dans le projet PRAO-SN en cours de restructuration. En conséquence, le contrat signé entre la DPM et la firme WWF-WAMER sera poursuivi, par voie d'Avenant, dans le cadre de la nouvelle convention de financement.

## **3. Evaluation des résultats.**

### **3.1. Pertinence des Objectifs, de la Conception et de la Mise en Œuvre**

- **Cohérence du Programme avec les politiques nationales de Pêche et d'Environnement et celles de la Banque mondiale**

L'analyse des composantes 1 et 2 du Projet GDRH et de leurs sous-composantes montre qu'elles s'inscrivent toutes dans l'une ou l'autre des objectifs stratégiques de développement de la pêche ainsi que des politiques environnementales du Gouvernement.

Ce projet contribue directement à la stratégie de croissance accélérée du gouvernement sénégalais qui veut faire de la pêche l'un des principaux moteurs de la croissance économique en favorisant l'exploitation durable des ressources et la réalisation de valeur ajoutée. Pour faciliter la réalisation des objectifs de la stratégie de croissance accélérée, le gouvernement a préparé en 2008 une Lettre de Politique Sectorielle de la Pêche et de l'Aquaculture ainsi qu'un plan d'action pour sa mise en œuvre pendant la période 2008–2010. Il a sollicité l'appui de la communauté de bailleurs de fonds pour l'application de ce plan d'action. Tout comme le projet GIRMaC, le GDRH répond à cette demande en appuyant l'un des grands axes et objectifs du plan, à savoir la reconstitution des pêcheries côtières par l'introduction de systèmes de cogestion reposant sur divers outils dont l'implantation de récifs artificiels et des mesures d'incitation commerciale tels que l'éco-certification des produits halieutiques.

Le projet apporte une réponse directe aux défis identifiés dans l'avant-projet de Stratégie d'aide-pays (CAS), pour l'exercice 07-10, dont le grand axe «Croissance accélérée/création de richesse/renforcement des grands facteurs de croissance » — prévoit une réalisation portant sur la « promotion du développement durable et de la gestion des ressources naturelles », les ressources halieutiques étant les premières citées. Compte tenu de cette situation, la Banque a maintenu son soutien au secteur de la pêche et que « les aides financières apportées par le FEM au titre du projet Gestion durable de la pêche permettront à la Banque de renforcer la réglementation régissant l'accès aux ressources halieutiques, et d'appuyer la décision présidentielle visant à créer 10 nouvelles aires marines protégées ».

Les activités de gestion durable de la pêche, appuyées par le projet, s'inscrivent en droite ligne de l'Objectif Stratégique n° 1 du FEM « Eaux Internationales » et plus particulièrement le Programme Stratégique n° 1: « Restaurer et soutenir les stocks de poissons côtiers et marins et diversité biologique associée ». De façon spécifique, le projet permettra au Sénégal de travailler avec les pêcheurs artisanaux pour mettre en œuvre des réformes de gestion des pêcheries et des habitats, comme les plans de cogestion, ou des zones de pêche protégées (i.e. réserves marines), ce qui permettra au pays de s'attaquer au problème de la surexploitation des pêcheries et stocks de poissons transfrontaliers.

L'appui du FEM (Partenariat Stratégique) permettra également de renforcer le réseau d'aires de conservation pour la pêche au Sénégal. La participation à la cogestion des communautés locales vivant sur leur pourtour ou à proximité contribuera à la stabilité du réseau, à la réalisation de l'objectif et des

résultats clés du Partenariat stratégique pour un fonds d'investissement pour l'appui d'une pêche écologiquement viable dans les grands écosystèmes marins d'Afrique subsaharienne.

- **Pertinence des objectifs et des orientations stratégiques du Projet**

Les objectifs de développement et en matière d'environnement assignés au Projet sont en phase avec les réformes indispensables pour juguler à court et moyen termes la crise environnementale, sociale et économique du secteur, notamment les pêcheries démersales côtières. En effet, l'expérience des investissements et des leçons apprises dans le cadre du projet GIRMaC a permis d'acquérir une base solide à partir de laquelle elle peut continuer d'appuyer la mise en œuvre des réformes.

Pour asseoir et consolider les réformes sectorielles à entreprendre, le gouvernement a finalisé et approuvé en 2008 une Lettre de Politique Sectorielle de la Pêche et de l'Aquaculture ainsi qu'un plan d'action pour sa mise en œuvre pendant la période 2008–2010. Les investissements du projet sont également en phase avec l'axe stratégique portant sur la gouvernance des pêcheries, la reconstitution des ressources halieutiques et la réhabilitation des écosystèmes marins.

### **3.2. Réalisation des Objectifs de développement du projet et des Objectifs Globaux environnementaux**

**Pour la composante 1 :** Le projet GDRH, qui vise à redresser les tendances de baisse pesant sur la pêche et les stocks halieutiques côtiers du Sénégal, a été conçu pour compléter le projet GIRMaC. Il contribue, à travers la promotion des initiatives locales de cogestion au niveau des quatre sites pilotes initiaux, à l'élargissement de la portée des activités pilotes de cogestion des pêcheries côtières exécutées au titre du projet GIRMaC.

La mise en œuvre des initiatives de cogestion s'est poursuivie dans les quatre sites pilotes initiaux de cogestion du GIRMaC avec le renforcement des acquis en termes de cohésion sociale et la participation des communautés regroupées en comités locaux de pêcheurs (CLP). Les résultats enregistrés dans la restauration des ressources dans les aires de cogestion, notamment à Ngarparou, ont conduit à une augmentation de l'effort de surveillance du fait des incursions des embarcations de braconniers cherchant à pêcher illégalement dans les zones protégées où se concentrent d'importantes quantités de ressources halieutiques. De nombreux conflits (entre acteurs ou entre acteurs et administration) ont résulté du succès obtenu dans les sites de cogestion. Les villages voisins des sites pilotes de cogestion manifestent une grande volonté pour bénéficier d'une extension dans leurs localités des initiatives de cogestion en cours. Plusieurs actions ont été ainsi réalisées par les CLP des sites pilotes initiaux de cogestion pour informer, sensibiliser et partager leurs résultats de la cogestion avec les villages voisins. Les CLPA concernés par les sites pilotes initiaux œuvrent à l'extension des initiatives via les plans de gestion consolidés des pêcheries. Les deux sites pilotes du Saloum, Foundiougne et Bétenty, ont proposé chacun une nouvelle initiative de cogestion devant compléter la gestion de la crevette côtière entamée avec l'initiative en cours, confirmant ainsi leur ferme volonté d'avancer vers une gestion durable de l'ensemble de leurs pêcheries. La mise en œuvre de ces deux nouvelles initiatives pourrait être prise en considération lors de l'établissement des plans de gestion des pêcheries prévus dans le PRAO-SN.

Les huit nouveaux sites de cogestion ont été confirmés dans un rapport technique. Il s'agit de Soumbédioune, Bargny et Yenne pour la région de Dakar, Mballing, Nianing, Pointe Sarène et Mbodiène pour la région de Thiès et Fimela-Ndangane pour la région de Fatick.

Huit animateurs communautaires ont été recrutés pour ces sites selon un processus participatif, et leur capacité théorique renforcée dans les thématiques de la cogestion des pêcheries et de la participation communautaire. Ils ont été ensuite officiellement installés dans leurs sites d'affectation par les autorités.

Les communautés des huit nouveaux sites de cogestion ont été organisées en CLP administrativement reconnus. Des rencontres techniques successives ont permis aux acteurs de chaque site d'identifier une initiative de cogestion d'une pêcherie d'importance économique et représentative du site. Les initiatives de cogestion des sites localisés dans la région de Dakar ciblent le mérrou blanc (*Epinephelus aenus*) et ses

espèces associées. Celles retenues par les sites situés sur la Petite-Côte s'orientent vers la restauration des ressources en langouste verte côtière (*Panilurus regius*) et le renforcement de la cogestion du poulpe (*Octopus vulgaris*) et du cymbium (*Cymbium spp.*) conduite par des projets antérieurs (JICA). L'initiative du nouveau site du Saloum cible principalement la crevette blanche côtière (*Penaeus notialis*) mais s'intéresse aussi à la protection des juvéniles et jeunes du mérrou blanc (thiof) et des tilapies (cyclidae). Lesdites initiatives ont été complétées par leurs mesures d'accompagnement (surveillance participative, sensibilisation, recherche participative, suivi-évaluation). Les huit documents de sous projets, en attente de validation par la DPM, les CLP élargis, les CLPA et le CNCPM, seront mis en œuvre dans le cadre du PRAO-SN.

Pour la **composante 2** : A la clôture du projet GDRH, la firme WWF WAMER, chargée des activités de réhabilitation des écosystèmes, n'aura réalisé que 10 mois de travail effectif dans les sites d'intervention (de septembre 2010 à juin 2011). Les activités conduites avec les communautés, y compris la mise en œuvre d'un plan de communication, ont permis de renforcer la prise de conscience des communautés des 8 nouveaux sites notamment dans les domaines relatifs à la réhabilitation des écosystèmes marins côtiers dont dépendent les communautés côtières comme moyens d'existence. Ce travail sera poursuivi dans le contexte du PRAO-SN.

Les résultats du projet et des composantes sont indiqués à l'Annexe 3 (cadre des résultats).

### **3.3. Thèmes généraux, Autres résultats et Impacts**

#### **(a) Impacts sur la pauvreté, Aspects genre, et Développement social**

- Dans les 4 sites de la Petite Côte, un intérêt particulier est porté à la gestion du Cymbium (Yeet) par les acteurs nonobstant leur volonté de restaurer les ressources en langouste verte côtière. En effet, traditionnellement, le premier maillon du segment post-capture (la première vente et la transformation artisanale) du yeet est le fait des femmes pour la plupart. Quelques rares hommes interviennent dans le segment post-capture, notamment au niveau du mareyage, confirmant l'importance du genre dans la pêche du yeet.
- Le développement d'AGRs dans les 4 sites pilotes a impulsé une nouvelle dynamique sociale avec le développement des capacités d'autofinancement de la communauté, facilitant ainsi des actions sociales envers les familles les plus vulnérables à la pauvreté.
- Dans des sites comme Foundiougne, les ressources dégagées par la quincaillerie maritime, ont permis au CLP d'appuyer annuellement les familles des pêcheurs pendant le repos biologique, à travers la distribution de vivres, pour un montant cumulé à ce jour, de 5 050 000 F CFA. C'est également le cas à Ngaparou, où beaucoup d'actions sociales ont été conduites en faveur des membres du CLP jugés vulnérables, grâce aux ressources dégagées par la quincaillerie maritime.
- Dans les sites pilotes de pêche où elles sont mises en œuvre, les 4 sous-projets d'AGR appuyés par le projet GDRH, ont permis de créer une dizaine d'emplois directs avec des rémunérations fixes et régulières dont certaines ont atteint 80 000 F CFA par mois.
- Dans certains sites comme Ngaparou, l'appui à la commercialisation par le Fonds de Reconversion du Projet a solutionné les problèmes d'écoulement des produits.
- L'intervention du projet dans des sites comme Bétenty, a permis à d'ex-femmes transformatrices de la petite crevette, de s'organiser en groupements de quartiers pour renforcer leurs moyens d'existence, en transportant, grâce à l'appui des fonds du FRAP du GDRH, des produits transformés dans leur localité, vers des marchés plus rémunérateurs comme ceux de Dakar. Ce faisant, elles se sont senties moins vulnérables et plus à même de prendre leur destin en main.
- La forte représentation des femmes dans les instances des CLP, dont certaines occupent même des postes de responsabilités, témoigne de la prise en compte de l'approche genre dans la mise en œuvre de la cogestion locale. Il en est de même de l'approche intergénérationnelle, dans la mesure où, l'équilibre de ces organisations de base tient surtout dans leur composition, qui prend en compte, aussi bien les jeunes pêcheurs, les anciens que les notabilités locales.

- En permettant aux communautés de pêcheurs d'être sensibilisées sur leur présent et leur devenir, en leur donnant les capacités techniques et les moyens matériels et financiers de s'organiser pour prendre elles-mêmes à bras-le-corps la problématique de la gestion durable des ressources halieutiques, le GDRH, même s'il n'est récompensé par aucun résultat physique sur les sites, a le mérite d'y rompre l'attentisme pour créer une dynamique collective d'auto-prise en charge des problèmes locaux.

### **(b) Changement Institutionnel/renforcement (particulièrement avec référence aux impacts sur la capacité à long-terme et le développement institutionnel)**

Par rapport au GIRMaC, l'approche de cogestion du GDRH a bénéficié d'une avancée technique dans la conception des initiatives dans les huit sites de cogestion, notamment au plan institutionnel et financier.

- D'une manière générale, le modèle de cogestion promu par le GDRH devait être fondé sur la mise en place de Comités Locaux de Pêcheurs (CLP) au sein des communautés, reconnus sur le plan juridique comme des associations de droit privé, et les Conseils Locaux de Pêche Artisanale (CLPA) comme organes du Gouvernement opérant à l'échelle de plusieurs communautés. Plus spécifiquement, les CLP sont définis comme entités de droit privé de pêcheurs établies par les communautés. Les CLPA sont définis comme des conseils locaux, composés de représentants locaux de l'administration, des élus, des notables, des pêcheurs artisans, des associations de pêcheurs artisans (CLP), des transformateurs, des mareyeurs et des aquaculteurs. Les CLPA sont susceptibles de réunir les représentants de plusieurs CLP, et chargés de fournir des avis au Ministre en charge des pêches sur des mesures de gestion et de conservation des ressources halieutiques.
- Dans le cas du GDRH, les CLP ont assumé de nouvelles fonctions d'appui aux initiatives de cogestion, particulièrement sous-tendant la recherche de sources alternatives de revenus et la réduction de la pauvreté appuyées par la composante 3 du projet. Ainsi les CLP joueront un rôle central en travaillant avec leurs communautés pour identifier les participants et bénéficiaires des microcrédits et activités alternatives génératrices de revenus (AGR). Les CLP aideront également au suivi des progrès de ces initiatives et joueront un rôle important par s'assurer que les bénéficiaires de ces programmes sont respectueux des termes de leurs accords et aussi des accords de cogestion des communautés. Cela est une garantie supplémentaire d'impacts à plus long terme pour la lutte contre la pauvreté et donc pour le maintien des stocks renouvelés.
- Le GDRH promeut ainsi une approche plus intégrative des activités clés et parties prenantes du processus d'identification des initiatives locale de cogestion. Le processus d'identification des acteurs négativement impactés par les initiatives (les bénéficiaires des mesures sociales de la composante 3) interviendra concomitamment à l'identification des initiatives de cogestion et en présence de toutes les parties prenantes concernées. Il en est de même des besoins en recherches participatives.
- Le seuil financier initial par sous-projet est fixé à 100 000 000 F CFA (équivalant à 4 initiatives de cogestion du GIRMaC, à raison de 27 500 000 F CFA par initiative), et celui-ci pourra augmenter de 50 000 000 F CFA si la mise en œuvre du précédent sous-projet du CLP s'est avérée satisfaisante.

Ces changements institutionnels et financiers ont eu comme objectif de mettre en place un modèle de cogestion locale plus robuste et plus participatif que dans le cas du projet GIRMaC.

### **(c) Autres résultats et Impacts inattendus (positifs ou négatifs)**

L'un des principaux impacts inattendus du GDRH est l'exacerbation des conflits entre autochtones et allochtones dans les sites où la cogestion locale a contribué à l'accroissement de l'abondance des ressources halieutiques de la zone côtière.

Dans un site comme Ngaparou, où l'abondance de la langouste et d'espèces pélagiques d'intérêt commercial a été notée, les membres du CLP sont quotidiennement confrontés à des incursions de

pirogues venant d'autres sites pour exploiter l'aire de cogestion. Cette situation démontre toute l'urgence et la pertinence de mettre en place un système de régulation de l'accès à la ressource dans le dispositif de gestion de la pêche artisanale maritime sénégalaise.

#### **4. Evaluation de Risques aux Résultats de Développement et Résultats Globaux environnementaux**

L'évaluation des risques est indiquée à l'**Annexe 1.1.**

#### **5. Evaluation de la Performance de la Banque et de l'Emprunteur**

##### **5.1. Performance de la Banque**

La Performance globale de la Banque Mondiale a été jugée **satisfaisante (Annexe1.2.)**.

##### **5.2. Performance de l'Emprunteur**

La Performance globale de l'Emprunteur a été jugée **modérément satisfaisante (Annexe 1.3.)**.

#### **6. Leçons tirées**

Les leçons tirées du projet GDRH (composantes 1, 2 et 3) et sur les performances de la Banque et de l'Emprunteur sont indiquées à l'**Annexe 1.4. /-**

## Annexe 1.1. - Evaluation de Risques majeurs et aspects pouvant donner lieu à controverse

Risques	Notation du risque à la fin du Projet	Mesures d'atténuation du risque et commentaires à la fin du Projet
<b>Risques concernant l'objectif de développement</b>		
<b>Capacité de mise en œuvre :</b> La structure institutionnelle de gestion recommandée lors de la revue à mi-parcours du projet GIRMaC n'a pas été retenue pour le GDRH, et les pouvoirs d'administration des initiatives locales de cogestion ne sont pas confiés au Ministère de l'Economie Maritime.	<b>Satisfaisant</b>	La COMO-pêche a été maintenue pour la gestion du GDRH, ses capacités techniques renforcées (affectation de 2 experts par arrêtés ministériels). Les responsabilités techniques et fiduciaires du projet GDRH ont été entièrement transférées à la Direction des Pêches Maritimes (qui assure la tutelle de la COMO-Pêche).
<b>Social :</b> Le projet n'a pu mettre en place un mécanisme ayant spécifiquement pour objet d'atténuer le risque social (i) en indemnisant les pêcheurs et leurs familles en raison de leurs pertes de revenus ou de l'érosion de leurs moyens de subsistance et (ii) en les encourageant à se reconvertir vers de nouveaux métiers.	<b>Satisfaisant</b>	Le projet a mis en place à travers le FRAP, plusieurs instruments de mitigation des impacts sociaux négatifs des mesures de gestion des ressources halieutiques : AGR, microcrédit d'entrepreneuriat féminin, microcrédit de reconversion, divers appuis destinés à mieux commercialiser les produits halieutiques cogérés, financement de groupements de femmes.
<b>Risques concernant les résultats par composante</b>		
<b>Composante 1 :</b>  Les pouvoirs publics ne mettent pas en place les Conseils Locaux de Pêche Artisanale (CLPA) dans les zones d'intervention du projet et n'assurent pas le bon fonctionnement de ceux existants, exacerbant ainsi les conflits et autres difficultés entre communautés et sites de pêche voisins.	<b>Insatisfaisant</b>	CLPA en place avec des arrêtés ministériels de création signés, appui au fonctionnement inexistant (sauf autres bailleurs) d'où des CLPA non fonctionnels, c'est à dire des instances ne pouvant pas remplir correctement leurs missions statutaires.
<b>Composante 2 :</b> Absence de reconnaissance par le MEM des activités de gestion conduites dans les sites pilotes pour reconstituer les pêcheries		Ce risque n'a pu être totalement atténué dans certains sites comme le site pilote de Ngaparou où le projet a enregistré des résultats positifs du projet GIRMaC sur l'abondance des

côtières et manque de moyens nécessaires aux communautés concernées pour faire respecter les mesures de gestion locale par les pêcheurs extérieurs.	<b>Modérément satisfaisant</b>	ressources démersales (langouste).. De nombreuses incursions de pêche illégale sont de plus en plus notées dans l'aire de cogestion occasionnant des conflits entre le CLP du site et les pêcheurs migrants fautifs. Le manque de coordination dans le suivi des infractions risque d'impacter négativement sur les performances de la cogestion.
<b>Composante 3 :</b> Pour réduire les risques de défaillance, le projet ne dispose pas d'une institution de microfinance bien implantée, réputée et jouissant d'une solide expérience et pratiquant un taux d'intérêt moins élevé pour permettre aux pêcheurs concernés d'avoir accès au micro-crédit.	<b>Très satisfaisant</b>	Le projet a sélectionné une IMF (CMS), avec qui il a négocié un taux d'intérêt préférentiel pour les bénéficiaires. Des Comités locaux de microcrédit (CLM) ont été installés sur les sites pour sélectionner les bénéficiaires éligibles et le CMS s'est engagé dans l'accord de partenariat à déployer ses équipes sur le terrain pour recouvrer les crédits.
<b>Composante 4 :</b> Manque de capacité de suivi des résultats du projet en l'absence de données pour renseigner les indicateurs du cadre des résultats et indisponibilité d'un spécialiste en suivi-évaluation à temps plein pour le projet.	<b>Insatisfaisant</b>	Un spécialiste en S&E a été recruté dès le démarrage du projet (janvier 2010). En l'absence d'un système de S&E assorti de protocoles, les données collectées n'ont pas permis de suivre de manière fiable les résultats du projet.
Notation globale du risque		Mesures d'atténuation jugées moyennement satisfaisantes

Niveaux de risque - **H** (Haut Risque), **S** (Risque Important), **M** (Risque Modéré), **N** (Risque Négligeable ou Faible)

## Annexe 1.2. Evaluation de la Performance de la Banque

Classement de l'action	Notation de l'action	Commentaires à la fin du projet.
Qualité de la phase de préparation	TS	A l'initiative de la Banque Mondiale, deux équipes de préparation ont été mises en place et, malgré la complexité du montage du projet, la préparation a été faite dans des délais très satisfaisants (préparation et soumission d'une Note conceptuelle du projet, requête et mise en œuvre d'un projet de PDF Bloc B pour la réalisation d'une dizaine d'études (annexe 1.5.), etc)
Diligence des avis de non objection (ANO)	S	Les délais des avis de non objection ont été significativement réduits, notamment depuis la présence d'un expert « pêche » (Co-TTL) à la Mission Résidente de la Banque au Sénégal .
Mission de supervision technique	MS	Le caractère conjoint des missions de supervision /d'appui s'est davantage confirmé.
Mission de supervision de la gestion financière	TS	La mission d'appui de juin 2011 et surtout la revue fiduciaire de décembre 2011 ont permis de relever sans complaisance des dépenses inéligibles d'une grande ampleur, témoignant du non respect des directives et procédures applicables.
Politiques de sauvegarde environnementale et sociale	MS	Elles sont de moins en moins prises en considération lors des missions de supervision/d'appui. L'absence systématique d'un spécialiste en évaluation environnementale et sociale dans l'équipe de la Banque, lors des missions de supervision, en témoigne.
Politiques fiduciaires	IS	Les blocages de l'avancement des activités du fait de la passation de marchés sont faiblement pris en charge lors des audits et revues fiduciaires ; il en est de même des lourdeurs des procédures dans ce domaine. L'option de la Banque de recruter pour la COMO-Pêche un SPM à mi-temps durant les 8 premiers mois de démarrage du projet ont également causé des retards importants dans l'exécution à temps de certaines activités clés du GDRH. L'absence systématique d'un spécialiste en passation de marchés dans l'équipe de la Banque, lors des missions de supervision, en témoigne.
Performances globales de la Banque Mondiale	S	Les Performances globales de la Banque Mondiale ont été satisfaisantes.

**Insatisfaisant (IS), Modérément Satisfaisant (MS), Satisfaisant (S), Très Satisfaisant (TS)**



### Annexe 1.3. Evaluation de la Performance de l'Emprunteur

Classement de l'action	Notation de l'action	Commentaires à la fin du projet.
Qualité de la phase de préparation	TS	A l'initiative de la Banque Mondiale, deux équipes de préparation ont été mises en place qui, malgré la complexité du montage du projet, la préparation a été faite dans des délais très satisfaisants (préparation et soumission d'une Note conceptuelle du projet, requête et mise en œuvre d'un projet de PDF Bloc B pour la réalisation d'une dizaine d'études ( <b>Annexe 1.5.</b> ), etc) De même, la Gestion des fonds du PPG ont été gérés de manière très satisfaisante avec un taux de décaissement de près de 98%).
Mise à disposition des fonds de contrepartie nationale	IS	Les fonds de contrepartie du projet ont été inscrits dans les BCI annuels mis en place par l'Etat mais leur mobilisation a été irrégulière notamment pour ce qui concerne le paiement des indemnités dues aux fonctionnaires impliqués dans la mise en œuvre du projet. Les niveaux atteints sont toujours non motivants par les bénéficiaires. Le décret 90-600, devenu obsolète, devait être modifié depuis plusieurs années.
Gestion de la tutelle administrative	IS	La mise en œuvre du GDRH a été jalonnée de nombreux changements institutionnels intervenus au niveau de la Direction des Pêches Maritimes, de la DPSP et de la COMO-Pêche, ce qui a eu un impact sur la rapidité d'exécution de certaines activités.
Gestion de la tutelle technique des composantes	IS	La coordination technique des composantes a connu des défaillances liées au management de la COMO-Pêche.
Performances globales de l'Emprunteur	MS	Les Performances globales de l'Emprunteur ont été modérément satisfaisantes.

**Insatisfaisant (IS), Modérément Satisfaisant (MS) Satisfaisant (S), Très Satisfaisant (TS)**

## **SUR LA PERFORMANCE DE LA BANQUE**

- Les avantages comparatifs de la Banque mondiale en matière d'appui à la pêche et aux communautés de pêcheurs des zones côtières du Sénégal ont facilité le montage de ce projet dans des délais satisfaisants. Ces avantages tiennent à plusieurs facteurs :
  - i) le travail économique et sectoriel de qualité (*Senegal Fisheries ESW, 2004*) ;
  - ii) le dialogue de politique générale engagée avec les partenaires financiers pour faciliter la mise en œuvre des réformes nécessaires dans la gestion des pêches côtières ;
  - iii) la coprésidence du groupe des bailleurs de fonds intervenant dans le secteur sénégalais de la pêche ;
  - iv) le poids nécessaire pour réunir les parties concernées à l'échelon local et national, et pour rechercher des consensus; et,
  - v) l'expérience des investissements et des leçons apprises dans le cadre du projet GIRMaC qui, en dépit de ses imperfections, a permis d'acquérir une base solide à partir de laquelle elle peut continuer d'appuyer la mise en œuvre des réformes.
- La Banque Mondiale a ainsi joué un rôle important dans la préparation du u Projet, notamment lors de la préparation de la Note Conceptuelle du projet, la préparation du projet de PDF Bloc B, la coordination, le suivi et la validation des études de base conduites ainsi que la gestion des fonds de préparation (GEF PPG DON n° TF 090576 de **256 740 US\$**)
- Le sentiment globalement partagé est que le retard dans la mise en œuvre effective des activités est dû en grande partie à des lenteurs observées dans les procédures de passation de marchés de la Banque (situation d'avant restructuration) mais également, et en plus, dans celles à dérouler au niveau national (situation d'après restructuration).
- Le financement par le Crédit IDA de la Revue des Dépenses Publiques, initialement prévu sur les fonds PHRD, a été de nature à réduire substantiellement les fonds du Projet.
- Il en est de même du Fonds Social qui n'a pu être pris en charge par un organisme approprié de même nature que l'AFDS. Les procédures internes de la Banque n'ont pas permis le financement par le Fonds Japonais de Développement Social (JSDF)./

## **SUR LA PERFORMANCE DE L'EMPRUNTEUR**

- Le gouvernement du Sénégal a également joué un rôle important dans le montage du Projet, notamment lors de la préparation de la Note Conceptuelle du projet, la préparation du projet de PDF Bloc B, la coordination, le suivi et la validation des études de base conduites ainsi que la gestion des fonds de préparation (GEF PPG don n° TF 090576 de 256 740 US\$)
- Le faible taux de décaissement des crédits alloués à la composante 2 (8% environ) est dû au retard enregistré dans la contractualisation définitive avec la firme WWF WAMER (mai-juin 2011 au lieu de mai-juin 2010). La main levée sur les conditions préalables de décaissement des fonds de la composante 2 n'a pu ainsi être notifiée à la DPM/COMO-Pêche que le 7 juin 2011. Le lancement officiel des interventions de la firme dans les sites du projet a ensuite enregistré trois (3) mois de retard en raison des dysfonctionnements du management de la COMO-Pêche.
- Le volume des dépenses inéligibles effectuées sur le projet GDRH, relevées lors de la revue fiduciaire de la Banque Mondiale de décembre 2011, n'a pas permis au Gouvernement de bénéficier d'une prolongation du projet supérieure à trois (3) mois alors que les possibilités d'une prolongation d'une quatrième année ont été acceptées par les deux parties pendant les négociations finales du projet (22-29 octobre 2008). Le GDRH a été ainsi clôturé à la date du 30 juin 2012, après une prorogation de trois (3) mois demandée par le Gouvernement.
- La mise en œuvre du GDRH a été jalonnée de nombreux changements institutionnels intervenus au niveau de la Direction des Pêches Maritimes, de la DPSP et de la COMO-Pêche.

- L'insuffisance des effectifs et la faible motivation financière des agents de l'administration déconcentrée pour accompagner, d'une manière générale, les processus de cogestion des pêcheries côtières et de réhabilitation des écosystèmes. /-

## **Annexe 1.4. Leçons tirées**

- A la lumière de la mise en œuvre du GDRH, tout comme du GIRMaC, la motivation des fonctionnaires de l'Administration locale impliqués, dans la cogestion locale, est une nécessité. Les fonds de contrepartie doivent prendre en charge cette question en priorité.
- Le résultat obtenu dans la reconstitution des ressources démersales cogérées, les difficultés de surveillance des aires de cogestion et les nombreuses infractions de pêche artisanale INN dans les sites pilotes initiaux démontrent l'urgence de mettre en place un mécanisme de contrôle et de limitation de l'accès aux ressources cogérées dans tout site de cogestion des pêcheries.
- L'introduction des recherches participatives dans le système de cogestion locale n'a pas connu l'appropriation souhaitée par la DPM, le CRODT et les acteurs locaux. Un renforcement des capacités des parties prenantes est indispensable pour la maîtrise du concept, notamment au plan méthodologique.
- Les mesures sociales de lutte contre la pauvreté (AGR, activités d'appui à la commercialisation) initiées suite à la mobilisation du FRAP dans le cadre du projet complémentaire (GDRH) ont encouragé les communautés et renforcé leur participation à l'effort de gestion durable des ressources halieutiques.
- Les nombreuses demandes enregistrées par les Comités locaux de microcrédits (CLM) installés sur les sites de cogestion locale, traduisent une forte appropriation par les communautés de pêcheurs du programme de reconversion et d'entrepreneuriat féminin proposé par le projet GDRH à travers le FRAP. C'est aussi la preuve que les acteurs de la pêche (pêcheurs, femmes transformatrices, mareyeurs) sont prêts à se redéployer vers d'autres secteurs économiques et participer ainsi à la réduction de la surcapacité, si les opportunités et les moyens adéquats leur sont donnés.
- L'enquête sur les créneaux porteurs réalisée par l'IAT dans les sites de cogestion locale et leur environnement immédiat, a montré que la pêche n'est pas le seul moyen d'existence des communautés de pêcheurs, et qu'elles regorgent beaucoup d'autres potentialités, sur lesquelles elles peuvent s'appuyer pour diversifier et élargir leurs bases économiques.
- L'absence de mesures concrètes sur les sites n'est pas un échec pour un projet de cogestion locale comme le GDRH, s'il a permis aux communautés de pêcheurs ciblées de s'organiser pour identifier et mettre en œuvre des initiatives locales gestion durable des pêcheries, en s'appuyant sur des moyens et matériels locaux, ou sur d'autres partenaires.
- L'approche de « participation communautaire » expérimentée dans le GDRH et s'appuyant sur des acteurs issus des communautés de pêcheurs ciblées, en l'occurrence les animateurs communautaires, a facilité l'appropriation de la cogestion locale et l'ancrage local du projet.
- Les communautés, organisées en Comités Locaux de Pêcheurs (CLP), sont capables de s'investir pleinement dans la gestion responsable des ressources halieutiques si l'Etat leur fait confiance et met à disposition l'appui technique et financier nécessaire.

- L'impact des initiatives de cogestion est optimal dans le cas d'application d'amende communautaire dissuasive, nonobstant leur non-conformité avec les dispositions des textes réglementaires.
- La cogestion des pêcheries par concession de droits d'accès, inscrite dans la Lettre de Politique Sectorielle (LPS), est souhaitée par certaines communautés mais non encore prise en compte par les textes légaux en vigueur.
- Les surveillants-pêcheurs issus du CLP (commission surveillance) semblent plus engagés et plus efficaces que les agents de l'administration dans la recherche de renseignements sur les infractions et dans la surveillance des aires de mise en œuvre de la cogestion.
- L'identification des initiatives locales de cogestion met en évidence la très bonne connaissance que les communautés ont des pêcheries adjacentes à leurs terroirs tant du point de vue bioécologique que socioéconomique.
- Dans un contexte de cogestion, l'organisation des communautés en CLP apparaît comme un facteur important de cohésion sociale.

## **Annexe 1.5. :**

### **LISTE DES ETUDES REALISEES DANS LE CADRE DU PROJET DE PDF BLOC B POUR LA PREPARATION DU PROJET GDRH**

1. Etude de faisabilité de la mise en place au sein de Direction des Pêches Maritimes d'une Unité de coordination des activités des donateurs dans le domaine de l'aménagement et de la gestion durable des pêcheries maritimes.
2. Etude de Faisabilité d'un Fonds de Soutien à la Gestion des Pêcheries fondées sur les critères du développement durable
3. Analyse des Coûts- Bénéfices et des impacts d'une réduction des subventions dans les pêcheries artisanales au Sénégal.
4. Etude de base sur les méthodes, les technologies de capture et les pratiques en usage dans les pêcheries industrielles crevettières côtières et sur leurs problématiques d'exploitation, d'aménagement et de contrôle.
5. Evaluation environnementale et sociale (EES) du projet complémentaire GIRMaC+
6. Cadre de Processus du projet complémentaire GIRMaC+
7. Etude de la faisabilité de l'éco-labellisation dans les sites pilotes du GIRMaC Proposition d'un programme pilote pour les produits de la pêche artisanale au Sénégal.
8. Faisabilité de la création d'un réseau national d'Aires Marines Protégées pour une gestion durable de la pêche. Proposition d'un programme de mise en place.
9. Faisabilité de mise en place d'un Programme d'immersion de récifs artificiels pour une gestion durable de la pêche au Sénégal./-

## Annexe 2. - Coûts et Financement du Programme (30 septembre 2012)

### (a) Composante par Bailleur de Fonds (en Millions Francs CFA)

<b>Gestion Durable des Ressources Halieutiques (GDRH)</b>			
<b>Composantes</b>	<b>Document d'évaluation Coût du projet (CFA millions)</b>	<b>Cumul Décaissements à la clôture du Projet (CFA millions)</b>	<b>Pourcentage de décaissement (%)</b>
1. Cogestion des Pêcheries Côtières	1.266,79	321,39	7
2. Réhabilitation des Ecosystèmes Essentiels pour les Pêcheries Côtières	1.262,16	214,62	4
3. Reconversion et Mesures d'Accompagnement	1.812,30	380,82	8
4. Appui Institutionnel, Gestion & Suivi Evaluation	461,87	360,65	7
<b>Total Coût Composantes</b>	<b>4.803,12</b>	<b>1.277,50</b>	<b>26</b>
Divers et imprévus physiques	0.00		
Divers et imprévus en monnaie	0.00		
<b>Total Coût du Projet</b>	<b>4.803,12</b>	<b>1.277,50</b>	<b>26</b>
Non Alloué FEM	108,00		
<b>Total Financement demandé</b>	<b>4.911,12</b>	<b>1.277,50</b>	<b>26</b>

<b>Gestion Durable des Ressources Halieutiques (GDRH) Projet – P105881 CREDIT IDA 45450-SE</b>			
<b>Composantes</b>	<b>Document d'évaluation Coût du projet (CFA millions)</b>	<b>Cumul Décaissements à la clôture du Projet (CFA millions)</b>	<b>Pourcentage de décaissement (%)</b>
3. Reconversion et Mesures d'Accompagnement	1.575.00	380,82	24
<b>Total Coût Composantes</b>	<b>1.575.00</b>	<b>380,82</b>	<b>24</b>
Divers et imprévus physiques	0.00		
Divers et imprévus en monnaie	0.00		
<b>Total Coût du Projet</b>	<b>1.575.00</b>	<b>380,82</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Total Financement demandé</b>	<b>1.575.00</b>	<b>380,82</b>	<b>24</b>

<b>Gestion Durable des Ressources Halieutiques (GDRH) Projet – P092062 DON FEM 93654-SE</b>			
<b>Components</b>	<b>Document d'évaluation Coût du projet (CFA millions)</b>	<b>Cumul Décaissements à la clôture du Projet (CFA millions)</b>	<b>Pourcentage de décaissement (%)</b>
1. Cogestion des Pêcheries Côtières	1.266,79	321,39	11.90
2. Réhabilitation des Ecosystèmes Essentiels pour les Pêcheries Côtières	1.262,16	214,62	7.95
3. Appui Institutionnel, Gestion & Suivi Evaluation	461,87	360,65	13.36
<b>Total Coût Composantes</b>	<b>2.592,00</b>	<b>896,67</b>	<b>33.21</b>
Divers et imprévus physiques	0.00		
Divers et imprévus en monnaie	0.00		
<b>Total Project Costs</b>	<b>2.592,00</b>	<b>896,67</b>	<b>33.21</b>
PPF	0.00	0.00	0
Non Alloué	108,00		
<b>Total Financement demandé</b>	<b>2700.00</b>	<b>896,67</b>	<b>33,21</b>

(b) Financement

<b>P105881 Gestion Durable des Ressources Halieutiques (GDRH) CREDIT IDA 45450-SE</b>				
<b>Source des fonds</b>	<b>Type de financement</b>	<b>Document d'évaluation Coût du projet (CFA millions)</b>	<b>Cumul Décaissement à la clôture du Projet (CFA millions)</b>	<b>Pourcentage de décaissement (%)</b>
Bailleur				
International Development Association (IDA)		<b>1.575,00</b>	<b>380,82</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>P092062 Gestion Durable des Ressources Halieutiques (GDRH) DON FEM 93654-SE P058367 - Programme de Gestion Intégrée des Ressources Marines et Côtières</b>				
<b>Source des fonds</b>	<b>Type of Financing</b>	<b>Document d'évaluation Coût du projet (CFA millions)</b>	<b>A Cumul Décaissement à la clôture du Projet (CFA millions)</b>	<b>Pourcentage de décaissement (%)</b>
Bailleur				
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT - Associated IDA Fund		<b>2700.00</b>	<b>896,67</b>	<b>33,21</b>
Global Environment Facility (GEF)		<b>2700.00</b>	<b>896,67</b>	<b>33,21</b>



**Annexe 3. Résultats du projet ( KPIs)**  
**Cadre des résultats (Projet et Composantes)**

Objectif de développement / Objectif global du projet	Indicateurs de Performance	Commentaires à la fin du Projet
L'objectif double environnemental et de développement du Projet est d'habiliter les communautés de pêcheurs dans la réduction de la pression de pêche sur les ressources halieutiques qui supportent les pêcheries de la zone côtière centrale du Sénégal (de la presqu'île du Cap vert au delta du Saloum).	<b>Indicateur de l'Objectif de développement :</b> La taille moyenne de capture des espèces ciblées dans les sites mettant en œuvre des initiatives de cogestion a augmenté.	Indicateur non réalisé étant donné que les sous projets de cogestion ne sont pas encore validés par les acteurs centraux et locaux. Ils n'ont donc pu être mis en œuvre par les communautés.
	<b>Indicateur de l'Objectif de développement :</b> Le niveau de l'effort de pêche pour les espèces ciblées dans les sites mettant en œuvre des initiatives de cogestion a baissé.	Indicateur non réalisé à la fin du projet étant donné que les sous projets de cogestion ne sont pas encore validés par les acteurs centraux et locaux. Ils n'ont donc pu être mis en œuvre par les communautés.
	<b>Indicateur de la cogestion des pêcheries côtières:</b> Huit (8) nouvelles propositions de sous-projets de cogestion sont approuvées sous forme d'accords légaux avec le Gouvernement et sont mises en œuvre avec succès avant la fin du projet.	Indicateur non réalisé que très partiellement étant donné que les sous projets de cogestion en sont au stade de la validation par les acteurs centraux et locaux. Ils n'ont donc pu être mis en œuvre par les communautés jusqu'à la clôture du projet.
	<b>Indicateur de la réhabilitation des écosystèmes :</b> 70% des villages interrogés dans les communautés associées se disent satisfaits des activités mises en œuvre par le projet pour reconstituer les stocks halieutiques côtiers (via les ZPPs, les récifs artificiels et l'éco-certification).	Indicateur non réalisé à la fin du Projet. En raison de lourdes procédures de passation des marchés, la firme ayant en charge les activités de réhabilitation des écosystèmes côtiers a été recrutée en mai 2011 (signature et enregistrement du contrat) pour 30 mois environ, au lieu de mai 2010 comme initialement prévu. En fait, à la clôture du projet au 30 juin 2012, la firme n'a eu que 12 mois d'activité. Une prolongation de 18 mois du projet GDRH aurait permis à la firme de réaliser son contrat jusqu'à terme, réalisant ainsi les indicateurs fixés. Une prolongation du Projet de 3

		<p>mois seulement a été obtenue par le Gouvernement, en raison de la notation insatisfaisante du Projet à la suite de la revue fiduciaire réalisée en décembre 2011. Les activités de réhabilitation des écosystèmes côtiers seront ainsi poursuivies dans le cadre du PRAO-SN restructure.</p>
	<p><b>Indicateur des moyens de subsistance alternative à la pêche:</b> Chaque communauté cible a accès à un système de microcrédit et des mesures d'appui à la réduction de la pauvreté sont mises en œuvre au moins dans les 4 sites pilotes initiaux.</p>	<p>Indicateur non réalisé que partiellement avec la signature d'un Accord entre la Direction des Pêches maritimes (DPM) et une agence nationale de microfinance, le « Crédit Mutuel du Sénégal » (CMS). L'objectif visé est de permettre à chacune des communautés ciblées, y compris celles des 4 sites pilotes initiaux, d'avoir accès au microcrédit avec l'assistance technique d'une institution d'appui technique qualifiée. Le recrutement de cette firme, intervenue en mai 2011, a enregistré un long retard. Des candidats à la reconversion vers d'autres activités alternatives ont été identifiés dans les 4 sites pilotes et les études de faisabilité de sous projets d'Activités Génératrices de Revenus (AGRs) sont en cours à la clôture. Toutefois, des mesures de réduction de la pauvreté, appuyées par le projet, sont mises en œuvre dans les 4 sites pilotes initiaux du GIRMaC à la clôture du projet. Pour les 8 nouveaux sous projets de cogestion 7 des 8 sous projets d'AGRs des communautés ont été approuvés par la Banque en août 2011 mais n'ont pu être mis en œuvre en raison des retards et des dysfonctionnements relevés dans la gestion des fonds du</p>

		projet.
<b>Résultats intermédiaires</b>	<b>Indicateurs de résultats intermédiaires</b>	<b>Commentaires</b>
<p><b>Composante 1:</b> Cogestion des pêcheries côtières</p> <p>Un système de gouvernance locale des pêcheries côtières, basé sur la cogestion, cohérent, bien compris et renforcé au plan institutionnel, est mis en place. Un système de gouvernance des pêcheries locales basé sur la cogestion qui est cohérent, bien assimilé, et renforcé institutionnellement est établi.</p>	8 nouveaux CLP légalement établis dans la zone côtière centrale, durant les 18 premiers mois de mise en œuvre du projet.	Indicateur réalisé de manière satisfaisante.
	4 plans consolidés de gestion des pêcheries locales sont approuvés par les CLPAs concernés au cours des 24 mois de mise en œuvre et mis en œuvre avant la fin du Projet.	Indicateur non réalisé à la fin du Projet. Trois (3) plans de gestion consolidés seront approuvés et mis en œuvre autour des sites pilotes initiaux dans le cadre du PRAO-SN.
<p><b>Composante 2:</b> <b>Réhabilitation des écosystèmes côtiers</b></p> <p>Les habitats critiques des espèces côtières clé sont protégés de manière participative, à travers l'établissement de ZPPs, l'immersion de récifs artificiels, l'introduction de droits d'accès aux pêcheries cibles, et les efforts vers l'éco-certification des produits halieutiques.</p>	2 zones de pêche protégée (ZPPs) sont créées et légalement établies.	Indicateur non réalisé en raison des 12 mois de retard enregistrés dans le recrutement de la firme qui ont induit un retard dans la mise en œuvre des activités jusqu'à la fin du Projet. Ces activités ont été transférées dans le PRAO-SN restructuré et seront prises en charge par la firme.
	Au moins 2 récifs artificiels sont agrandis, immergés et cogérés avec les communautés locales avant la fin du Projet.	Indicateur non réalisé en raison des 12 mois de retard enregistrés dans le recrutement de la firme qui ont induit un retard dans la mise en œuvre des activités jusqu'à la fin du Projet. Ces activités ont été transférées dans le PRAO-SN restructuré et seront prises en charge par la firme.
	Les droits d'accès sont définis, reconnus légalement et introduits dans 2 pêcheries sous régime de cogestion.	Indicateur non réalisé en raison du retard dans la mise en œuvre des activités liées à la cogestion des pêcheries, aux ZPPs et aux récifs artificiels jusqu'à la fin du Projet. Ces activités relatives aux droits d'accès ont été transférées dans le PRAO-SN restructuré et seront prises en charge par la firme.

	<p>Toutes les pirogues de pêche et de transport provenant de la région centrale sont immatriculées par le PNI durant les 6 premiers mois de mise en œuvre du Projet.</p>	<p>Indicateur réalisé avec satisfaction à la fin du Projet (même si des retards ont été observés) et avec des financements complémentaires du PRAO-SN. A la fin du projet, plus de <b>17 500 pirogues</b> ont été immatriculées, soit plus de 85% de taux d'immatriculation. Les <b>15%</b> restant du parc piroguier sont constitués de pirogues basées pour l'essentiel dans les pays voisins ou y pêchant une bonne partie de l'année.</p>
	<p>Au moins une (1) pêcherie est éligible à l'éco-certification selon les critères du Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) avant la fin du Projet</p>	<p>Indicateur non réalisé à la fin du Projet. Cette activité a été transférée dans le PRAO-SN restructuré et sera prise en charge par la firme.</p>
	<p>Etude de faisabilité et consensus sur un mécanisme de financement durable pour les coûts récurrents des ZPPs et des récifs artificiels.</p>	<p>Indicateur non réalisé à la fin du Projet. Cette activité a été transférée dans le PRAO-SN restructuré et sera prise en charge par la firme.</p>
<p><b>Composante 3: Mesures d'atténuation de la pauvreté en faveur des communautés de pêcheurs et moyens alternatifs de subsistance pour les pêcheurs et transformateurs des produits de la pêche.</b></p> <p>Des activités alternatives à la pêche et génératrices de revenus sont développées par les pêcheurs et leurs familles dans les zones ciblées par le projet. Certaines sont toujours dans le secteur de la pêche, à travers un meilleur accès aux marchés des produits à plus haute valeur, ou bien en dehors du secteur avec formation et appui financier (micro-finance) du projet, pour compenser la réduction de l'effort de pêche et les</p>	<p>Pourcentage de femmes dans les communautés cibles bénéficiant d'un microcrédit pour développer des activités en dehors du secteur de la pêche.</p>	<p>Cet indicateur n'a pas été satisfait. Selon le dernier rapport trimestriel de l'IAT (février à avril 2012), <b>1703</b> bénéficiaires éligibles ont été sélectionnés dont <b>1430</b> demandes de microcrédit d'entrepreneuriat féminin. <b>20</b> femmes seulement disposaient de microprojets élaborés et prêts à être financés par le CMS. Aucune femme n'a bénéficié de financement à la fin du Projet.</p>
	<p>Pourcentage des communautés cibles qui reçoivent le soutien en micro-finance, et nombre de familles dans les communautés cibles qui ont accès à de nouveaux marchés commerciaux.</p>	<p>Des AGR (ferme avicole, quincailleries maritimes, campement touristique, financements pour des groupements de femmes transformatrices) et des mesures d'appui à la commercialisation (fonds d'appui à la commercialisation, camion frigorifique, points de collecte de la crevette) ont été</p>

<p>pertes de revenus, et pour promouvoir les investissements dans des moyens d'existence alternatifs.</p>		<p>prises en oeuvre dans les 4 sites pilotes initiaux du GIRMaC.</p> <p>Des sous-projets d'AGR identifiés et élaborés en faveur des 8 sites du GDRH ont obtenu l'avis de non objection de la Banque Mondiale (Biomarine 379) depuis juillet 2011, mais leur mise en oeuvre était dépendante des progrès enregistrés par le processus de cogestion locale.</p>
	<p>Pourcentage de cas de reconversion entrepris par les pêcheurs percevant un appui financier et technique, qui sont durables et rentables à la fin du Projet.</p>	<p>Cet indicateur n'a pas été satisfait. Selon le rapport trimestriel de l'IAT (février à avril 2012), 1703 bénéficiaires éligibles ont été sélectionnés dont 273 demandes de microcrédit de reconversion. 22 acteurs seulement disposaient de microprojets élaborés et prêts à être financés par le CMS. Aucun projet de reconversion n'a été financé à la fin du Projet.</p>
<p><b>Composante 4: Renforcement institutionnel pour la gestion des pêcheries, gestion du projet et suivi et évaluation</b></p> <p>Gestion et suivi et évaluation efficaces du projet, et divulgation des résultats de mise en oeuvre du projet.</p>	<p>- Rapports annuels de suivi et évaluation avec toutes les données sur les indicateurs de résultats et plan de S&amp;E complétés.</p> <p>- Les communautés participantes reçoivent les informations concernant les indicateurs clé en temps voulu.</p> <p>- Avis d'audits annuels non qualifiés.</p>	<p>Indicateurs non réalisés en l'absence d'un système de suivi-évaluation conçu, approuvé et opérationnel.</p>

#### A. Commentaires généraux du cadre des résultats

- ▶ Les activités clés devant être mesurées et appréciées n'ont pas démarrées de manière effective ;
- ▶ Les documents des sous projets sur les initiatives de cogestion sont finalisés et attendent d'être validés par les CLP et les CLPA
- ▶ Les activités d'appui à la reconversion et à l'entrepreneuriat ont démarré avec l'encadrement des promoteurs pour l'élaboration de plan d'affaires.
- ▶ Aucun financement de promoteur n'a été enregistré./-

## **Annex 7. Comments of Cofinanciers and Other Partners/Stakeholders**

## Annex 8. List of Supporting Documents

“Gestion du mérrou blanc (*epinephelus aenus*) et ses espèces associées dans l’aire de congestion de Bargny,” Comité Local des Pêcheurs de Bargny, Département de Dakar, Bargny, Mars 2012.

“Gestion du mérrou blanc (*epinephelus aenus*) et ses espèces associées dans l’aire de congestion de Soumbédioune et Carrière,” Comité Local des Pêcheurs de Soumbédioune, Département de Dakar, Soumbédioune, Mars 2012.

“Gestion du mérrou blanc (*epinephelus aenus*) et ses espèces associées dans l’aire de congestion de Yène-Dialaw,” Comité Local des Pêcheurs de Yène, Département de Rufisque, Yène, Mars 2012.

“Gestion de la langouste (*Panulirus regius*) et ses espèces associées dans l’aire de congestion de Mballing,” Comité Local des Pêcheurs de Mballing, Département de Mbour, Mballing, Mars 2012.

“Gestion de la langouste (*Panulirus regius*) et ses espèces associées dans l’aire de congestion de Mballing,” Comité Local des Pêcheurs de Mballing, Département de Mbour, Mballing, Mars 2012.

“Gestion de la langouste (*Panulirus regius*) et ses espèces associées dans l’aire de congestion de Nianing,” Comité Local des Pêcheurs de Nianing, Département de Mbour, Nianing, Mars 2012.

“Gestion de la langouste (*Panulirus regius*) et ses espèces associées dans l’aire de congestion de Pointe-Sarène,” Comité Local des Pêcheurs de Pointe-Sarène, Département de Mbour, Pointe-Sarène, Mars 2012.

“Gestion des ressources démersales maritimes et lagunaires (*Cyclidae*) dans l’aire de congestion de Mbodiène,” Comité Local des Pêcheurs de Mbodiène, Département de Mbour, Mbodiène, Mars 2012.

“Gestion de la crevette côtière (*Penaeus notialis*), du mérrou blanc (*epinephelus aenus*) et des carpes (*Cyclidae*) dans l’aire de congestion de Fimela-Ndangane,” Comité Local des Pêcheurs de Fimela-Ndangane, Département de Fatick, Fimela-Ndangane, Mars 2012.

**MAP #IBRD 3459**

**I N S E R T**

**M A P**

**H E R E**

AFTER APPROVAL BY COUNTRY DIRECTOR  
AN ORIGINAL MAP OBTAINED FROM GSD MAP DESIGN UNIT  
SHOULD BE INSERTED  
MANUALLY IN HARD COPY  
BEFORE SENDING A FINAL ICR TO THE PRINT SHOP.

NOTE: To obtain a map, please contact  
the GSD Map Design Unit (Ext. 31482)

A minimum of a one week turnaround is required