

Partnerships for Coral Reef Finance and Insurance in Asia and the Pacific

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10431

Countries

Regional (Fiji, Indonesia, Philippines, Solomon Islands)

Project Name

Partnerships for Coral Reef Finance and Insurance in Asia and the Pacific

Agencies

ADB

Date received by PM

7/14/2021

Review completed by PM

10/7/2021

Program Manager

Fareeha Iqbal

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 25July2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/5/2021:
Cleared.

9/29/2021:

Adjustment is requested.

As the GEF does not have a mandate to finance 'Loss & Damage' in the context of the UNFCCC negotiations, to avoid possible confusion, please change the wording of the title for Output 2.1.2, in Table B and the title of the sub-component in the main text describing the components.

GEFSEC 25July2021:

We note changes made to some of the Outcomes and Outputs from the PIF. Please further explain the changes from PIF to CER, why they are necessary, and any anticipated relevant to anticipated project results and impacts.

Agency Response

ADB Response 04 October 2021

Noted, Output 2.1.2 in the CER Table B, the narrative Alternative Scenario, and Annex A (results framework) has been adjusted accordingly.

ADB Response 24 September 2021

A table which outlines changes between PIF and CER has been inserted, with a column of explanations.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/22/2021:

Cleared. Agency has provided adequate explanation re comment (a). For comment (b), ADB has clarified that TA will finance the knowledge product. However, a disaggregated amount is not available.

Update, Oct. 19, '21:

Further information or adjustment needed:

(a) After reading the documents, it appears that the Co-financing provided by ABD and the TNC are in form of technical assistance (TA). As this co-financing will be used to cover the salaries of staff to provide support, analysis and additional assessment, this type of co-financing should be categorized as ?in-kind? ?recurrent expenditures?. If the

agency has a different definition of Investment Mobilized, we could review, as stipulated in table C.

(b) We were able to locate the co-financing letter, from ADB, stipulating the contribution of \$ 101,712 USD, but not the one for \$50,000. Could you please advise where we may find this or upload it to the portal documents?

9/29/2021:

Cleared.

GEFSEC 25July2021:

We note there are significant changes from the PIF and appreciate the detailed explanation on these changes in the project description section of Part II. Please also explain, preferably in the co-financing section, any impact they will have on the scope or depth of overall project implementation.

Agency Response

ADB Response 21 October 2021

(a) We are unclear on this comment. First there is no option for "Technical Assistance" in the Portal drop down boxes. Second, perhaps there is a misunderstanding - the TNC co-finance actually originates from an external grant provided another agency / organization - and the funds were used to engage external consultants, not using their own (TNC) staff resources. We have marked this TNC co-finance as "grants" and "investment mobilized" because this does not, in our view qualify as a 'recurrent expenditure'. These funds have been used already during PPG. Third, the ADB co-financing which we now have marked as "grants" (which are both TA projects). These funds are also drawn from either external donors and managed by ADB, or from within ADB own trust fund resources. They are not supporting any staff resources. We believe that this should also qualify as "Investment mobilized" as this is part of ADB's Country Operations Business Plan process. Finally, please understand that the main co-financing of \$ 5 million is an ADB loan to the Government of the Philippines. How does this qualify as 'in-kind' and 'recurrent expenditures. We believe this should be classified as "Investment Mobilized" - as we have been doing for all of our GEF projects which have been cleared and endorsed.

(b) We draw your attention to the document uploaded in Roadmap entitled "Co-financing Support VPKM Approved RETA 9518 etc". On page 4 of this document we have highlighted the dedicated section which confirms the co-financing.

ADB Response 24 September 2021

A table which outlines changes between PIF and CER has been inserted, with a column of explanations. Further discussion has been provided in the section on "co-financing".

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 25July2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/5/2021:

Cleared. Explanation has been included in the Portal entry for the reduced number of LDCF, and increased number of SCCF, beneficiaries.

9/29/2021:

Explanation is requested.

Please discuss why the number of expected beneficiaries of the LDCF funding is significantly below the PIF-stage estimate.

GEFSEC 25July2021:

For both the LDCF and SCCF CCA results frameworks, please update the "Project status at submission" to "CEO Endorsement/Approval".

Agency Response

ADB Response 04 October 2021

We are unable to provide narrative in the new meta information and LDCF/SCCF tracking section of the Portal, So an explanation has been provided in the Adaptation Benefits section of the CER narrative, as well as the Section on "Benefits".

ADB Response 24 September 2021

This has been done.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/29/2021:

Cleared.

GEFSEC 25July2021:

Please note the comment above in section 2 of part I about providing further explanation on changes made to some of the outcomes and outputs from the PIF.

Please provide further information on the impacts on current and anticipated climate hazards to coral reefs, based on an optimistic and pessimist climate scenario, preferably to 2050. This is important to be able to articulate and link the project interventions on reducing these climate impacts.

Agency Response

ADB Response 24 September 2021

A table which outlines changes between PIF and CER has been inserted, with a column of explanations. Further discussion has been provided in the section on "co-financing".

A new section "on climate projections to 2050" has been included.

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 25July2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/5/2021:

Cleared.

9/29/2021:

If possible, please include a clearer version of the ToC, as it is still somewhat blurry.

GEFSEC 25July2021:

We note the Theory of Change diagram included in this section. However, it is quite blurry and hard to read. Please attach a clearer version. Also, please include a short text explanation of the ToC diagram.

Agency Response

ADB Response 04 October 2021

The Theory of Change illustration has been simplified and re-formatted in the relevant narrative section of the CER.

ADB Response 24 September 2021

A more clear TOC table has now been included, along with explanatory narrative.

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 25July2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 25July2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/29/2021:
Cleared.

GEFSEC 25July2021:

Please note the comment in section 1 of part 2 on providing further information on the impacts on current and anticipated climate hazards to coral reefs, based on an optimistic and pessimist climate scenario, preferably to 2050. Please articulate climate change adaptation benefits produced by the project interventions to directly reducing the indicated climate change impacts.

Agency Response

ADB Response 24 September 2021

A new section "on climate projections to 2050" has been included.

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 25July2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 25July21:

Yes

Agency Response
Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
N/A

Agency Response
Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 25July2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/22/2021:

Cleared.

Update, Oct. 19, '21:

Further information or adjustment needed:

It is well noted that the project incorporated a gender analysis and a draft gender action plan. It is, however, unclear from the plan/submission and/or provided indicators how this project intends to support efforts to closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources as noted in the portal. Please either provide further details and/or revise tickbox selection indicating that the project expects to close this important gender gap.

GEFSEC 25July2021:

Yes

Agency Response

[ADB Response 21 October 2021](#)

This comment is well noted. Please refer to the newly added narrative in the gender section to address this concern.

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 25July2021:

Yes, cleared

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 25July2021:

Yes, cleared

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/29/2021:

Cleared.

GEFSEC 25July2021:

Please explicitly clarify who will be the GEF Executing Partner(s) for this project.

Agency Response

ADB Response 24 September 2021

This information is included in the Project Information section of the PIF, with some additional comments in the section on institutional arrangements and coordination. To clarify:

Indonesia: The MOEF has jurisdiction over national marine parks, while MMAF has jurisdiction over provincial marine parks. The candidate sites in the alternative scenario cross over both classifications, so both Ministries have been included. It has been agreed that MOEF would be the "lead" since this is where the Directorate for Climate Change Adaptation is hosted.

Philippines: Based on the precision of sites during PPG, it was decided that Palawan Council for Sustainable Development would be best placed to act in execution role. (See annexed letter from DENR). This will be in close coordination with the national ministry and other members of the CTI-CFF national coordinating committee.

Solomon Islands: Ministry of Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 25July2021:

Yes, cleared

Agency Response
Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 25July2021:

Yes

Agency Response
Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 25July2021:

Yes

Agency Response
Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 25July2021:

Yes

Agency Response
Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/29/2021:
Cleared.

GEFSEC 25July2021:

Please explain in this section if and how this project will contribute to recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic.

Agency Response
ADB Response 24 September 2021

Some narrative on "building back blue" has been included in the "Risks" section of the CER.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/29/2021:

Cleared.

GEFSEC 25July2021:

Regarding Appendix A: Indicative Project Budget Template, please provide further information on the budget for the Grant/sub-grant to the "Arvanons Community Marine Park Endowment".

Agency Response

ADB Response 24 September 2021

This comment no longer applies. Activities in Solomon Islands have been re-defined through additional stakeholder consultations. This has had implications on the project budget, which has also been correspondingly revised.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 25July2021:

Included in annex A

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 25July2021:

Please address the comments above and resubmit.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request PPG was not requested.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 25July2021:

Provided

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/22/2021:

Yes.

Update, Oct. 19, '21:

Not yet. Please address comments pertaining to (a) Co-finance; and (b) Gender.

10/5/2021:

Yes, cleared.

9/29/2021:

Not yet. Please address comments of 9/29/2021.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review	7/25/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/29/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/5/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/19/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/22/2021

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations