



# Mainstreaming Sustainable Marine Fisheries Value Chains into the Blue Economy of the Canary Current and the Pacific Central American Coastal Large Marine Ecosystems

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11011

**Countries**

Global (Guatemala, Ecuador, Mauritania, Morocco, Panama, Senegal)

**Project Name**

Mainstreaming Sustainable Marine Fisheries Value Chains into the Blue Economy of the Canary Current and the Pacific Central American Coastal Large Marine Ecosystems

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

9/22/2023

**Review completed by PM**

2/26/2024

**Program Manager**

Andrew Hume

**Focal Area**

International Waters

**Project Type**

FSP

**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

SH (10.05.23): 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

SH (10.05.23): The project structure remains largely identical between PIF and CEO Endorsement stage. Please address the below point:

1. In the portal submission part 1 The Executing Partner is referenced as "other?". In the PRODOC the Executing Modality is listed as "CSO". Please ensure consistency between the two.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

2. Project budget: The way it is presented it is not possible to read. Please reduce some text or find a solution so that the budget in Annex E becomes readable. As it is Council members, and the Secretariat, are not able to review the budget. Once resubmitted, we will provide comments if appropriate.

SH (11.6.23): Not cleared. Please address below comments:

Now the budget is readable ? however, the way it is presented does not allow to see how much is paid to each position, reason why one cannot assess the reasonability of these being charged to the project components, M&E and PMC. For instance, within these positions, there is a Gender Specialist, and further down there is another gender specialist.

The point is that the current format is not conducive for a rigorous assessment of the expenditures. Please itemize the different positions / activities, so one can understand what is being charged to which source.

With the current format, it is not possible to calculate the cost of the Technical Project Coordinator, but it is shown being charged through the Project components. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC ? whenever the itemized budget table comes, it will be possible to calculate the cost of the project staff.

Final point: we read the TORs of the Technical Project Coordinator (who is the most senior technical representative of the PMU) and the Operations Manager. The former is presented as who will lead the technical implementation of the project, will direct the work of the technical thematic specialists of the project management unit, and will closely coordinate with the Operations Manager to ensure adequate project implementation and the generation of the outputs and outcomes set in the project document. The later (also called project coordinator) heads the project management unit, and will ensure adequate administrative, logistic, and financial support for project execution ? the Operations Manager is presented as the responsible for the administrative day-to-day management of the project on behalf of the Implementing Partner. It is explained that this person will closely coordinate with Technical Project Coordinator to ensure adequate project implementation and the generation of the outputs and outcomes set in the project document. We still don't understand why in projects not implemented by UNDP there is only one Senior person that leads the operational and technical issues, while accompanied by one Administrative Assistant, which is less expensive ? there is no reason why this scheme cannot be applied to this project.

ACH (2.6.24): Partly addressed. The Agency has provided a revised budget that now shows the updated four PMU positions costed to the project components, M&E and PMC. However, one pending issues still remains: The Agency has removed the Operations Manager position from the project but references to the Operations Manager are still included in the ProDoc Budget and Budget Notes (pages 146, 147, 154, 175, 262, 263). Please remove these to be consistent with the updated budget.

ACH(2.22.24): Still not fully addressed. There are at least two references to the Operations Manager in the Portal version of the CEO Endorsement. Please carefully read through all the final documents to ensure they are consistent.

ACH(2.26.24): Addressed.

#### Agency Response

1. Change has been done in the portal.
2. Budget has been adjusted and is readable.

UNDP (12.14.23):

Changes in the budget were made to itemize the different positions/activities for easily check the charges done per source. Additionally, for the other points highlighted and discussed, the following changes were carried out:

1. Reduce the project unit (PMU) to project coordinator, a fisheries officer in each LME and an administrative assistant. Figure 14 was changed in the PRODOC and CEO Endorsement.
2. Text changes to replace "technical project coordinator" with "project coordinator" and eliminate "operations manager" in both the PRODOC and CEO Endorsement.
3. Adjust PRODOC's annexes 6 Overview of Technical Consultancies/Subcontracts and 11 Terms of Reference for Project Board and Project Team, based in the changes indicated in point 1.
4. Adjust the PRODOC's Annex 10 Procurement plan, based in the changes indicated in point 1.
5. Update the co-financing tables in the budget and in the PRODOC and CEO Endorsement. Four co-financing letters were added from the UNDP offices of Panama, Morocco, Senegal and Ecuador.
6. Update the project amount including the new co-financing amount both in the PRODOC and CEO Endorsement.

UNDP (15Feb2024)

Reference to Operations manager has been removed from the budget and budget notes

UNDP (23Feb2024)

Portal and documents have been revised to ensure there is no more reference to "Operations manager"..

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SH (10.05.23): NA

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

SH (10.11.23):

1. According to the co-financing letter provided the SFPs total co-finance contribution amounts to USD 11 million. In the portal entry co-finance table this amount is divided into in-kind and grant investment mobilized, while in the co-financing letter no such distinction is made. Please explain and make the necessary corrections in the portal entry co-financing table.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

2. Please provide English translation of letter of cofinancing support for C?mara Nacional de Pesquer?as (FIP pomada). Ecuador. Also, for type of cofinancing "in-kind", replace "investment mobilized" to "recurrent expenditures".

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

3. Please provide English translation of letter of cofinancing support for Industria Pesquera Samaritana S.A. Guatemala. Also, for type of cofinancing "in-kind", replace "investment mobilized" to "recurrent expenditures".

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

4. Please provide English translation of letter of cofinancing support for Langosta Roja S.A. Guatemala. Also, for type of cofinancing "in-kind", replace "investment mobilized" to "recurrent expenditures".

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

5. Please provide English translation of letter of cofinancing support for Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food. Guatemala.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

6. Please provide English translation of letter of cofinancing support for Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources. Guatemala.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

7. Please replace ?investment mobilized? to ?recurrent expenditures? for the type of cofinancing as in-kind for Fisheries Transparency Initiative (FiTI)

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

8. Please replace ?investment mobilized? to ?recurrent expenditures? for the type of cofinancing as in-kind for Sustainable Fisheries Partnership (SFP)

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

9. Please replace ?investment mobilized? to ?recurrent expenditures? for the type of cofinancing as in-kind for Global Octopus Supply Chain Roundtable

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

10. Please provide English translation of letter of cofinancing support for Ministry of Fisheries and Maritime Economy. Mauritania.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

11. Please provide English translation of letter of cofinancing support for Aquatic Resources Authority of Panama

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

12. Please provide English translation of letter of cofinancing support for Ministry of Environment. Panama

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

13. Please provide English translation of letter of cofinancing support MARPESCA. Panama. Also, for type of cofinancing ?in-kind?, replace ?investment mobilized? to ?recurrent expenditures?.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

14. Please provide English translation of letter of cofinancing support for Comarca Nacional de Pesca y Acuicultura (FIP shrimp). Panama.. Also, for type of cofinancing ?in-kind?, replace ?investment mobilized? to ?recurrent expenditures?.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

15. Please provide English translation of letter of cofinancing support for Comarca Nacional de Pesca y Acuicultura (FIP large pelagic fish). Panama. Also, for type of cofinancing ?in-kind?, replace ?investment mobilized? to ?recurrent expenditures?.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

16. Please provide English translation of letter of cofinancing support for Conseil Local de Pêche Artisanale of Joal. Senegal.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

17. Please replace ?investment mobilized? to ?recurrent expenditures? for the type of cofinancing as in-kind WACA project. Senegal

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

18. Please provide English translation of letter of cofinancing support for Ministry of Fisheries and Maritime Economy. Senegal

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

## Agency Response

UNDP (10.27.23):

1. The entries in the portal are correct. Although the SFP's cofinancing letter does not have a distribution of the cofinancing amounts, the distribution in the portal responds to an electronic mail sent by SFP on 23 August 2023 indicating the amounts to be listed as grant and in-kind. The message is the following:

Re: SFP Co-financing Commitment Letter for GEF ID 11011

Enrique Alonso <enrique.alonso@sustainablefish.org> 23 de agosto de 2023, 02:48

Para: Segundo Coello <segundo.coello@ecobiotec.org>

CC: Joana Troyano <joana.troyano@undp.org>, AnaMaria Nunez

<anamaria.nunez@undp.org>, Annie Haylon

<annie.haylon@sustainablefish.org>, Chuck Burg <chuck.burg@sustainablefish.org>, Chisa

Woodley

<chisa.woodley@sustainablefish.org>

Hi Segundo, Ana Mar?a,

We are reworking the letter and budgets in order to be able to classify accordingly to the categories your note. Based on the definitions provided, US\$8.8M would be classified as ?grant?, while US\$2.2M would be "in-kind?. In previous and present GEF projects, all our co-financing has been classified as "in-kind", so my main question at this point is if by classifying co-financing from other donors for complementary/similar objectives as ?grant" a) the reporting requirements will vary and become more detailed (e.g. our co-financing letters providing more details of use of funds), and if b) we will be forced to place funding for project activities that is earmarked or committed with other funders for ?similar objectives?, i.e. if that will serve as argument by the donor to try to oversee other projects funded by other donors.

Cheers

Enrique

2. English version of the cofinancing letter is in the portal. With regards to the request to replace ?investment mobilized? to ?recurrent expenditures? in the cofinancing letters of the private sector partners, it is asked to revise this request. As defined in the "Guidelines on co-financing" (Policy: FI/GN/01 Approved on June 26, 2018), "investment mobilized" means co-financing that excludes recurrent expenditures. Further, in the section "further guidance on applying the concept of investment mobilised" (page 8 of the previously mentioned document), it is indicated that: ... Investment Mobilized includes any Co-Financing not classified as recurrent expenditures<sup>2</sup>. The footnote 2 is: different governments, companies and organizations may use different terms to refer to ?recurrent expenditures?, such as ?current expenditures? or ?operational/ operating expenditures?.

The contributions from these private sector partners are not a recurrent expenditure since they are not ?current expenditures? nor ?operational expenditures? of these companies. The co-financing contributions

will be actual resources that they will invest (real investment) in the development of the pertinent Fishery Improvement Project (FIP). The amounts are not recurrently contributed yearly, they will depend on an agreed budget among FIP participants. This applies to the following private sector partners: Industria Pesquera Samaritana S.A., Langosta Roja S.A., Global Octopus Supply Chain Roundtable, MARPESCA, C?mara Nacional de Pesca y Acuicultura (FIP shrimp). C?mara Nacional de Pesca y Acuicultura (FIP large pelagic fish). The same applies to the following contributions: Fisheries Transparency Initiative (FiTI), Sustainable Fisheries Partnership (SFP) and WACA project. These resources are not recurrent operational expenditures, in all cases, the contribution will come from complementary initiatives from different funding sources.

3. See the response in point 2.
4. See the response in point 2.
5. English version of the cofinancing letter is in the portal.



6. English version of the cofinancing letter is in the portal.
7. With regards to the request to replace "investment mobilized" to "recurrent expenditures" in the cofinancing letters of the private sector partners, it is asked to revise this request. As defined in the "Guidelines on co-financing" (Policy: FI/GN/01 Approved on June 26, 2018), "investment mobilized" means co-financing that excludes recurrent expenditures. Further, in the section "further guidance on applying the concept of investment mobilised" (page 8 of the previously mentioned document), it is indicated that: ... Investment Mobilized includes any Co-Financing not classified as recurrent expenditures<sup>2</sup>. The footnote 2 is: different governments, companies and organizations may use different terms to refer to "recurrent expenditures", such as "current expenditures" or "operational/ operating expenditures".

The contributions from these private sector partners are not a recurrent expenditure since they are not "current expenditures" nor "operational expenditures" of these companies. The cofinancing contributions will be actual resources that they will invest (real investment) in the development of the pertinent Fishery Improvement Project (FIP). The amounts are not recurrently contributed yearly, they will depend on an agreed budget among FIP participants. This applies to the following private sector partners: Industria Pesquera Samaritana S.A., Langosta Roja S.A., Global Octopus Supply Chain Roundtable, MARPESCA, Cámara Nacional de Pesca y Acuicultura (FIP shrimp). Cámara Nacional de Pesca y Acuicultura (FIP large pelagic fish). The same applies to the following contributions: Fisheries Transparency Initiative (FiTI), Sustainable Fisheries Partnership (SFP) and WACA project. These resources are not recurrent operational expenditures, in all cases, the contribution will come from complementary initiatives from different funding sources.

8. See response in point 7.
9. See response in point 7.
10. English version of the cofinancing letter is in the portal.
11. English version of the cofinancing letter is in the portal.
12. English version of the cofinancing letter is in the portal.
13. See the response in point 2.
14. See the response in point 2.
15. See the response in point 2.
16. English version of the cofinancing letter is in the portal.
17. See response in point 7.
18. English version of the cofinancing letter is in the portal.

NOTE: An additional co-financing letter from the Global Roundtable on Marine Ingredients was received. The letter has been uploaded to the portal and the amounts of grant and in-kind contributions have been added to the budget. This contribution is listed as investment mobilised since it will be direct investment from the companies that are part of the Global Roundtable on Marine Ingredients, these resources are not recurrent or operational expenditures (see previous explanations in this respect).

## **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 RequestSH (10.11.23): 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 RequestSH (10.11.23): Yes, cleared.

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

SH (10.11.23): Changes have been made to the CI targets, which remain realistic. Please address the below points:

1. Core indicator 8: MT expected at PIF is listed at 1,015,000 while MT at CEO End stage is listed at 1,417,500. 1. The indicator 8 Fisheries Details sub-section only accounts for the tonnage number listed at PIF stage. This section needs to be updated to reflect the 1,417,500 tonnage number at CEO End stage.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

2. Please explain the reasoning behind the tonnage difference between PIF and CEO End stage?

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

3. The CCA Rio Marker have been adjusted to ?0?. At PIF stage the CCA Rio Marker was set at ?1?. Please explain the reasoning for this adjustment and consider changing the marker to reflect the projects relevance to CCA.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

4. Please update PRODOC Annex 12 to include data specific to CI 7.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

## Agency Response

UNDP (10.27.23):

1. The information was updated in the portal. The pertinent explanatory text is:

For core indicator 8, the sources will be (i) the stock status from official reports of national fisheries authorities or pertinent regional bodies (i.e., ?FAO Working Group on the Assessment of Small Pelagic Fish off Northwest Africa? and the ?Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission?) and (ii) annual catch from official reports of national fisheries authorities.

### Fishery Details

- ? Ecuador pomada (*Protrachypene precipua*) 2,277 t per year
  - ? Ecuador large pelagic fish longline (espinel grueso) 1,600 t per year (mainly swordfish *Xiphias gladius*, yellowfin tuna *Thunnus albacares* and marlins, and sharks as bycatch).
  - ? Guatemala dorado *Coryphaena hippurus*) and sharks longline fishery. 3,840 t per year.
  - ? Panama shrimp fisheries (trawl and artisanal) 1,248 t per year.
  - ? Panama large pelagic fish longline fishery (mainly *Thunnus albacares* and *Coryphaena hippurus*).
  - ? Mauritania octopus fishery (*Octopus vulgaris*) 39,000 t per year.
  - ? Mauritania small pelagic fish fishery (*Sardinella aurita*, *S. maderensis*) 318,000 t per year.
  - ? Morocco sardine fishery (*Sardina pilchardus*) zone C stock shared with Mauritania 824,000 t per year.
  - ? Senegal small pelagic fish fishery (*Sardinella aurita*, *S. maderensis*) 218,163 t per year.
  - ? Senegal octopus fishery (*Octopus vulgaris*) 8,375 t per year.
- TOTAL 1,417,500 t per year under improved management.

2. The difference is explained by: (1) the use of more detailed sources of information, and (2) focusing on specific species of small pelagic fish in CCLME countries. For example, the GMC2 project will contribute to improve the management of the *Sardina pilchardus* stock shared by Morocco and Mauritania (action 8 of output 2.1.1) instead of focusing on round sardinella, Atlantic horse mackerel and Cunene horse mackerel as proposed in the PIF. Detailed information about is included in Table 14 of the PRODOC and Table 16 of the CEO

ER. The following table present the difference in estimates for Core Indicator 8 between the PIF and the PRODOC.

<b>Fishery</b>	<b>PIF</b>	<b>CEO ER</b>
Shrimp (Panamanian fishery)	1,000	
Ecuador pomada (Protrachypene precipua)		2,277
Panama shrimp fisheries (trawl and artisanal)		1,248
Large pelagic fish	18,000	
Ecuador large pelagic fish longline (espinel grueso)		1,600
Guatemala dorado Coryphaena hippurus) and sharks longline fishery		3,840
Panama large pelagic fish longline fishery (mainly Thunnus albacares and Coryphaena hippurus).		997
Mauritania octopus fishery (Octopus vulgaris)	31,000	39,000
Senegal octopus fishery (Octopus vulgaris)		8,375
Moroccan small pelagic fish fishery (round sardinella, Atlantic horse mackerel and Cunene horse mackerel)	134,000	
Morocco sardine fishery (Sardina pilchardus) zone C stock shared with Mauritania		824,000
Mauritanian small pelagic fish fishery (round sardinella, flat sardinella, Cunene horse mackerel and bonga)	478,000	
Mauritania small pelagic fish fishery (Sardinella aurita, S. maderensis)		318,000
Senegalese small pelagic fish fishery (sardinellas, horse mackerels and bonga).	353,000	
Senegal small pelagic fish fishery (Sardinella aurita, S. maderensis)		218,163
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,015,000</b>	<b>1,417,500</b>

3. After revising the detailed interventions designed during the PPG phase it was found that the project will not have direct contributions in terms of mitigation or adaptation to climate change. In terms of mitigation, the project will not deal with fuel efficiency to reduce GHG

emission. In terms of adaptation, the project will motivate that climate variability and change are considered in the fisheries management plans but will not directly develop adaptation measures.

4. The information is already included in the Annex 12. Regarding Core Indicator 7, it is indicated the GMC2 project will contribute to improved cooperative management in two shared water ecosystems (PACA and CC). Sub indicators 7.1 to 7.3 do not apply as the project is not developing/applying a TDA/SAP perse. In sub indicator 7.4 it is marked the level of engagement in IW LEARN.

## **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

SH (10.11.23): Yes, a clear explanation has been provided. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (10.11.23): Table 16. Is off the margins ? please amend.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

.

Agency Response

UNDP (10.27.23):

Margins have been adjusted in the portal.

**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

SH (10.11.23): Overall yes. However, please address the below points:

1. Please ensure consistence across the portal table B, the portal output descriptions and the Results Framework. As an example, the portal table B output 2.1.2 states ?six industry led

verifiable fishery improvements projects? while parts of the portal 2.1.2 outputs description and the Results Framework references ?eight industry led verifiable fishery improvements projects?. Please also check and ensure consistency between the portal and Agency CEO endorsement submission (Results Framework, outputs description etc.).

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

2. Please update text across the portal submission sections to ensure consistency with portal table B information. As an example, the portal submission ?Results and Partnerships? section references three components and 21 outcomes, which does not align with table B information nor table 3. Another example can be found under the portal submission ?expected results? section and in which the described output 1.2.3 does not match the table B output 1.2.3.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

3. Not all baseline, mid-term and end of project targets appear populated in the Portal and PRODOC Results Framework. E.g., pls. look at outcome 2.2 and 2.3 and populate.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

#### Agency Response

UNDP (10.27.23):

1. The text has been reviewed and updated for inconsistencies.
2. The text of the portal, PRODOC and CEO ER has been reviewed and updated for inconsistencies.
3. The information was updated in the portal. The CEO ER and PRODOC have the pertinent information.

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

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (10.11.23): Overall yes. However, please address the below point:

Please expand the portal submission section 4 ?alignment with GEF focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?. E.g., please be a bit more explicit specific to which elements of the GEF obj. 1 / strategic action 1.1 are relevant to the objective and outcomes under this project.

Please also be explicit specific to the alignment between this project and the LME strategies in place.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

#### Agency Response

UNDP (10.27.23):

The text has been expanded accordingly ? paragraphs 303 ? 305 (highlighted with yellow in the CEO Endorsement) .

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

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (10.11.23): Please address the below point:

In section ?5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing?, please further expand the expected contribution from the project baseline.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

#### Agency Response

UNDP (10.27.23):

The text was expanded (see new paragraphs 310 and 311 added in the CEO Endorsement and highlighted with yellow).

#### **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

SH (10.11.23):

In the section ?6) global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?, please further expand on the delivery of this project to the TDA/SAP priorities across the two LMEs.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

#### Agency Response

UNDP (10.27.23):

The text was expanded (see new paragraphs 313 to 315 added in the CEO Endorsement and highlighted with yellow).

**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

SH (10.11.23):

In the section ?7. innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up?, please add text specifying how this project responds to TEs recommendations from the prior project.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

#### Agency Response

UNDP (10.27.23):

The requested text has been integrated into the CEO ER, see paragraph 329 (highlighted with yellow).

#### **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

SH (10.11.23): In Annex D on Project Map and Coordinates, please consider inserting the geographic location of the cite under the dedicated data entry field ?GEO LOCATION INFORMATION? ? it is left blank.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

#### Agency Response

UNDP (10.27.23):

The geo location information was included into the CEO ER and the portal.



## **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

SH (10.11.23): NA

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

SH (10.11.23): Please address the below comment:

Upload annex 19 to the portal containing detailed documentation of the PPG stakeholder participation and engagement activities.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP (10.27.23):

The Annex 19 was uploaded to the portal.

## **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

SH (10.11.23):

Please include an explanation why women account for only about 18% of the direct beneficiaries (Core Indicator 11). The aim is to approach parity, or 33% at least.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

### Agency Response

UNDP (10.27.23):

It is not possible to aim to parity or 33% of women as direct beneficiaries of the project (core indicator 11).

First, the identification of beneficiaries was carried out based on a detailed analysis of each project activity (see Annex 18 of the PRODOC ? List of the project direct and indirect beneficiaries). The direct recipients (men and women) of the benefits of the project were calculated for each project intervention. Therefore, these figures are as accurate as possible: 14,105 men (81.7%) and 3,162 women (18.3%). It has to be taken into account that the main fishing-related activities of the target supply chains are carried out by men. Women participate mainly in processing activities of these supply chains, but they are significantly fewer in number. Therefore, the number of women direct beneficiaries indicated in the Core Indicator 11 is a pertinent estimate. It is unrealistic to pretend to approach parity or >33% as suggested.

Second, the project interventions aim to strengthen women engagement and to increase as much as possible gender parity, despite the cultural and religious barriers that women face in the participating countries and in a predominantly male-dominated fishing sector (see Gender Analysis main findings in Annex 9 of the PRODOC). For this, the project includes a range of affirmative actions to motivate and to foster women involvement in project activities (e.g., taking part in the fisheries governance platforms and training activities). For these activities, the project will aim: (i) that the co-management platforms include ?40% of women members at the end of the project (indicator 12 in the results framework), (ii) that in the events for dissemination of lessons women constitute ?30% of the participants (indicator 19 in the results framework), and (iii) that in training activities women constitute ?30% of the participants (indicators of the Gender Action Plan). These target figures are challenging but realistic.

### 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

SH (10.11.23): Yes the role of the private sector is incorporated into project outcomes and manifests both via the international and domestic buyers (demand side) and across fisheries priority value chains (supply side). 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

SH (10.11.23): Overall, risks have been elaborated and mitigating actions presented.

However, please answer the below points:

1. Note that the CCA Rio Marker have been adjusted to ?0?. At PIF stage the CCA Rio Marker was set at ?1?. Please explain the reasoning for this adjustment? Note that medium and high-risk projects should conduct a detailed evaluation of climate change risks and risk management options prior to CEO Endorsement.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

2. Please explain how climate risks have been evaluated during PPG, and how climate risks will be factored into the various project activities?

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

## Agency Response

UNDP (10.27.23):

1. As indicated before, after revising the detailed interventions designed during the PPG phase it was found that the project will not have direct contributions in terms of mitigation or adaptation to climate change. In terms of mitigation, the project will not deal with fuel efficiency to reduce GHG emission. In terms of adaptation, the project will motivate that climate variability and change are considered in the fisheries management plans but will not directly develop adaptation measures. The climate risk screening has been included as Annex 20 of the PRODOC.

2. The exposure and vulnerability to climate-related hazards were assessed for the fisheries and related supply chains of large pelagic fish and shrimps in PACA and small pelagic fish and octopus in the CCLME. The following climate-related hazards were assessed: increase in ocean temperature, changes in ocean circulation, increased ocean acidification, increased sea

level rise and increased extreme weather events. Climate risks were assessed based on available information, though there are enormous information gaps.

The project will not directly engage into developing mitigation measures. However, it will encourage that the projected climate change impacts are considered during the development of fisheries management plans, fisheries conservation and management measures and the FIPs. Text was added to highlight the pertinent actions in both the CEO ER ((paragraphs 152, 179, 213, 241, 282) and the PRODOC (paragraphs 142, 169, 202, 230, 271) ? all highlighted in yellow. The climate risk screening has been added as Annex 20 in the PRODOC.

## **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

SH (10.11.23):

1. Please expand the portal section 6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination section to include an elaboration on coordination with relevant GEF financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

2. Please explain how national capacity is built within i.e. national fisheries authorities, e.g., will the national Fisheries Officer be located in house at relevant national institutions?

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

3. Please explain the role of the UNDP Country Offices specific to their oversight and quality assurance roles?

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

## **Agency Response**

UNDP (10.27.23):

1. The information about coordination with other initiatives is already included in section ?baseline projects? of the CEO ER (paragraphs 88 and 89) and the PRODOC. Also, Annex 16 of the PRODOC compile the projects that are relevant for coordination and collaboration. In addition, the section ?partnerships? of the PRODOC (paragraphs 292 to 301) summarise the actors and initiatives that will be key during project implementation.

This explanation has been included in the CEO Endorsement at the end of section 6 (highlighted in yellow).

2. The fisheries officers will be located on the premises of the national fisheries authorities to ensure close interaction with them. The project will provide targeted support to the fisheries authorities to gain experience and develop capacities for implementing Regulatory Impact Assessment and whole-of-government responses and the development and management of co-management platforms and fisheries management plans (outputs 2.1.1 and 2.2.2). In addition, the project will facilitate the exchange of experience and lessons among fisheries authorities (see ?support collaborative management of small pelagic fish between Morocco and Mauritania? in output 2.1.1, and ?regional learning exchanges on fisheries management plans? and ?support the implementation of Mauritania?s small pelagic fish management plan? in output 2.2.2).

3. Please refer to the OAI Checklist in which it is explained the role of country offices and their oversight and quality assurance roles.

#### **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

SH (10.11.23): 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

SH (10.11.23):

The agency is requested to clarify the budget and timeline for key KM and communications activities across all components. This can be done by including a simple table in the KM&L section.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

## Agency Response

UNDP (10.27.23):

The component 3 (outcomes 3.1 and 3.2) is dedicated to knowledge management. The planned activities are included in the multiyear workplan (Annex 3 of the PRODOC). As requested, the pertinent part of the multiyear workplan has been included into the Knowledge Management section of the CEO ER (see paragraphs 313 and 314 highlighted in yellow). The total budget for this component is USD 1,503,050, the details are found in the project budget.

### **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

SH (10.11.23): Yes. Note the the SESP identified multiple moderate risks and one risk as substantial, which involves potential risks of economic displacement and loss of livelihoods for measures which are yet to be defined and will be decided during project implementation. Management measures has been identified. Cleared.

## 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

SH (10.11.23): Yes, cleared.

## 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

SH (10.11.23): Please expand the portal section ?10. Benefits? to include expected socio economic benefits specific to the direct/secondary beneficiaries of the project?

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

#### Agency Response

UNDP (10.27.23):

A new paragraph (440) and a table that summarises the social and economic benefits have been included in the section 10 of the CEO ER ? highlighted in yellow.

#### **Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (10.11.23): Please upload annex 19 to the portal containing detailed documentation of the PPG stakeholder participation and engagement activities.

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

#### Agency Response

UNDP (10.27.23):

Annex 19 has been uploaded to the portal.

#### **Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement RequestSH (10.11.23): A results framework has been included in the portal submission.

#### Agency Response

**GEF Secretariat comments**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

#### Agency Response

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement RequestSH (10.11.23): The agency have provided responses to council comments. Cleared.

Agency Response

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (10.11.23): Partly. Please explain how the planned outcomes encompass important climate risks and how such risks will be mainstreamed across management plans and tools produced by the project?

SH (11.6.23): Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP (10.27.23):

Climate risks and the associated project measures are included in Annex 20 of the PRODOC.

The four main actions will be:

1. To include projected climate change impacts in the agenda of the co-management platforms and the development of fisheries management plans and instruments.
2. To foster that pertinent research institutions present information and forecasts to the co-management platforms.
3. To motivate key stakeholders to develop and implement adaptation measures in their operations.
4. To mainstream information about climate change impacts on the target supply chains in the project communication strategy.

These actions have been integrated into the project activities.

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement RequestSH (10.11.23): NA

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement RequestSH (10.11.23): NA

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement RequestSH (10.11.23): NA



Agency Response  
**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
SH (10.11.23):

*Amount Spent To date:* 116,019.93

*Amount Committed:* 159,209.07

Agency Response  
**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SH (10.11.23): Yes, maps across participatory countries and specific to the relevant value chains have been provided. Cleared.

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  
NA

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  
NA

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

NA

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (10.11.23): Please address comments and resubmit.

SH (11.6.23): Please address comments and resubmit.

ACH (2.6.24): Please address comments and resubmit.

ACH (2.22.24): Please address comments and resubmit.

ACH(2.26.24): All comments have been addressed. The project is recommend for CEO endorsement.

**Review Dates**

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat comments**

<b>First Review</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

The GMC2 project will aim to advance the transformation of the seafood market and to generate learning to be useful worldwide. The project contributes to confront the overexploitation of marine fishery resources, which is produced by three main causes: (1) the increasing global demand for seafood, (2) a deficient management of the fisheries that receive pressure from the markets, and (3) insufficient measures to protect key biodiversity elements of the marine environment (e.g., nurseries, breeding and feeding grounds, ETP species). The core of the project theory of change is that if the buyers integrate sustainability and ethical considerations into their demand for seafood, then the suppliers will be driven to comply with these market requirements and, therefore, they will implement improvements in their own operations and will encourage advances in the fisheries management framework like stronger fisheries governance and better conservation and management measures. These changes will improve fisheries production and the wellbeing of fishing communities that will, finally, contribute to have healthy marine ecosystems and sustainable livelihoods of fishing-dependent communities.

At the end of the intervention, it is expected that 1,417,500 t of seafood capture have improved management and that about 373,883 persons benefit from the project.