

Pacific I2I Regional Project: Ocean Health for Ocean Wealth - The Voyage to a Blue Economy for the Blue Pacific Continent

Basic Information

GEF ID

10783

Countries

Regional (Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu)

Project Title

Pacific I2I Regional Project: Ocean Health for Ocean Wealth - The Voyage to a Blue Economy for the Blue Pacific Continent

GEF Agency(ies)

UNEP, ADB

Agency ID

GEF Focal Area(s)

International Waters

Program Manager

Christian Severin

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

2nd of April 2021 (cseverin): Probably, but the PIF need to present the case better. It is not that clear what the project will deliver and if it aligns with FA strategy. One of the issues that complicates this is the VERY lengthy PIF (168 pp) and the reference to deliverables to a myriad of focal areas. E.g., it is hard to understand how improved management of the Pacific EEZs would deliver towards the LD FAs LDN mandate.

21st of April 2021 (cseverin): Addressed.

Agency Response

15 April 2021

The PIF has been streamlined and its scope has been sharpened; its length has been reduced to 56 pages plus annexes. An indicative summary result framework has been added as Annex E. The primary alignment with IW has been strengthened.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

2nd of April 2021 (cseverin): No. The lack of a project results framework makes it impossible to understand what is being proposed. The PIF is VERY long, eg the document includes more than 60 pages of situational reports, before the proposed actions and deliverables are touched upon.

Please make following edits/additions:

1) Please provide a table B that CLEARLY outlines what will be produced. Many of the deliverables are indeed outputs and hence should be listed there, compared to outcome level that are high level deliverables. Including the possible interventions makes table B very hard to read.

1b) the alignment with and delivery towards implementation of the Pacific Warm Water Pool SAP is missing. Please strengthen this link.

2) The proposed funding envelope for the coordination activities for component 4 is too high. Comparing to similar regional investments, such as Pacific r2r program, suggest that coordinating this, much smaller project, should be three times more costly to coordinate. Please lower this amount considerable and move released financing to national delivery activities instead. Further, please make sure that the coordination activities do not cover activities that are to be financed by the fee.

2) The project description is kick started by a long list of issues, more than 40 paragraphs, before the reader gets a bit of a sense what the project will actually do. It is okay to let the reader understand the seriousness of the issues that the pacific SIDS are facing, but this is a very long analysis. Please consider to insert in an annex and instead insert a couple of paragraphs that makes it CLEAR to the reader what the project will be doing and what will be addressed.

3) It is not clear why the project will only support 6 country investments. Further, it is unclear how this number was identified and what the process will be for countries to compete for these investments. Maybe consider to minimize the funds spend on regional activities to be able to support all participating countries.

4) It is noted several places in the PIF that the project will support plastic interventions. Please note that the IW focal area has already allocated the financing available for such activities in GEF 7 and therefore, such activities are not eligible. Please remove these from activities financed by GEF.

5) It is confusing to the reader that the document has multiple references to the other GEF focal areas, e.g. it is confusing how investments in the EEZ will be able to deliver to the LD focal area. It is understood that this investment is to be financed by the IW focal area. if so please make sure to focus on IW GEBs. E.g. indicator 7 has not been selected, but CC mitigation has been calculated and included. It is fine that the project will be delivering benefits that support other GEF focal areas, but it is imperative that GEF IW GEBs as a minimum are included.

6) Considering that the country populations, excluding PNG is 2.7 mio people, it seems very ambitious that the project estimates that this investment will directly benefit 3 mio people. Please ensure these numbers are correct.

7) On the taxonomy, LD, CC and BD has also been ticked by this proposed intervention. Please ensure that these are fully aligned with the objective of this IW financed marine management project.

8) Please make sure there is coherency between the numbers included in the GEB table and what is included in annex b.

9) Please produce and include a results framework. It is understood that some details will lack due to some missing baseline data, but we still need to see a results framework. In relation to this point, the one page country briefs are informative, thank you for producing those

10) paragraph lays out the importance of policy coordination and identifies this as one of the major stumbling blocks for long term adoption and implementation of blue economy plans. It can be argued that finance and particular trade-off analysis to inform financial decisions may be an even larger stumbling block. Please elaborate on this aspect too.

11) component 4 has been included in Table B, however is lacking in figure 3 and para 197. If component 4 is not delivering towards the project. The description of what happens in the regional intervention that will be executed by SPREP is unclear in figure 3.

12) Please produce and include a climate risk screening

13) Please produce and include a Theory of Change

14) Three LOEs are mentioning Tonga financing, for a UNDP project that is not part of the project. One LOE is endorsed by a minister and not the OFP.

15) The PIF is too long and it is hard to understand what will be delivered. Please consolidate the submission and make it clearer what will be delivered.

21st of April 2021 (cseverin): Most points addressed, and thank you for providing a shorter more concise version of the PIF, it makes it much easier to understand. However, please address the below points:

1) it is understood, based on multiple conversations, that as part of the 14 national SBE frameworks, the project will deliver 14 national marine spatial plans as a necessary step towards informing the national SBEs. Please make sure this is explicitly stated in table B and component description, as well as draft results framework in Annex E of submission. This is already alluded to in the Core indicator framework, but please include wording to this effect to make it possible to understand how the 71 mio hectares under MSP will be achieved.

2) The core indicator table, mentions under indicator 7, that the project will be working in the Pacific Warm Water Pool LME, which is aligned with understanding of the GEFSEC. However, under Core Indicator 5, a southwest Pacific LME is listed. Please have consistency.

3) Under Core indicator 5, 71 mio hectare marine area under MSP is mentioned as a result, however, in annex B of the PIF word version, 75 mio hectare is mentioned, which is it?

4) in word PIF submission annex B also states that core indicator 11 will be directly benefitting 3 mio people, whereas the uploaded version to the portal mentions 300k. Please have consistency.

5) box 2 and box 3 inserted into text can not be read. please upload a version of these images that are readable.

23rd of April 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

27th of April 2021 (cseverin):No, please address following issues:

1) There is no proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC, compared to the overall project financing. The costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level.

2) Please remove "Asia/Pacific" from the country list.

3) For Table D: Kindly note that in the Country section, the option 'Regional' must be selected instead of 'Asia/Pacific'.

29th of April 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

15 April 2021

The PIF has been shortened to 56 pages plus annexes.

1) Table B has been streamlined and an indicative summary result framework has prepared in Annex D

1.b The alignment with the 1997 Pacific SAP has been strengthened see section 4) para 105 and section 5) para 108

2) The funding envelope for component 4 has been reduced to 6.9% of project budget (981K) and the balance shifted to Component 1 (\$500K for national policy; SBE strategies and implementation plans) and Component 3 (\$236K to prepare knowledge products and transfer capacities for national upscaling SBE). No additional budget was provided to Component 2 as its scope is at the national level with national executing agencies. Component 4 is will strictly cover project execution coordination costs and not supervision which fall under the IA fee.

3) Part II situation information have been summarized and national background and profile information shifted to Annex E.

4) Given that the final number of national interventions will be contingent to the selection process at inception based on criteria to be further developed during PPG, at this stage the project is committing to at least 6 pilot interventions. Indeed selection criteria for national SBE pilot projects will be developed during PPG phase based on scoping studies conducted in all 14 PICs to identify possible candidates for national SBE pilot projects and sustainable financing mechanisms (Output 2.1). The national SBE pilot projects will serve as learning sites for future replication and upscaling, and therefore as a minimum must demonstrate commercial viability, financial sustainability, and social, economic, and environmental benefits. The Pacific I2I project needs to be rigorous during the selection process to ensure that potential projects will meet all three criteria, as well as have national government support for implementation.

5) Marine plastics was highlighted as a critical priority for the countries and the list of possible interventions under component 2 was purely illustrative with the understanding that MP interventions would have been strictly covered by co-financing. For clarity any reference to

marine plastic and solid waste management has been removed.

- 6) The FA alignment has been reformulated to emphasize the IW FA alignment - see para 105-107. GEBs were strengthened as well see para 116 – 122 and in addition to the IW:LEARN 7.4 indicator which had been selected at submission, indicator 7.3 “Level of National/Local reforms and active participation of Inter-Ministerial Committees” as well indicator 7.1 referring to SAP implementation in view of the 1997 Pacific SAP has also been added. Annex B and Table F were also amended accordingly. It is hoped that the portal glitch faced at submission when trying to choose 1 water body will no longer be. The Gender indicator has been lowered to 300,000.
- 7) The taxonomy entries against BD LD and CC have been reviewed.
- 8) A summary indicative result framework has been prepared and is presented in Annex E.
- 9) Please see revised baseline section and para 65 discussing policy and financial barriers.
- 10) Fig 3 in the coordination section has been refined and the coordination section adjusted to add clarity with respect to the role of SPREP.
- 11) A ToC was and still is presented in Annex D (see page 74).
- 12) The matter of LoE was discussed with the GEF Secretariat and it was agreed to get a new LoE for Palau now that there is a new focal point as at 02 April 2021. As referenced on the GEF Website, to-date Samoa does not have an OFP but only a political focal point. Revised LoEs could be re-secured at PPG stage by CEO endorsement

23 April 2021

1. While indeed Component one will *inter alia* deliver 14 National BE assessments and plans, this will be done upscaling and upgrading in each country existing national ocean policies and strategies to truly deliver on integrated ocean management and support a ‘sustainable ocean economy’ for long-term, sustainable use of ocean resources preserving marine ecosystems health and resilience for improved livelihoods and jobs, balancing protection and production. The 14 SBE plans will capitalize on current plans and decision support systems thereby looking at updating existing MSPs, ICZM plans, adaptive ocean management plans, EbA plans or integrated ocean management plans (the newest addition from the High Level Panel for a Sustainable Ocean Economy) as relevant and considered appropriate by countries. Indeed, an integrated, cross-sectoral, area-based planning approach will be a key step towards implementing a sustainable blue economy. Depending on the context, countries might however choose different approaches to achieve integrated area-based planning for preparing their SBE plan. Each country might also take a different pathway towards SBE depending on their own context.

It should also be noted that developing 14 MSPs for the whole EEZs is a huge endeavor. Comprehensive Marine Spatial Planning if to be realized across all sectors is expensive and data intensive. However, several global and regional institutions are and have been supporting PICs with the formulation of MSPs. At present, while no country has SBE plans, 9 countries have either MSPs or ICZM plans or EbA plans and/or LLMAs, MPA networks.

The text in table B, the matching alternative narrative (para 77) and in the result framework in Annex F have been finessed accordingly.

2. The Pacific Warm Water Pool is reflected under indicator 7 & 5.
3. The PIF in Word presented in the roadmap had not been entirely updated. Apologies. This is now done.
4. Improved versions of the text boxes have been uploaded.

28 April 2021

1. The GEF/non GEF PMC ratio has been adjusted to be the same as the total GEF/non GEF ratio.
2. Asia Pacific has been removed from the country's list
3. Regional was selected instead of Asia/Pacific in Table D

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

2nd of April 2021 (cseverin): Yes, however it is noted that the investment mobilized is high considering this investment is in the Pacific SIDS.

27th of April 2021 (cseverin): No, most of the co-financing originates from different donor-funded activities, and this should be properly reflected in table C (from: donor Agency, and the name of the donor).

29th of April 2021: Addressed satisfactorily at this time. Further, it is impossible to decipher which funding agency is behind all the national cofinancing at this time. Therefore, please make sure to have this further detailed at the time of CEO Endorsement.

Agency Response

15 April 2021

Based on a calculator spreadsheet sent to all PICs, the recurring expenditures and investments mobilised have been mapped out and recorded accordingly in the PIF.

28 April 2021.

SPREP has been added as a donor instead of others . However, please note that the various programmes listed against government in-kind investment mobilised co-financing (as described below Table C) represent co-financing raised by the countries hence considered as

country's co-financing per se. Also note, that while a couple of names might be reflected against those programmes and activities, none of those donors indirectly cited have given their consent to be listed as co-financier per se. Indeed, this in-kind mobilized investment will come through governments and is managed directly by them. The current listed in-kind government mobilized investments will be refined during PPG for confirmation by CEO endorsement.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

2nd of April 2021 (cseverin): Yes, if above comments will be addressed.

21st of April 2021 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Agency response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 2nd of April 2021 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

nd of April 2021 (cseverin): No,

- 1) please make sure to list ALL GEBs, especially those of the IW focal area.
- 2) the indicator 2 is the one that is partly to be delivered on from IW. Please consider if some of the km2s listed under indicator 5 can be moved to 2.
- 3) please make sure that it will be possible for the investment to deliver on indicator 11

21st of April 2021 (cseverin): No, please address below comments:

- 1) The core indicator table, mentions under indicator 7, that the project will be working in the Pacific Warm Water Pool LME, which is aligned with understanding of the GEFSEC. However, under Core Indicator 5, a southwest Pacific LME is listed. Please have consistency.
- 2) Under Core indicator 5, 71 mio hectare marine area under MSP is mentioned as a result, however, in annex B of the PIF word version, 75 mio hectare is mentioned, which is it?
- 3) in word PIF submisison annex B also states that core indicator 11 will be directly benefitting 3 mio people, where as the uploaded version to the portal mentions 300k. Please have consistency.

23rd of April 2021 (cseverin) Addressed

27th of April 2021 (cseverin): Please double check that the estimated targets for GEF Core Indicators correspond to the information provided in the PIF.

29th of April 2021(cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

15 April 2021

1. As stated above, Table F and Annex B have been adjusted.
2. As discussed, given that Indicator 2 targets are already met at the portfolio level and given that this project will not develop new MPAs (Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use) but contribute to reducing pollution and hypoxia in coastal zones, the entire amount was kept under 5.2.
3. Indicator 11 has been adjusted.

23 April 2021

1. Indicator 7 and 5 were updated to reflect the Pacific Warm Water Pool

1. Indicator 7 and 9 were updated to reflect the Pacific Warm Water Pool.
2. The PIF in Word presented in the roadmap had not been entirely updated. Apologies. This is now done.
3. Improved versions of the text boxes have been uploaded.

28 April 2021

6.2 Targets were adjusted.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

2nd of April 2021 (cseverin): No, please re-evaluate if all the TAGs ticked are appropriate for this investment.

21st of April 2021 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

15 April 2021

All the TAGS were reviewed accordingly.

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

2nd of April 2021 (cseverin): Partly. The submission includes a VERY long list of issues, but is not truly consolidating the issues at hand and how the investment will be addressing these. Please carefully reformulate the issues to be addressed and how it connects to the overall regional and global discourse. The aim should be to do this in a consolidated fashion.

21st of April 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

15 April 2021

As stated above, the PIF was considerably shortened and the text refined for more clarity.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5th of April 2021 (cseverin): the Baseline section has been divided into a regional and a national section, which is an interesting way to present the complex baseline, but the section is simply too long. Please consider to consolidate and then include the details of this very long (26 page) baseline as an annex, and instead insert a more consolidated baseline description into the actual PIF.

21st of April 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

15 April 2021

The Baseline section has been refined for more clarity and text shifted to Annex E.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5th of April 2021 (cseverin): Partly. Some information is presented, but the section is primarily descriptive, with no quantifiable deliverables mentioned. Please provide a write-up that summarizes the expected outcomes and then followed by more specificity from each component.

Further, please note that para 183, includes ineligible activities. Please remove these.

Moreover, it is noted that the proposed alternative scenario is a long list of potential investments, but with limited details. It is imperative that by the time of CEO Endorsement this is MUCH more detailed and understandable for the reader what will be financed, compared to the long list of potential investments presented at this time. Such specificity will also be important in order to quantify impact.

21st of April 2021 (cseverin): the new shortened and more clear PIF which makes it easier to understand what will be delivered. THANK YOU. However, the component outputs should include the 14 national MSPs that will be delivered as part of the national SBEs, please include where appropriate in the submission.

23rd of April 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

15 April 2021

The Alternative section 3 has been restructured. References to MP have been removed. Investments contemplated under Component 2 will be defined at inception based on a methodology and selection criteria for national SBE pilot projects will be developed during PPG phase. Scoping studies will be conducted in all 14 PICs to identify possible candidates for national SBE pilot projects and sustainable financing mechanisms (Output 2.1). The national SBE pilot projects will serve as learning sites for future replication and upscaling, and therefore as a minimum must demonstrate commercial viability, financial sustainability, and social, economic, and environmental benefits. The Pacific I2I project needs to be rigorous during the selection process to ensure that potential projects will meet all three criteria, as well as have national government support for implementation.

23 April 2021

As noted above, given that the SBE approach is the ultimate integrated ocean management approach upscaling existing marine policies and plans, each country might take a different pathway towards SBE depending on their own context. Table B, the log frame in Annex F and the alternative narrative section (para 77) have been nuanced to capture the fact 14 National BE assessments and plans will be prepared (including updated or new MSPs, ICZM plans, adaptive ocean management plans, EbA plans or integrated ocean management plans as relevant and considered appropriate by countries).

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5th of April 2021 (cseverin): Maybe, not quite possible to identify at this stage, but if above comments will be addressed it is anticipated it will be eligible.

21st of April 2021 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5th of April 2021 (cseverin): Please note that the GEF was founded in October 1991, therefore 29 years ago and not 25. Further, it may make sense to mention that the first ever adopted SAP was the Pacific SAP in August 1997.

It is not clear what the GEF will be an increment too, formulations like "GEF funds will contribute to expanding critical processes " are not really helpful. Please make it clearer what that activities (regional and national) what the GEF financing will be an increment too. This does NOT need to be an explicit list, but provide more specificity than "critical processes".

21st of April 2021 (cseverin): addressed

Agency Response

15 April 2021

Dates were corrected and references to 1997 Pacific SAP were added (see para 108). The Incremental reasoning section was also refined for more clarity (see para 108-115).

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5th of April 2021 (cseverin): Partly. as mentioned above, following needs to be addressed:

1) It is confusing to the reader that the document has multiple references to the other GEF focal areas, e.g. it is confusing how investments in the EEZ will be able to deliver to the LD focal area. It is understood that this investment is to be financed by the IW focal area. if so please make sure to focus on IW GEBs. E.g. indicator 7 has not been selected, but CC mitigation has been calculated and included. It is fine that the project will be delivering benefits that support other GEF focal areas, but it is imperative that GEF IW GEBs as a minimum are included.

2) Considering that the country populations, excluding PNG is 2.7 mio people, it seems very ambitious that the project estimates that this investment will directly benefit 3 mio people. Please ensure these numbers are correct.

3) Please make sure to fill-in sub-indicators as well, in case the project will be delivering to specific IW sub-indicators as well.

21st of April 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please make sure that there is coherency between eg the amount of area under MSP in pif template is same as included in annex of WORD version of PIF. Further, please make sure that the correct LME is mentioned throughout the core indicator table in PIF submission.

23rd of April 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

15 April 2021

As stated above section 4 on FA area alignment has been simplified. Core indicators in Table F and Annex B were also reviewed and adjusted.

23 April 2021

Please note, as stated above, that the matter has been addressed and all documents on the portal and in Word in the road map are consistent.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5th of April 2021 (cseverin): Yes the formulation and delivery of 14 blue economy plans, including marine spatial plans, will be instrumental for catalyzing innovation. Please note that the GEF financing can not support solid waste management.

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5th of April 2021 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5th of April 2021 (cseverin):Partly, please include confirmation that at the time of CEO endorsement there will be much more detail provided on national and regional stakeholder groups and engagement strategies and protocols will be provided.

21st of April 2021 (cseverin): The stakeholder engagement has been limited for this project due to the current COVID pandemic. Please include more elaborate information on the process that is planned, including mentioning core stakeholder groups that is to be engaged with regionally

26th of April 2021 (cseverin): Addressed, but it is noted that considerable work remains during PPG (as it has not been possible to undertake due to the COVID pandemic) and that this will lead to a full gender analysis and engagement plan.

Agency Response

15 April 2021

Section 2 page 39 was adjusted accordingly.

23 April 2021

Section 2 on page 39 has been strengthened.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5th of April 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please explain why the proposed project will not be supporting "closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources".

21st of April 2021 (cseverin): Partly addressed, please elaborate on the plan for ensuring gender aspects into the project and its components, both nationally and regionally.

26th of April 2021 (cseverin): Addressed.

Agency Response

15 April 2021

"closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources" has been added.

23 April 2021

The gender section has been strengthened accordingly – see page 41.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5th of April 2021 (cseverin): Partly, the private sector engagement is generic. Please including wording to the fact that the project description at CEO endorsement will include much more/detailed information on what role the PS will have towards delivering and sustaining towards the project objective.

21st of April 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

15 April 2021

Section 4 on private sector has been refined accordingly (see page 40)

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5th of April 2021 (cseverin): Partly, most risks have been addressed, however the submission lacks a Climate Risk Screening, please produce and include as an annex to the submission.

21st of April 2021 (cseverin): Addressed.

Agency Response

15 April 2021

Climate risk screening forms part of the SRIF which was uploaded at submission. Please note the Safeguard Standard SS 2 on Climate Change and Disaster Risks

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5th of April 2021 (cseverin): No, please provide assurance on what IA/EA arrangement is planned. The text nor the illustration is clear in outlining how the EA will function as EA for the project. The only part of the investment where this relationship seems clear is for component 4.

21st of April 2021 (cseverin): Addressed. Thanks for confirming that an execution agency (SPREP) has been identified for the entire project.

Agency Response

15 April 2021

The Coordination section including Fig 3 have been refined (see para 143-162 on page 46-50).

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5th of April 2021 (cseverin): Yes the proposed project activities seem to align with national priorities. But this will be easier to confirm once the above comment have been addressed.

21st of April 2021 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5th of April 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please include reference to the fact that the project will allocate minimum 1% of the GEF grant to support IWLEARN activities.

21st of April 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

15 April 2021

Reference to IWLEARN (1%) was included in Table B and has now also been added in Section 8 on KM including in Para 176.

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5th of April 2021 (cseverin): Document attached, however several of the parts of the document, seem to have not been filled in, please double check if all sections have been filled in.

21st of April 2021 (cseverin): Yes, thanks for double checking and confirming.

Agency Response

15 April 2021

All SRIF sections to be completed at PIF stage are indeed complete – see specifically section 3.

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5th of April 2021 (cseverin): Partly, 14 LOEs have been uploaded. Please ensure that all LOEs have been signed by the OFP from each country. The OFP signature from Palau and Samoa can not be confirmed on the GEF OFP list. Please double check and make sure to upload LOEs signed by the proper persons. Secondly, it seems that four of the LOEs are mentioning Tonga funding (Tuvalu, Palau, Niue and Cooks), that apparently is not part of the project and has not been included in the Tonga LOE.

21st of April 2021 (cseverin): Palau LOE has been uploaded. Samoa has an OFP, please obtain LOE from Samoa and upload

23rd of April 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

27th of April 2021 (cseverin): No, the LoE from Papua New Guinea has not been signed. Please request Mr. Joku to sign the letter.

29th of April 2021 (cseverin): LOE from PNG is still missing. please upload LOE, or alternatively delete PNG from the country list. If the latter, then please insert a footnote that describes how the project proponents will work towards obtaining the LOE before WP posting or during the PPG.

30 of April 2021 (cseverin): Revised LOE from PNG has been uploaded. Thank you for you

Agency Response

15 April 2021

The matter of LoE was discussed with the GEF Secretariat and it was agreed to get a new LoE for Palau now that there is a new focal point as at 02 April 2021. As referenced on the GEF Website, to-date Samoa does not have an OFP but only a political focal point. Revised LoEs could be re-secured at PPG stage by CEO endorsement.

23 April 2021

It turns out that the person who signed the Samoa LoE is now the official OFP. Please note the March 2021 LoE in the portal.

28 April 2021

PNG LoE is now signed manually.

29 April 2021

A revised signed LoE is now uploaded

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5th of April 2021 (cseverin): No, please review and address all comments and resubmit the project.

21st of April 2021 (cseverin): No, please address remaining issues and resubmit

26th of April 2021 (cseverin): Yes, PIF is recommended for technical clearance and inclusion into a future work program.

27th of April 2021 (cseverin): Please address comments and resubmit ASAP

29th of April 2021 (cseverin): Please address remaining comment and resubmit ASAP.

30th of April 2021 (cseverin): yes PIF is being recommended for technical clearance

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

PIF Review Agency Response

First Review	4/16/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

Pacific island ecosystems are being degraded from pollution, overfishing, and unsustainable management of coastal and ocean resources. This leads to coastal ecosystems being less resilient to absorb climate induced impacts. Ultimately the degradation of the ocean resources, leads to negative impacts on food and water security, loss of socio-economic opportunities and ultimately to climate-induced migration. The Pacific I2I Project will assist the 14 Pacific Island nations to build resilience to climate change by assisting countries to develop and implement EEZ-scale marine spatial plans to protect, restore and manage their blue carbon resources, and to invest in soft-engineering approaches to coastal adaptation.

The over-arching goal of the Pacific I2I Regional Project is to preserve and safeguard the health of ocean ecosystems while catalyzing the development and growth of sustainable blue economies (SBE) in Pacific Island Countries.

This will be achieved through supporting the delivery of one regional and 14 national sustainable blue economy plans, which in turn will inform national and regional priority setting and investment planning. Moreover priority sustainable blue economy actions will be identified and national implementation will be undertaken to demonstrate (1) conservation and restoration of natural capital and ecosystem services; (2) pollution reduction and waste management; (3) climate change; and (4) emerging opportunities in ocean-based economic sectors.

Ultimately the project will improve awareness and understanding of the challenges and solutions to sustainable use and management of the natural capital assets and ecosystems services of the ocean and encourage wider support and increased investment to address threats to ocean health for ocean wealth.

The Sustainable Blue Economy Plans will map the ocean resources within the EEZ and beyond, which in turn will be essential to inform political decision making and investment opportunities. Moreover, these SBEs will lead to identification of new technologies, processes and systems that will support a healthy ocean ecosystems governance process, that includes the broadest set of stakeholders, from public and private sectors. This approach will in turn facilitate up-scaling and implementation of SBE priority investment projects at the national and regional levels.