



Global Coordination Project for the Common Oceans ABNJ Program

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10626

Countries

Global

Project Name

Global Coordination Project for the Common Oceans ABNJ Program

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

11/29/2021

Review completed by PM

2/3/2022

Program Manager

Christian Severin

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

8th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response NA

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

8th of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address below comments:

- 1) It is understood that this project, with its coordination focus, will have fewer tangible/measurable outcomes than the technical projects under the program. But please quantify project outcomes in Table B, where possible. To do so, please bring the quantifiable output indicators and final targets from Annex A forward to Table B.
- 2) One of the most impactful ways of illustrating delivery on the program, that this project will support through coordination, will be sharing of achievements, advances and results. Please ensure to include clearer description of such activities in the Results Framework. Moreover, please also include the anticipated number and frequency of such Results Reports in the results framework
- 3) Please also ensure that the figures included in the GEF Core Indicator section are reflected upon in Table B.

4) Please insert reference into results framework (Table B), probably under component 3, to the fact that 1% of the GEF grant will be supporting IWLEARN activities and participation in regional and global events organized by IWLEARN.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

8th of February 2022 (cseverin): No, please address following:

1) Budget table: Program Manager is charged across all components and PMC. We found only three TORs, one for the Global Steering Committee, one for Global Program Coordinator, and one for M&E Officer. We assume that the Global Program Coordinator might be equivalent to the Program Manager position indicated in the budget table below ? if that is the case, please include the correct position title in the budget table. Also, the TOR indicates project management tasks plus technical oversight and support only for Output 1.1.1, which doesn't justify the charge across component 2 and 3 below ? kindly amend

2) In Table B the figure of the cost of Component 1 is \$688,912 while in Budget table in Annex E in Portal (whose calculation is correct) the figure is \$602,262 (see screenshots below). Please make sure there is coherency between the entries.

8th of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

FAO 8th of February 2022

1) The label for the budget line covering the cost of the Project Manager as been changed to Global Program Coordinator to make it consistent with the correspondent ToR.

The ToR of the Global Program Coordinator has been updated to indicate the technical tasks to be delivered under each of the Project's outputs, whose costs are reflected in the project's budget.

Kindly note that the *Annex N-Draft ToRs* has been updated consistently in the GEF Agency Project Document (uploaded in the roadmap of the submission). *Annex N-Draft ToRs* has been also uploaded as standalone document for ease reference.

2) The total for the Project's Component 1 is now consistent to \$688,912 across the submission, i.e. Table B and Budget table in Annex E in Portal.

The difference was due to the M&E costs, which are part of Component 1. This was reflected in Table B but not in the budget table where the M&E column did not sum up to the total of the Component 1. Thank you for spotting the mistake.

Kindly note that the revised Project's Budget has been uploaded in the roadmap of the submission for ease reference.

1) Agreed. Project outcomes and outputs include quantitative targets to the extent possible. This is reflected in the results framework and Table B.

2) Agreed. Description in logframe changed and results reports and associated target values included.

3) Agreed. Relevant GEF Core indicators (7.4 and 11) are reflected in table B.

4) Agreed. IW:Learn allocation included in results framework and table B.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response NA

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

8th of December 2021 (cseverin): No. Please address below points:

1) There is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution to PMC is kept at 4.8% of the total project cost, for a co-financing of \$9,773,901, the expected contribution to PMC must be \$465,237 instead of \$800,890 (which is 8.2%). As the costs associated with the project management must be covered by the GEF portion and co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the co-financing contribution to PMC should be decreased to reach a similar level. Please adjust accordingly (including adjusting the co-financing figures for each Component accordingly).

2) Please label WWF-US as ?Donor Agency? and not ?Civil Society Organization?.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

8th of February 2022 (cseverin): No, please address following comment:

1) Co-finance provided by FAO ? typically Grants are ?Investment mobilized? instead of ?Recurrent expenditures?. Please revise or confirm that indeed this is Investment

mobilized. If the latter, please fill out the info about the FAO grant in the 'Investment Mobilized description' section.

2) WWF-US and CI ? change 'GEF Agency' to 'Donor Agency'?

8th of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

FAO 8th of February 2022

1. The confining of FAO is IN-KIND 'Recurrent expenditures?'. It was labelled as GRANT by mistake. Thank you for spotting the mistake.
2. WWF-US and CI has been labelled as 'Donor Agency?'.

1) Agreed. 4.8% of total co-financing is allocated for PMC. However, kindly note that this is not in line with the amounts allocated by partners in the co-financing letters.

2) the label of WWF-US has been set to 'Donor Agency'?

Note: one additional Co-financing letter from Conservation International has been added. This adds US\$482,355 in kind financing to the Project.

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 8th of December 2021

(cseverin): Yes

Agency Response NA

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 8th of December 2021

(cseverin): Yes

Agency Response NA

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

8th of December 2021 (cseverin): No, please address below points

1) Please provide an explanation for Core Indicator 11. How are the number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as a co-benefit of the GEF investment (6,000) derived and how will it be verified? This number seems low given that the nature of this project includes a focus on knowledge management, outreach and learning. Please ensure this figure is present in Table B and the Annex A results framework.

2) The Annex F GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet is missing. Please upload.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

1) Agreed. Explanation of calculation for CI 11 was added.

2) Annex F of the Agency ProDoc is the GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet. The Agency ProDoc is attached to the roadmap of the submission in the GEF Portal. For ease of reference, Annex F GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet has also been attached to the roadmap as a separate file now.

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

8th of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly. Please address following point:

1) please include a concise explanation of the barriers that need to be addressed (under a separate heading) and move the write up on the 'Contribution of the GCP Project to the Common Oceans Program' to the Child Project section. Some of the barriers are seemingly noted under the baseline scenario section and should be articulated here.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

Agreed, a concise explanation of the barriers that need to be addressed have been added in a new sub-sections under the headings 'Root Causes/drivers' and 'Barriers'.

The text on "Contribution of the GCP Project to the Common Oceans Program" moved to the Child Project section.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response NA

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

8th of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly. Please address following points:

1) Please clearly articulate the theory of change of this project in succinct narrative form based on the presented diagram.

2) As per the instruction for Table B, please quantify project outcomes in this section, where possible. Please also check to ensure each project output has tangibility in its phrasing.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

1) Agreed. Additional text was added to describe the logic of the ToC for the Project, after the presentation of the ToC diagram

2) Agreed. To the extent possible, project outcomes have been quantified in both the Results Framework and table B.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8th of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly. Please address following points:

1) Please pinpoint project alignment with phrasing in paragraphs 194 and 195 of the GEF-7 Programming Directions, which set out the overarching ABNJ strategy and the types of investments that are supported.

2) Please better describe how the project (under Component 3) aligns with the GEF's private sector engagement strategy.

3) Please describe how the project contributes to the GEF's Response to Covid-19 (supports transformational change to restore a balance between natural systems and human systems)?

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

1) Agreed. Text was added on how the Project and the Program aligns with GEF-7 Programming Directions at the end of section 1.a, subsection 8) under the heading Alignment with GEF-7 Programming Directions.

2) Agreed. Text was added at the end of section 4, under the heading Alignment with GEF Private Sector Engagement Strategy.

3) Agreed. Text was added at the of the Section 5, after the discussion of possible consequences of covid for the implementation of the Project.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8th of December 2021 (cseverin): No, the text provided in this section is NOT incremental reasoning. Please reformulate the section around the phrase "Without the GEF increment [...] will/will not happen?". The current write up is more a summary of what the project will do rather than the reasoning/need for incremental costs. Please make this reasoning more apparent. What is the value added that the GEF increment will provide?

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response Text in this section has been modified to emphasize the possible situation in the absence of a GEF investment.

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

8th of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly. Please address following comment:

1) Because this project has a program-level focus, please provide the overall *quantified* global environmental benefits that the Common Oceans program expects to contribute to.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response Agreed. Text was added showing a Table with Core Indicators target values for the child projects.in section 1.A (6) ?Global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?, and additional text under section 10 Benefits.

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

8th of December 2021 (cseverin): No. Please address following points

1) This section notes that the GCP will take an innovative approach to engaging the private sector and that activities for engaging the private sector in ?innovative ways? is listed under Component 3 of the work plan. However, this innovativeness needs to be clearly demonstrated under this section. Please elaborate accordingly.

2) The scalability element under this section is not sufficiently developed. Please elaborate accordingly.

3) How the project is sustainable is missing from this section. Please include a detailed description on project sustainability.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response Agreed. To address comments 1), 2) and 3), new text explaining the innovative approach implemented by the GCP to engage with the PS was added to section 4 on Private Sector Engagement, and scalability and sustainability elements were further developed under section 1.a, subsection 7, under the headings ?Scalability? and ?Sustainability?.

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

8th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response NA

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

8th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes. But please consider moving the 'Contribution of the Global Coordination Project to the Common Oceans Program' write up under section 1.a. to this section.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Cleared

Agency Response Agreed, done **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

8th of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly, stakeholder engagement during the design phase is sufficiently documented. However, please address following points:

1) A stakeholder engagement plan is provided in Annex I2. However, this plan is somewhat generic. Please better tailor it to the project's stakeholders.

2) This section notes that 'More details, including roles and responsibilities of stakeholders, methodology and findings during the Project preparation consultations, are provided in Annex M1 and M2.' Annexes M1 and M2 do not appear in the portal. Please upload.

3) This section also notes that detail on projected stakeholder consultation in the project implementation phase is found in Annex M, which is also missing in the portal.

4) Please explain how the Covid-19 pandemic has affected stakeholder consultation during the PPG phase and how the project will engage stakeholders during implementation should the pandemic persist.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

1), 2) and 3) Agreed. The stakeholder engagement plan in Annex I2 was expanded to address the comment and at the same time consolidated in section 2 and Annex I2. Incorrect references to Annexes M, M1 and M2 were fixed.

4) Stakeholder consultations have been conducted during the pandemic through the online meeting tools currently widely available. The major hurdles, apart from the well-known difficulties of having extended online meetings, has been that, because this is a global project/program contacting stakeholders and partners over a large number of time zones has created the need for splitting some meetings into two or more 'versions'. These were held at different times to accommodate the most extreme differences, which limited interaction to some extent and resulted in discussion of the same topics more than once.

While it currently seems that in-person meetings might be resumed later in 2022 (next round of BBNJ negotiations are expected to take place in-person in March 2022) the Project will be prepared to continue with online meetings if so required. In any case, more frequent use of online facilities will be encouraged to minimize the travel carbon impact when possible.

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

8th of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly.

This section provides an overview of the gender equality and women's empowerment challenges in ABNJ and outlines the gender analysis approach taken. However, the gender action plan matrix, which is a 'resulting product' of the gender analysis and is referred to as being included in the document, is not present, nor is it included as an annex in the portal. Please upload the GAP so that a full and thorough review of this section can be conducted. Please also include the gender analysis document, if possible.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response The ANNEX M GENDER ANALYSIS AND ACTION PLAN (GAP) was attached at the roadmap of the submission as well as at in the Portal's Section 3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. We can see the file in the roadmap of the submission. Please let us know in case you cannot see it.

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

8th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response NA
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

8th of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly. Please address following points:

- 1) Please elaborate on the meaning of 'Lack of participation from the child projects'.
- 2) Please explain whether there is a project implementation risk if BBNJ Agreement negotiations are further delayed.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

1) An effective coordination relies not only on the leadership and efforts from the PMU but also on the comparable efforts and contributions from the child projects. This was clear during the first Common Ocean Program where communication across the projects was not effective enough to have a cohesive program, as noted in the programmatic Terminal Evaluation. As part of the consultations with the other implementing agencies in the Program, there was an agreement to a series of principles that were incorporated in all project documents and that will be the basis for the commitment of the child projects to the efforts in coordination, lowering further this risk. (see section 1.c)

2) No implementation risk for the Project or the Program is anticipated if the BBNJ process is further delayed. The Cross-Sectoral Project, that will be more closely linked to the BBNJ Agreement is focused on providing capacity building to eligible countries to improve their ability to participate in the BBNJ process, now and when it comes into force. In this case, the ability of the Project to deliver is not dependent on a timely adoption of the final text, as it is meant to also accompany States during the negotiation process as well. In any case, latest news from the UNDOALOS is that in-person negotiations will resume in March 2022.

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

8th of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly. Please address following points:

- 1) The institutional arrangement for project implementation is fully described. However, Annex K, which is noted to contain details of FAO's role in internal organization is not included in the portal. Please upload.
- 2) For clarity, please change the heading 'Executing Agencies' to Executing Agency and Partners?.
- 3) A table that sets out relevant GEF-financed projects is included. The last column includes 'coordination approach?'. However, this is not sufficiently clear/elaborated for the purposes of this section. How will the project coordinate with these GEF projects? Please explain what the benefits of coordination with these projects are.
- 4) Relevance to international frameworks is articulated. But coordination with Non-GEF initiatives in the ABNJ is not present. Please elaborate accordingly.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

- 1) Annex K was uploaded in the roadmap of the submission as part of the Agency ProDoc. It is now also uploaded as standalone file.
- 2) Agreed. The heading in the institutional arrangement section was changed from 'Executing Agencies' to Executing Agency and Partners?.
- 3) Agreed. More detail was added, similar to that that was added in the Tuna Project, as those additions are more related to the programmatic goals mediated by the GCP in collaboration with the child projects.
- 4) Text added at the end of section 6 under heading 'Non-GEF initiatives in the ABNJ?'

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

8th of December 2021 (cseverin): No, even though this is a global investment supporting a suite of global investments, it is anticipated that this investment will directly be supporting national priorities in many if not all nations globally.

The section needs to much clearer be describing the project's alignment with national strategies through delivering on the objective.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response Agreed. Text has been added, emphasizing the alignment at the Program level with national priorities and international obligations.

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

8th of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly. Please address following points:

1) Knowledge management represents a significant component of the project. However, this section asks for a KM approach that includes a clear timeline and corresponding set of deliverables. Please amend accordingly.

2) As part of this KM section, please make specific reference to the fact that 1% of the GEF grant will be allocated to support IWLEARN activities, such as production of a website, production and delivery of minimum 2 experience notes and 1 results note, while also ensuring that the PCU part takes in regional and global IWLEARN events, such as the IWCs that will take place during the implementation. (This is stated under the coordination section, but should be stated and reinforced here).

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

1) Agreed. The section has been amended accordingly and now has a timeline and set of deliverables on knowledge management.

2) Agreed. New language on the 1% GEF grant allocation in support of IW:LEARN activities and elaboration on planned activities, has been added to the section.

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

8th of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response NA

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

8th of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly.

The text does not go far enough in describing the *socioeconomic* benefits. Please focus on beneficiaries and how the socioeconomic benefits (across the program) translate to supporting global environmental benefits.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response Agreed. Text has been added to that effect.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8th of December 2021 (cseverin): No. The annexes do not entirely follow the CEO entry for FSP Child template.

- 1) Annex D should be Calendar of Expected Reflows and not Project Map.
- 2) Annex E should be Project Map and not Project Budget Table.
- 3) Annex F should be GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet (which is missing);
- 4) Annex G should be the GEF Project Taxonomy Worksheet (which is missing).
- 5) A number of other Annexes referenced throughout the document are also missing in the portal. These are referenced under the specific sections.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

All the Annexes, following the order mentioned in the GEF Review were uploaded in the Roadmap of the Portal as part of the Agency ProDoc (Word document). Some of them (Gender Stakeholders, ESS, etc.) were also uploaded as standalone files in the related sections of the Portal.

A new version of the Agency ProDoc and Annexes has been uploaded in the roadmap. Hopefully this should fix solve the problem. Annex D is the Calendar of Expected Reflows, Annex E is the Project Map, etc.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response NA

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response NA

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8th of December 2021 (cseverin): Addressed. Please ensure that all child projects to program 10548 includes reflections and responses to the Council comments.

Agency Response All CPs to the Program 10548 include reflections and responses to the Council comments in their respective submissions.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8th of December 2021 (cseverin): STAP concurred with the Program, however, reflections has still been included in the submission. Thank you

Agency Response Thank you

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response NA

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response NA

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response NA

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8th of December 2021

(cseverin): All PPG funds have been either utilized or committed.

Agency Response NA

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8th of December 2021

(cseverin): Yes

Agency Response NA

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

NA

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 NA

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 NA

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8th of December 2021 (cseverin): No, please address the above comments.

3rd of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes, CEO Endorsement recommended

8th of February 2022 (cseverin): No, please address above comments

8th of February 2022 (cseverin): Yes, CEO Endorsement is recommended

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

This project is one of five child projects under the 'Common Oceans' programme (developed in collaboration by FAO, UNDP, UNEP and GEF) which aims to demonstrate and promote more comprehensive processes and integrated approaches to the sustainable use and management of the ABNJ. Its objective is to maximize the effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of GEF-7 investments in the Common Oceans program. It is considered the umbrella project of the program. It provides arrangements for the four other

child projects to collaborate (while retaining their individuality) to achieve large-scale impacts on the global management of the ABNJ.

To this end, the project will ensure efficient programme-wide coordination and monitoring of the four projects, while also being responsible for facilitating collaborative engagement by relevant entities that could play a major role in advancing transformational change; focus on knowledge management, communication and outreach and capacity building and contribute to sustained uptake and scaling of impacts; and enable the private sector to engage and invest in collective action to address ABNJ sustainability issues. In general, interlinking brings the four child projects together to ensure actions will be consistent and far reaching, since integrating these interventions will combine the views of different sectors and reach far more stakeholders than if done at a sector/individual level.

Global environmental benefits under the umbrella include 42 million ha of marine protected areas created or under improved management; 685 million hectares of marine habitat put under improved practices; 774,000 metric tons of over-exploited marine fisheries moved to more sustainable levels; and more than 25,000 people directly benefitting.