

Mainstreaming climate change and ecosystem-based approaches into the sustainable management of the living marine resources of the WCPFC

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10394

Countries

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

Project Name

Mainstreaming climate change and ecosystem-based approaches into the sustainable management of the living marine resources of the WCPFC

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

9/14/2021

Review completed by PM

11/15/2021

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

6th of October 2021 (cseverin): Partly. At PIF, IW 1-2 was indicated. At CEO Endorsement, IW 1-1 is also included. Please explain and justify this deviation.

3rd of November 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 1 Nov 2021

This was added in to address the proposed GEF 7 investment under Sustaining healthy coastal and marine ecosystems which focuses on formulating and formalizing cooperative legal and institutional frameworks built on TDAs/SAPs approach, towards addressing the multiple anthropogenic pressures, including climate related effects in the Large Marine Ecosystems. This OFMP III will aim to institutionalize the SAP process

developed and endorsed under OFMP II and implement it effectively with an emphasis on the climate related effects. The primary aim of this UNDP/GEF Project supporting the FFA member countries is to assist in implementing the SAP. Output 4.1.3 aims to ?Foster and promote collaborative mechanisms with LMEs, Regional Seas Conventions and RFMOs in order to better manage and sustain an overall healthy ecosystem and to catalyze cooperative sustainable fisheries management?.

However, the primary focus of this project is undoubtedly IW 1-2 and the document has now been amended to revert back to this.

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

6th of October 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address following points:

1) Please reformulate the Objective as a concise one-sentence statement. It is currently five sentences, which convolutes the overall objective. Most of this text should go under ?Alternative Scenario?.

1.a) Translating the ?proposed SAP strategies more specifically into an appropriate set of GEF project components? is not an objective in itself.

1.b) The ?overarching objective...? is different than the PIF objective. If the project objective has changed from PIF, please provide justification. The overarching objective ?to mainstream climate change and ecosystem-based approaches into the sustainable management of the highly migratory fish stocks of the Western and Central Pacific Ocean? is missing a few words. Should it be ?to mainstream climate change adaptation/mitigation/resilience and ecosystem-based management approaches...??

2) The expected outcomes are not quantified. the entire RF in section B is primarily utilizing words such as strengthened, improved, foster, promote and the like. This is not the first investment in the region on tuna, hence it is expected that this investment will deliver quantifiable results, above and beyond number of people trained or engaged with. Please revise accordingly so that outcomes are measurable.

3) The mandate for IW to finance this investment is the investment's ability to support the implementation of the SAP. SAP priorities that the investment will be aligned with need to be clearly identified in the project description summary. Please ensure that project outcomes and outputs in Table B are amended accordingly.

4) Language of Output 1.1.2, 2.1.3 and 2.2.1 and removal of 2.2.2 are deviations from the PIF. Please explain and justify this deviation.

5) Baseline and targets should be placed under 'Expected Outcomes' rather than 'Project Outputs'. The baseline refers to 2018 under Output 2.1.1. Has more recent baseline not been determined in PPG? The baseline figures under Output 4.1.1 are from 2019. Please revise to at least 2020 figures if they exist.

6) There is an issue with Core Indicator 5. Indicator 5.1 includes a target of certifying 36000000 fisheries. This surely is a typo, as that most likely will be most global fisheries. Please make the needed edit and include an explanation on this change in scope, as that will impact the amount of HAs promised at PIF stage. Finally, please note that indicator 5 does not roll up across the sub indicators to Core Indicator 5.

3rd of November 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

9th of November 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address following two points and resubmit urgently

1. M&E budget under section 9 shows \$189,800 while the budget table under Annex E \$159,800 - please ask the Agency to amend so both figures match

2. Technical input of the Project Manager: project manager has to be charged to the GEF portion and the co-financing portion of the PMC

15th of November 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

16th of November 2021 (cseverin): No, please address following comments:

1- Differences in figures between M&E budget under section 9 (\$189,800) and the budget table under Annex E (\$159,800): while in the Review Sheet the Agency acknowledges that 'This was due to an error in the Annex with a figure of \$30,000 having been placed in the incorrect column. This has now been rectified to align with figure in Section 9 in the Project Document' however, the \$30,000 continue being placed in the M&E budget under section 9 and the differences between both figures were not amended - please amend.

2- Project staff (Project Manager) still is charged to the project components and PMC. While it is true that per Guidelines 'Terms of reference have to be provided for the positions charging to both components and PMC', also in Guidelines it is stipulated that costs associated with the execution of the projects (including project's staff) has to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. This project allocated enough co-financing funds allocated to PMC (4,47 million) - also note that out of 93.2

million in co-financing, 16.2 million are represented in grants. Please address by fully charging the project's staff (the position mentioned above) to PMC.

Agency Response

Agency Response 8 Dec 21

1. M&E Budget - This was due to an error in the Annex with a figure of \$30,000 having been placed in the incorrect column. This has now been rectified to align with figure in Section 9 in the Project Document

2. The principal position of Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) is a multi-faceted role that includes project management and technical advice/input. The CTA management inputs are captured under the 5% PMC costs (\$10,000 P.A) and the other time-consuming technical inputs are captured under the relevant Project Components, as is defined within the budget notes in the Project Document.

The other main full-time post for the project is the Finance and Administration Officer. This post is purely managerial/administrative and the entire salary is therefore captured under the 5% PMC costs (\$50,000 P.A. over 5 years). This is also defined within the budget notes.

During the project development phase, UNDP has sought support from the co-financing partners to commit resources towards the GEF portion of PMC (project staff, consultants, office space, etc.). While no cash co-finance for the GEF PCU staff could be mobilized, FFA generously donated office space for the GEF financed team valued at \$72,000 per year or \$360,000 for the duration of the project, as cash co-finance towards the PMC.

UNDP has explored all possible co-financing options to support both the Project activities as well as the necessary posts and consultancies to deliver these activities. The following provides a break-down of the co-financing that has been specifically identified by the relevant co-funders to be allocated to support the overall PMC:

Forum Fisheries Agency = \$1,177,217

Pacific Community (SPC) = \$1,806,527

PNAO = \$155,530

Total = \$3,139,274. This represents contributions from the three aforementioned co-financing partners toward Project Management. As negotiated by UNDP and confirmed by the relevant co-funders, this represents the following contributions to project management:

? Forum Fisheries Agency will provide office space, facilities, utilities and communications systems to the GEF-financed FFA project staff positions for the duration of the project. This PMC co-finance is estimated at US\$ 2,000 per head a month for a total of US\$ 6,000 per month and US\$ 72,000 per year for a total contribution of US\$ 360,000 for the life of the project. The remainder (\$817,217) represents other PMC under FFA's grant and in-kind co-finance to the project.

? The Pacific Community (SPC) will provide office space, facilities, utilities, administrative support and communications systems to support the GEF-financed consultants at SPC including for the Senior Fisheries Scientist (Climate Change and Ecosystem Analysis), Data System Analyst (National Level Advisor) and the Fisheries Scientist (National Level Advisor) for the duration of the project. This aspect of the PMC co-finance is estimated at US\$ 3,000 per head a month for a total of US\$ 9,000 per month and US\$ 108,000 per year for a total contribution of US\$ 540,000 for the life of the project. The staff support costs have been estimated by SPC to be in the order of \$493,569 for the project lifetime. Other management costs for the substantial technical inputs from scientific and technical staff across the board from other core budget and project sources that feed into the Project work in SPC amount to \$300,000. The remainder (\$472,958) represents SPC management and administrative in-kind contributions to management meetings of the SPC that are of direct relevance and support to the Project. These will include the annual meetings of the Committee of Representatives of Governments and Administrations, Head of Fisheries Meetings, support from SPC to the WCPFC (Tuna Commission) meetings as its scientific provider, ABNJ and Maritime Boundaries Working Sessions and High-Level Dialogue, High Seas Allocations Workshops, etc.

? PNAO will provide a part-time coordinator in its offices to liaise directly with the Project Management Team at FFA (= \$155,530).

The overall Co-Financing allocated in the Project for the Project Management Costs comes to \$4,474,592. After accounting for the above, the balance of \$1,335,318 represents:

? In-kind in-country Project Management by the 14 countries at \$19,000 per year x 5 years = \$1,330,000

In-Kind contribution from PITIA (The Pacific Islands Tuna Industry Association) to management and administration within their organisation in support of Project activities = 5,318

Agency Response 15 Nov 21

1. M&E Budget - This was due to an error in the Annex with a figure of \$30,000 having been placed in the incorrect column. This has now been rectified to align with figure in Section 9 in the Project Document

2. .

The principal position of Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) is a multi-faceted role that includes project management and technical advice/input. The CTA management inputs are captured under the 5% PMC costs (\$10,000 P.A) and the other time-consuming technical inputs are captured under the relevant Project Components, as is defined within the budget notes in the Project Document.

The other main full-time post for the project is the Finance and Administration Officer. This post is purely managerial/administrative and the entire salary is therefore captured under the 5% PMC costs (\$50,000 P.A. over 5 years). This is also defined within the budget notes.

During the project development phase, UNDP has sought support from the co-financing partners to commit resources towards the GEF portion of PMC (project staff, consultants, office space, etc.). While no cash co-finance for the GEF PCU staff could be mobilized, FFA generously donated office space for the GEF financed team valued at \$72,000 per year or \$360,000 for the duration of the project, as cash co-finance towards the PMC.

UNDP has explored all possible co-financing options to support both the Project activities as well as the necessary posts and consultancies to deliver these activities. The following provides a break-down of the co-financing that has been specifically identified by the relevant co-funders to be allocated to support the overall PMC:

Forum Fisheries Agency = \$1,177,217

Pacific Community (SPC) = \$1,806,527

PNAO = \$155,530

Total = \$3,139,274. This represents contributions from the three aforementioned co-financing partners toward Project Management. As negotiated by UNDP and confirmed by the relevant co-funders, this represents the following contributions to project management:

? Forum Fisheries Agency will provide office space, facilities, utilities and communications systems to the GEF-financed FFA project staff positions for the duration of the project. This PMC co-finance is estimated at US\$ 2,000 per head a month for a total of US\$ 6,000 per month and US\$ 72,000 per year for a total contribution of US \$ 360,000 for the life of the project. The remainder (\$817,217) represents other PMC under FFA's grant and in-kind co-finance to the project.

? The Pacific Community (SPC) will provide office space, facilities, utilities, administrative support and communications systems to support the GEF advisory staff being the Senior Fisheries Scientist (Climate Change and Ecosystem Analysis), Data System Analyst (National Level Advisor) and the Fisheries Scientist (National Level Advisor) for the duration of the project. This aspect of the PMC co-

finance is estimated at US\$ 3,000 per head a month for a total of US\$ 9,000 per month and US\$ 108,000 per year for a total contribution of US \$540,000 for the life of the project. The staff support costs have been estimated by SPC to be in the order of \$493,569 for the project lifetime. Other management costs for the substation technical inputs from scientific and technical staff across the board from other core budget and project sources that feed into the Project work in SPC amount to \$300,000. The remainder (\$422,950) represents SPC management and administrative in-kind contributions to management meetings of the SPC that are of direct relevance and support to the Project. These will include the annual meetings of the Committee of Representatives of Governments and Administrations, Head of Fisheries Meetings, support from SPC to the WCPFC (Tuna Commission) meetings as its scientific provider, ABNJ and Maritime Boundaries Working Sessions and High-Level Dialogue, High Seas Allocations Workshops, etc.

? PNAO will provide a part-time coordinator in its offices to liaise directly with the Project Management Team at FFA (= \$155,530).

The overall Co-Financing allocated in the Project for the Project Management Costs comes to \$4,474,592. After accounting for the above, the balance of \$1,335,318 represents:

? In-kind in-country Project Management by the 14 countries at \$19,000 per year x 5 years = \$1,330,000

In-Kind contribution from PITIA (The Pacific Islands Tuna Industry Association) to management and administration within their organisation in support of Project activities = 5,318

Agency Response 1 Nov 2021

1. Reformulated in Portal to reflect what is in ProDoc and CEO ER

1.a. Removed and Objective re-worded as per below 1.b)

1.b. Yes, the suggestions from the GEF Review provide a more accurate and appropriate description of the overarching objectives. We have now replaced previous ones in the ProDoc and the CEO ER as: ?To mainstream climate change adaptation and resilience and ecosystem-based management approaches into the sustainable management of the highly migratory fish stocks of the West and Central Pacific Ocean?

2. Outcomes have now been quantified in detail with baseline figures and targets as appropriate, both in Table B as well as in the Results Frameworks.

3. The linkages between Outcomes and Outputs and the SAP priorities/ objectives are defined and explained in Annex H - The Theory of Change. However, for greater simplification, these have now also been lifted up into Table B.

4. Explanation of changes to language of Outputs and deviations from the PIF

From PIF	In Latest ProDoc and CEO ER	Explanations
Output 1.1.2 More timely and effective implementation of National Tuna Management Plans along with Eco- Labelling and offloading requirements	Output 1.1.2 Timely and effective implementation of National Tuna Management Plans and associated ?Traceability? Strategies	At the Validation Workshop, WWF as a partner noted that it would wish to see the Project support and promote ?traceability? and blockchain work for monitoring and maintaining sustainability of the fisheries and wanted to work closely with the Project on these aspects. ?Traceability? covers and includes the Eco-Labelling and Offloading aspects but goes further inasmuch as it includes the overall ability to fully trace a product from the point of sale back to its point of origin and it also
Output 2.1.3 Develop enhanced mechanisms and improved technology for catch documentation and tracking and traceability of vessels and associated catch products. This will include A. closer vessel tracking using state-of-the-art satellite/remote sensing technologies as well as B. requirements for ?chain-of-custody? and tracking of catches and shipment of products through to final markets (e.g. Blockchain technologies)	Output 2.1.3 Review existing mechanisms for strengthening vessel tracking as well as tracking/tracing provenance and movement of catches to the market and feasibility of introducing any new and/or potential improvements, in partnership with industry	The revised wording was proposed by the beneficiaries in the Project Review and Validation Workshop. It reflects that fact that a lot has already been achieved in relation to catch documentation and vessel tracking. Output 1.1.2 above now covers much of the ?traceability? aspect including include A. closer vessel tracking using state-of-the-art satellite/remote sensing technologies as well as B. requirements for ?chain-of-custody? and tracking of catches and shipment of products through to final markets (e.g. Blockchain technologies). What is really needed now is closer working relationships and partnerships with the industry and member-driven certification processes which this new wording and activities covers. It also has been expanded to include a Stakeholder and Partnership Workshop on supply chain traceability in conjunction with potential improvements in electronic data capture and better use of ?blockchain? platforms, vessel tracking and countering IUU

Output 2.2.1 Improved FAD management including control of deployment, and tracking and other mechanisms to optimise sustainable target stock catches, reduce bycatch and reduce ecological impacts from loss of FADs (e.g. Through use of LED lights)	Output 2.2.1 Improved FAD management and design including tracking, log sheets, and other mechanisms to optimise sustainable target stock catches, reduce bycatch/entanglement and reduce ecological impacts from loss of FADs.	Output description rationalized and expanded to capture both expectations from Output 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 (as recommended by the Project Beneficiaries)
Output 2.2.2 Collaborate with relevant stakeholders (including Private sector) to promote the design, manufacture and marketing/use of bio-degradable FADs and FADs that minimize impacts on non-target species (e.g. through avoiding entanglement)	Query as to why 2.2.2.removed?	Output 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 have been combined as this was more logical and the previous iteration under the two Outputs had duplications and overlaps. All of the intended deliverables are now captured under one Output.

5. Baseline and Targets moved to Outcomes instead of Outputs as requested and figures on baseline and targets updated to 2020-2021

6. Core Indicator 5 issue now resolved in CEO ER and ProDoc Annexes. %1 Number of Fisheries that meet national or international third-party certification?etc. This has been updated with the latest figures from 2021 and a footnote of explanation added to the Core Indicator Worksheets in both the CEO ER and the ProDoc

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

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

6th of October 2021 (cseverin): [Partly, please address following issues:](#)

1) Where co-financing truly meets the definition of "in-kind", it should typically be classified as "recurrent expenditures" rather than "investment mobilized". Please provide justification for in-kind ?investment mobilized? by the ?PNA? (US\$15,567,155).

2) There is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. The GEF contribution to PMC is 4.8%. For a co-financing of \$92,920,668, the expected contribution to PMC must be \$4,460,192.06 (4.8%) instead of \$5,210,411.00 (which is 5.6%). 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.

3) Please spell out all acronyms in the co-financing table.

4) There is little private sector financing (\$200,000). Please explain this reasoning.

3rd of November 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 1 Nov 2021

1. The Investment Mobilised for PNA is equivalent to \$2,625,000. The rest (\$15,567,155) is in-kind (recurrent). An explanation of the Investment Mobilised amount is now included under Table C. Confirmed Sources of Co-Financing on P.12 of the CEO ER

2. Co-financing figures in Table B now rebalanced and adjusted to reflect 4.8% to Project Management Costs and to capture increased co-financing (as per Point 4 below)

3. Acronyms spelled out

4. Private sector co-financing now confirmed at \$500,000 and all appropriate tables amended /increased.

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 6th of October 2021
(cseverin): Yes

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6th of October 2021 (cseverin): Yes

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
6th of October: Partly., Please address issues pertaining to CI 5, as described above
3rd of November 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response
Agency Response 1 Nov 2021

Issues addressed and covered above under section 2. Point 6

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

6th of October 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address following:

- 1) In general, this section could be strengthened with quantitative data to make a better case/more convincing argument for this project. Please amend accordingly.
- 2) The root causes are determined through the causal chain analysis (as part of the TDA), which is included as Annex G. However, the barriers that need to be overcome is not present. Please revise accordingly.
- 3) This document should be able to be read as standalone from the PIF. Please bring forward the text included in the PIF under ?The Outstanding Issues and Causal Chain Analysis?.

3rd of November 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 1 Nov 2021

1. The entire section under ?The Global Environmental and/or Adaptation Problems?? (CEO ER), and under the Development Challenge (ProDoc) has now been strengthened with more quantitative data that defines the efforts that have already been made and the need for improved and agreed harvest control rules in the struggle to maintain sustainability.

2. Causal Chain Analysis revised to show Barriers and Barriers highlighted now in text

Text from PIF brought forward into CEO ER under Project Justification and also add to ProDoc under Development Challenges

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6th of October 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please be more specific when describing which experiences (the project will build on the many experiences, examples and precedents within the region over the past two decades that have finally led to establishing a sustainable fishery within this region.... and will take advantage of the many

partnerships created through previous GEF supported initiatives in this region...) that will be build on

3rd of November 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 1 Nov 2021

Additional Section added now to the baseline to cover this

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

6th of October 2021 (cseverin): No, please address following:

- 1) Please include a write up describing any and all deviations from the PIF.
- 2) While the outcomes have been elaborated on, there is insufficient- to no detail on what the project outputs are and what the project will actually do. For example, how will the project specifically go about improving access to pelagic food resources for local communities under Output 3.2.1? How will the project provide technical and business-level assistance to PICs in promoting domestic fishery development and establishing local value-added fishing ventures under Output 1.2.2? What are the sub-activities? This needs to be elaborated on for each project output.
- 3) Each Component should include a summary of the overall component structure before moving to a discussion of project outcomes and then to project outputs.
- 4) Please ensure the identified barriers to be overcome are mapped to project components, outputs and outcomes.

3rd of November 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 1 Nov 2021

1. Annex 1 added below showing all changes. This is now included in the CEO ER P.13.
2. Full details of Outputs and Activities to achieve Outputs now pasted across from ProDoc into CEO ER
3. Detailed description of component structure (as elaborated in the Project Document) has now been added to the CEO ER

Barriers are now mapped to the SAP Objectives and thence to the Components, outcomes and outputs. This is captured on P.11 of the ProDoc, P.18 & 19 of the CEO ER and within the Theory of Change

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6th of October 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please strengthen the description on how the project aligns with the [GEF's priority to invest in projects to support SAP implementation](#).

Further, the SDG discussion does not fit under this section. Please move it to Consistency with National Priorities and reframe it along those lines or place it under Global Environmental Benefits.

3rd of November 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 1 Nov 2021

Appropriate text copied from the GEF-7 Programming Directions for International Waters

SGD discussion moved to Global Environmental Benefits in CEO ER (.22) and entire Global Environmental Benefits also copied into ProDoc (P.30)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6th of October 2021 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6th of October 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please provide quantifiable deliverables to the [global environmental benefits, where possible](#).

3rd of November 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 1 Nov 2021

Quantifiable deliverables added along with current baseline statistics on the sustainable fishery that need to be maintained

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

6th of October 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address following points:

- 1) Please include a description on how the project will be innovative.
- 2) Please insert sub headings, so that it is easier to identify the three sections ((1) innovativeness; (2) sustainability; and (3) potential for scaling up)

3rd of November 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 1 Nov 2021

1. Section on Innovation expanded with clearer linkages to Component 2 which is entirely dedicated to the development and implementation of innovative fisheries management strategies and technology
2. Expanded text provided to both CEO ER and ProDoc under separate headings of Innovativeness, Sustainability, and Scaling and Replication

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

6th of October 2021 (cseverin): No, please insert a map and coordinates into the portal submission.

3rd of November 2021 (cseverin): Addressed, inserted as annex D in the portal submission.

Agency Response

Agency Response 1 Nov 2021

An accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information/map is included in both the CEO ER and the ProDoc. UNDP to ensure that this has been uploaded separately into 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

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

6th of October 2021 (cseverin): No, please address following points:

- 1) Please insert stakeholder matrix into portal submission, which will provide an overview of the main stakeholders, along with their roles and responsibilities during project implementation.
- 2) Please elaborate on how and which stakeholders were engaged during PPG?
- 3) Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities is selected. Please explain how the project is following/ will follow the GEF's principles and guidelines for engagement with indigenous peoples.
- 4) Please explain why civil society will only part take in the projects in the form of "other engagements". It seems that it would be appropriate to have civil society part take in other roles too. It may be a lack of ticking specific boxes, please double check. Further, please elaborate on the engagements that will happen.
- 5) Please explain how the Covid-19 pandemic has affected stakeholder consultation during the PPG and how the project will engage stakeholders during implementation should the pandemic persist.

3rd of November 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 1 Nov 2021

1. Section on Stakeholders and Partners from ProDoc with the Matrix has now been uploaded to the portal.
2. The engagement with stakeholders during the PPG has now been captured under Stakeholder Engagement and South-South Cooperation (ProDoc P.31) and under Section 2 ? Stakeholders (P.36 CEO ER)
3. The details of the role of indigenous peoples and the manner in which the Project will follow the appropriate principles and guidelines for their engagement is presented now under the section in the ProDoc on ?Stakeholder Engagement and South-South Cooperation? and this section is also referred to in the CEO ER under 2. Stakeholders P.35
4. The role of civil society has been expanded (additional boxes ticked) and clarified in text in greater detail ? CEO ER P.35

The COVID concern has been addressed in several places now in both the ProDoc and the CEO ER, specifically where risks to the project are discussed (e.g. Under ?The Project Board? in the discussion on responsibilities; a new full section entitled ?Management under COVID 19 Constraints? and as an additional text to any mention of the PIR. Significantly, a further three risks have been added to the end of the UNDP RISK Register (Annex K of CEO ER and Annex 7 of the ProDoc)

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

6th of October 2021 (cseverin): Yes, however, please address following point:

When expanding on the description of the project outputs under ?Alternative Scenario?, please ensure that gender equality and empowerment-specific activities are clearly identified (and not all activities are gender neutral).

3rd of November 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

9th of November 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address below point and resubmit URGENTLY.

The submitted prodoc includes an annex titled gender analysis and action plan. In the section on gender in the portal it is stated that the Project will develop an appropriate gender analysis and gender action plan within 4 months of the Inception Meeting and also reference table. Considering that the gender analysis and action plan is very general, please provide describe the needed steps that will lead to the the action plan.

15th of November 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 15 Nov 21

This issue has now been clarified and confirmed as follows:

Project Document - Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment:

P.38 Annex 10 provides further elaboration by way of a preliminary Gender Analysis and Gender Mainstreaming Plan. The Project will develop a more detailed and appropriate gender analysis and gender action plan within four months of the Inception Meeting. The ESMF (Annex 17) clearly identifies this intention. The Plan will provide an analysis of gender inequalities and gender-based violence in the 14 SIDs as well as procedures to ensure that gaps associated with gender inequality and women empowerment are not exacerbated during project implementation.

And?

The Gender Action Plan (GAP) will provide a set of avoidance, mitigation, monitoring and institutional measures with an implementation plan to achieve the desired social and environmental sustainability outcomes. This plan must be implemented and updated throughout project implementation to ensure that all risks associated with Principle 3 Gender equality and Women Empowerment (from the Social and Environmental Screening) are further assessed and that the appropriate management measures are established to ensure SES compliance. The measures will be adopted and integrated into the project activities, monitoring and reporting framework and budget, and captured in a revised SESP. The GAP will take into account the requirements and measures under the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, as required. Additionally, the plan will take into consideration any limitations regarding the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, and make operational recommendations regarding the alignment of the Project with site-specific national guidelines and policies, and review cycles within the Project regarding those recommendations.

P.39. These will be developed more specifically and with detail of their intended outputs and deliverables through a Project Gender Analysis and Mainstreaming Plan immediately after inception (See above). Furthermore, a local Gender Consultant will be employed to provide input to the ESMF (Environmental and Social Management Framework) ? See Annex 17.

Annex 10 to ProDoc: Gender Analysis and Gender Mainstreaming Plan

P. 67: This preliminary Gender Analysis and Project Gender Mainstreaming Plan responds to GEF and UNDP guidance regarding gender mainstreaming in project development and implies that the needs, priorities, power structures, status, and relationship between men and women are identified and incorporated into the design, implementation, and evaluation of the project; in this way men and women can participate proportionally and benefit equally from the project intervention. The Project intends to develop a more detailed and appropriate gender analysis and gender action plan within four months of the Inception Meeting. The ESMF (Annex 17) clearly identifies this intention. The Plan will provide an analysis of gender inequalities and gender-based violence in the 14 SIDs as well as procedures to ensure that gaps associated with gender inequality and women empowerment are not exacerbated during project implementation.

P.70: As noted above and in the relevant section of the Project Document text under Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment), the Project will develop a more detailed and appropriate gender analysis and gender action plan within four months of the Inception Meeting. The Gender Mainstreaming Plan will be refined following project inception to ensure gender analysis is current and relevant and aligned with existing regional gender strategies and initiatives.

P.71: The Gender Action Plan (GAP) will provide a set of avoidance, mitigation, monitoring and institutional measures with an implementation plan to achieve the desired social and environmental sustainability outcomes. This plan must be implemented and updated throughout project implementation to ensure that all risks associated with Principle 3 Gender equality and Women Empowerment (from the Social and Environmental Screening) are further assessed and that the appropriate management measures are established to ensure SES compliance. The measures will be adopted and integrated into the project activities, monitoring and reporting framework and budget, and captured in a revised SESP. The GAP will take into account the requirements and measures under the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, as required. Additionally, the plan will take into consideration any limitations regarding the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, and make operational recommendations regarding the alignment of the Project with site-specific national guidelines and policies, and review cycles within the Project regarding those recommendations.

The following Table captures the planned gender equity and empowerment approaches for the various project Components and their Outcomes.

PROJECT COMPONENTS AND OUTPUTS	GENDER-RELATED ACTIVITIES AND RESPONSES
COMPONENT 1: IMPLEMENTATION OF A PROACTIVE AND ADAPTIVE ECOSYSTEM-BASED APPROACH TO REGIONAL FISHERIES MANAGEMENT	

Outcome 1.1	Institutional capacity building within the National Tuna Management and Development Plans will focus strongly on gender balance improvement and equity
Outcome 1.2	Number of staff that have undergone training on fisheries management techniques. These figures will be disaggregated by gender to demonstrate greater gender equity. Training through the stakeholder/partnerships programme will also focus on gender equity on business expansion in the domestic fisheries sector and on priority technical and scientific studies and data capture driving adaptive management processes
COMPONENT 2: INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION TO SUPPORT THE ADAPTIVE ECOSYSTEM-BASED APPROACH TO REGIONAL FISHERIES MANAGEMENT	
Outcome 2.1	port state monitoring and compliance for enforcement of catch documentation as well as improved tracking strategies and confirmation of provenance will endeavour to empower more female operatives at the port level.
COMPONENT 3: A REGIONAL STRATEGY FOR IMPROVED COMMUNITY SUBSISTENCE AND RESILIENCE TO CLIMATE CHANGE EFFECTS ON THE ECOLOGY AND FISHERIES OF THE REGION	
Outcome 3.2	Training provided in 100% of Pacific SIDS for alternative livelihoods and targeting at least 30% women and 50% youth in each Pacific SIDS. Alternative income generating activities from some 10 examples across 5 Pacific SIDS providing lessons and best practices with clear examples related to gender equity and youth
COMPONENT 4: KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT, PROJECT MONITORING AND EVALUATION	
Outcome 4.1	Support to strengthen the 'clearing house' role of the newly-formed PCCOS (Pacific Community Centre for Ocean Sciences) will include a gender equity and empowerment component.

CEO ER Section 3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment:

P.43 This is still considered to be a preliminary analysis and plan and the Project will develop a more detailed and appropriate gender analysis and gender action plan within four months of the Inception Meeting. This will aim to ensure that all gender analysis is current and relevant and aligned with existing regional gender strategies and initiatives. The Gender Action Plan (GAP) will provide a set of avoidance, mitigation, monitoring and institutional measures with an implementation plan to achieve the desired social and environmental sustainability outcomes. This plan will be implemented and updated throughout project implementation to ensure that all risks associated with Principle 3 Gender equality and Women Empowerment (from the Social and Environmental Screening) are further assessed and that the appropriate management measures are established to ensure SES compliance. The measures will be adopted and integrated into the project activities, monitoring and reporting framework and budget, and captured in a revised SESP. The GAP will take into account the requirements and measures under the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, as required. Additionally, the plan will take into consideration any limitations regarding the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, and make operational recommendations regarding the alignment of the Project with site-

specific national guidelines and policies, and review cycles within the Project regarding those recommendations?.

CEO ER Annex J:

P.93: This preliminary Gender Analysis and Project Gender Mainstreaming Plan responds to GEF and UNDP guidance regarding gender mainstreaming in project development and implies that the needs, priorities, power structures, status, and relationship between men and women are identified and incorporated into the design, implementation, and evaluation of the project; in this way men and women can participate proportionally and benefit equally from the project intervention. The Project intends to develop a more detailed and appropriate gender analysis and gender action plan within four months of the Inception Meeting. The ESMF (Annex 17) clearly identifies this intention. The Plan will provide an analysis of gender inequalities and gender-based violence in the 14 SIDs as well as procedures to ensure that gaps associated with gender inequality and women empowerment are not exacerbated during project implementation.

P.97: As noted above and in the relevant section of the Project Document text under Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment), the Project will develop a more detailed and appropriate gender analysis and gender action plan within four months of the Inception Meeting. The Gender Mainstreaming Plan will be refined following project inception to ensure gender analysis is current and relevant and aligned with existing regional gender strategies and initiatives.

P.97. The Gender Action Plan (GAP) will provide a set of avoidance, mitigation, monitoring and institutional measures with an implementation plan to achieve the desired social and environmental sustainability outcomes. This plan must be implemented and updated throughout project implementation to ensure that all risks associated with Principle 3 Gender equality and Women Empowerment (from the Social and Environmental Screening) are further assessed and that the appropriate management measures are established to ensure SES compliance. The measures will be adopted and integrated into the project activities, monitoring and reporting framework and budget, and captured in a revised SESP. The GAP will take into account the requirements and measures under the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, as required. Additionally, the plan will take into consideration any limitations regarding the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, and make operational recommendations regarding the alignment of the Project with site-specific national guidelines and policies, and review cycles within the Project regarding those recommendations.

Agency Response 1 Nov 2021

Appropriate references have now been added under the 'Alternative Scenario' that clarify which Outputs and their activities will be specifically targeting gender equity and empowerment. This has been further captured in an additional table added to the main text on 'Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment' in the ProDoc P. 34 and similarly in that section in the CEO ER (P. 40)

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

6th of October 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please expand on what the Partnership Platform will do to help achieve the project outcomes. How will it be constituted? How will the project seek private sector involvement? What will be the Platform's mandate? How often will it meet? Etc.

3rd of November 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 1 Nov 2021

Explanation as required has now been added to the documents. See P.29 CEO ER and P. 23 ProDoc

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

6th of October 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please include a separate matrix that focuses on the specific risks associated with Covid-19 should be included. Please provide a more thorough analysis of the potential impacts (including both opportunities and constraints) of the pandemic to the project (both short term and long term). Please also describe the risks of the pandemic to project sustainability and how these will be overcome.

3rd of November 2021 (cseverin): Addressed. Instead of a separate COVID matrix being uploaded, the proponents have ensured that COVID risks have been mainstreamed into the document and specific risks included in the risk matrix.

Agency Response

Agency Response 1 Nov 2021

This information has now been added under the sections on Project Management and Project Organisational Structure (p.30 and 32 in CEO ER and in various places in the

main ProDoc. Its has also been added in three new sections at the end of the UNDP Risk Register in both documents

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

6th of October 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please [include a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and/or other initiatives in the project area.](#)

3rd of November 2021 (cseverin): Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response 1 Nov 2021

This has now been expanded under 'Coordination with other GEF Project's and relevant Initiatives on P.44 of the CEO ER and P. 23 of the ProDoc.

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

6th of October 2021 (cseverin): Yes

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

6th of October 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please insert a more detailed description on how the project will be allocation a minimum of 1% of the GEF Grant to support the project's activities aligned with IWLEARN, such as formulation of a minimum of two experience notes, results notes, participation in regional and global IWLEARN meetings. Further, it

should also be clear that the project will be producing a website and ensure participation of the PCU as well as national representatives to the biannual IWCs.

3rd of November 2021 (cseverin): Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response 1 Nov 2021

This has now been addressed under the description of Component 4: Knowledge Management and Sharing on P.31 of CEO ER and P. 23 of ProDoc

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

6th of October 2021 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6th of October 2021 (cseverin) Yes

Agency Response

Benefits

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6th of October 2021 (cseverin) Yes

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6th of October 2021 (cseverin) Yes

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6th of October 2021 (cseverin): It is noted that the project results framework has more quantifiable indicators compared to Table B. Please explore if there is an opportunity to cross reference some of the quantifiable targets in to table b.

3rd of November 2021 (cseverin): Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response 1 Nov 2021

Appropriate quantifiable targets have now been migrated across to the Outcomes in Table B.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 6th of October 2021

(cseverin): Yes, council comments has been addressed

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 6th of October 2021

(cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6th of October 2021 (cseverin): Please insert map and coordinates as noted earlier in review.

3rd of November 2021 (cseverin): Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response 1 Nov 2021

Maps and Coordinates are in the ProDoc and CEOER. That have also now been uploaded to the Portal as appropriate.

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

6th of October 2021 (cseverin): No, Please address above comments.

3rd of November 2021 (cseverin): Yes, CEO Endorsement is being recommended.

9th of November 2021 (cseverin): No, please address above three points and resubmit ASAP

15th of November 2021 (cseverin): Yes, CEO Endorsement is being recommended.

16th of November 2021 (cseverin): No, please address above two points and resubmit urgently.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

Highly migratory fish stocks represent some of the world's most threatened marine species due to the diverse range of pressures they encounter and as a result of the high commercial value of many of these pelagic species, many of which are shared between nations. Cooperation among coastal countries is therefore necessary to manage these fisheries. The Pacific Ocean is home to some of the world's most abundant populations of tuna species such as albacore, skipjack and yellowfin as well as bigeye, and to billfish species such as marlin and swordfish. In the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) several countries, fish commercially for these species, representing an annual multi-billion dollar industry.

The project will mainstream ecosystem-based management approaches and climate change adaptation and resilience into the sustainable management of the highly migratory fish stocks of the Western and Central Pacific Ocean.

This project will follow up on the implementation of this regionally agreed Strategic Action Program. In doing so, the project will deliver benefits and advantages not just at the regional level but also at the global level through enhancing its sustainable fisheries given the outsize impact of a fishery that represents some 55-60% of global tuna catch.

Projected environmental changes in the tropical Pacific are considered to be some of the most severe in the global ocean according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), especially when these changes are considered in the context of the low natural climate variability in this region. Furthermore, because this is the only sustainable oceanic fishery globally, the value of the WCPO tuna fisheries can be expected to attract increased commercial pressure for higher catches in future.

The project will strengthen and encourage collaboration among major regional stakeholders such as the Regional Seas Programme(s) and Convention(s), other overlapping and neighboring Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs) and the private sector in order to protect the ecosystem and its living marine resources from further degradation and impact.

.