GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

Effectively Managing Networks of Marine Protected Areas in Large Marine Ecosystems in the ASEAN Region (ASEAN ENMAPS)

Basic Information

GEF ID
10873

Countries
Regional (Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand)

Project Title
Effectively Managing Networks of Marine Protected Areas in Large Marine Ecosystems in the ASEAN Region (ASEAN ENMAPS)

GEF Agency(ies)
UNDP

Agency ID
UNDP: 6375

GEF Focal Area(s)
Multi Focal Area

Program Manager
Leah Karrer

PIF

art 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

(Karrer, Oct 25, 2021). Yes.

(Karrer, September 22, 2021). No.
Please describe the BD mainstreaming results in the Alignment section on the BD Focal Area. And the Focal Area Outcomes need to be written into Table A next to BD 1-1 etc.

In addition, please address the following comments from PPO:
1. Regarding co-financing:
a. Five sources of co-financing, from Donor Agencies, have been categorized as in-kind investment mobilized when a large portion of in-kind co-financing should be categorized as Recurrent Expenditures. Kindly request the Agency to double check and confirm is these have been categorized adequately. Additionally “Asean Cooperation Projects” is not a co-financier per se. Please request the agency to correct and include the name of the co-financier. If it’s a mix of Donor Agencies then they can just leave the names of the mix of agencies.
b. Co-financing from WWF, Philippines, the EU, the Private Sector and more have been categorized as Investment Mobilized. The paragraph describing how Investment Mobilized was identified does not seem to reflect how any of these can be categorized as investment mobilized. Please request the agency to incldue this information in the paragraph below Table C.
2. Kindly note that we could only find the LoE for Thailand. LoEs for Philippines and Indonesia are missing. The LoE for Thailand stipulates funds for Thailand BD and for the Regional portion. In absence of the other LoEs, it is not possible to

Thailand stipulates funds for Thailand BD and for the Regional portion. In absence of the other LOEs, it is not possible to determine whether Tables A, B, D and E are correct. We will revisit after the complete set of LoEs are resubmitted.

3. On Gender equity: Fully agree with PM's comments that this project's statements with regard to gender equality and women's empowerment are generic and do not reflect even a basic understanding of how the gender issues may be affected by the project . In addition, the project states that it will include measures to address gender but it has not ticked any of the gender tags. Agency should also provide some indicative information on any measures to address the preliminary identified gender gaps.

4. In the Coordination section: As per the comment provided by the PM, it looks like the table in the Institutional Arrangements section includes countries (Cambodia and Viet Nam) that are no longer participating in this project. If so, please request the agency to delete.

Agency Response

Agency Response (21 Oct. 2021)

The BD Focal Area Outcomes are now included in Table A. The discussion of alignment of FA outcomes is expanded in the Alignment Section of the PIF.

1. Cofinancing

1. The table has been revised, please refer to Table C.
2. The explanations on the investment mobilized and recurrent expenditure have been added after Table C.

2. LOEs. The LOEs of Philippines and Indonesia are re-uploaded in the system.

3. Gender Equity. Please refer to Section 3 of the PIF (Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment). This part has been substantively revised to include gender mainstreaming strategies and specific activities on incorporating dimensions of gender equality. Indicators on gender will be incorporated in the design of the project to ensure that the project is inclusive and provides equal opportunity to the women sector, from designing and throughout the implementation phase.

4. Coordination: Cambodia has been deleted in the institutional arrangement for the project. Only the countries with LOEs were retained.

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?

project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 25, 2021). Yes.

Please ensure the following points are addressed during PPG:

1) As discussed, additional countries can be added during PPG (e.g. Viet Nam, Malaysia).

2) The CER will need to be clear that the project activities will focus on the 3 countries (or more if added). For example, the map shows candidate sites in Indonesia, Phlippines and Viet Nam which should be Thailand, not Viet Nam.

3) How the LMEs (projects, governance) will be involved in the project needs to be clear. This is especially important since most countries did not provide LOEs so are not directly involved through national activities, so the way to engage them is through the regional LMEs. This engagement may be through knowledge sharing.

4) While socioeconomic and governance aspects have been incorporated in a few places, it seems there is not a commitment to incorporating these aspects overall. For example the new 2nd paragraph in PASS notes 'The science-based approaches, which is the focus of Component 1 will define MPA networks in specific LMEs or across LMEs, identify new MPAs, support necessary management decisions to determine the scale of connectivity in the LMEs, and identify biological and spatial boundaries in conservation corridors between and among MPAs" without any mention of the socioeconomic and governance aspects. The socioeconomic and governance aspects are also still missing in the Barriers, GEBs, MPA and MPA Networks, and the "Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams sustainability and resilience below how the project mainstreams sustainability and resilience" sections. Please ensure socioeconomic, governance aspects are fully addressed along with ecological aspects during PPG.

5) The logic provided for $11M (including $1.5M from the GEF) for the first, research component is not sufficient. During PPG this amount needs to be reduced to maximum $1.0M from the GEF with strong justification given the wealth of existing information and need to focus on action.

6) Please edit the second cut off paragraph that starts missing the first word(s) so starts "other MPA sites…"

7) The Table B Component 1 Outcome and output need to state this point of identifying priority locales for MPAs, including priority existing and priority new MPAs, which is still not reflected in the revised text. The focus is on new MPAs as noted in Component 1, "identified potential new MPAs essential for the network". Please address during PPG.

8) Primary data collection under Component 1 needs to be limited to the LOE countries. This point has not been adequately addressed as indicated by the text noting, "During project implementation, supplementary analyses using primary data on species assemblages combined with information on larval exchange and habitat health validated or augmented with data on fishing pressure will be employed within the LMEs" which indicates plans to conduct research in countries regardless of whether they have LOEs.

9) Sustainable financing needs further consideration during PPG in Component 2 beyond what was explained.

10) For output 2.1.4, please clarify what is meant by "priority conservation investment projects". Also: what is the scale? Why only 22 What

10) For output 2.1.4, please clarify what is meant by "priority conservation investment projects". Also: what is the scale? Why only 2? What are the criteria for selecting sites? How are these different from the MPA sites selected/to be selected?

11) For output 2.1.4, please explain what you mean by "conservation investment projects" and please reconsider the reduction of investment projects to only one per country. There are only 3 countries, so would seem more than 2 would be possible per country. Also please ensure what you mean by "conservation investment projects" is clarified during PPG.

(Karrer, September 22, 2021). No.

Overall

1) Since the project only includes Philippines, Thailand and Indonesia, it will be limited as to what extent it will really work in the LMEs. In fact over half the LME countries are not in the project as follows (underlined are those not in the project):

   - South China Sea: China, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Viet Nam
   - Sulu-Celebes Sea: Philippines & Indonesia
   - BOBLME: Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Maldives, Myanmar, Sri Lanka and Thailand
   - Indonesian Sea: Indonesia & Timor Leste

It needs to be clear that for the project activities they will only occur in the 3 countries and what the connections will be to the broader, regional LMEs, such as sharing lessons and insights. Please check the text to ensure this is clear (e.g. the map section mentions non-project countries in the LME descriptions and in Table 1b).

Proposed Alternative Scenario Section (PASS) text:

1) The first overview paragraph stresses ICM and MSPs, yet these aspects are only in one output. In contrast the conservation investments are 3 outputs. Please revise the objective to reflect the focus of the project.

2) Please ensure the substance in Table B is reflected in the PASS. For example, Outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 are not reflected in the PASS.

3) Also, please provide more detail on project plans in the PASS. There should be an explanation of the logic of the project, such as component 1 is the research to prioritize MPAs and then component 2 is about actual improved management and designation and then component 3 is about knowledge sharing. More detail is needed. Some of the details in the incremental reasoning section might be included here and the theory of change referenced.

4) The second paragraph is an explanation of "connectivity" rather than an explanation of the project. Please move this context text elsewhere.

5) Please clarify the role of the LMEs in the alternative scenario text.

Component 1

6) The identification of new MPAs in Component 1 and the development of new MPAs in Component 2 require not only ecological

6) The identification of new MPAs in Component 1 and the development of new MPAs in Component 2 require not only ecological connectivity data, but also understanding the biodiversity of the region as well as social, economic and governance conditions. Community dependence on marine-related livelihoods, the economic value of the marine resources and services and perceptions of the need for governance are a few examples of the importance of conducting social, economic and governance analyses and incorporating these insights into planning. Further, marine spatial planning typically involves assessing the ecological as well as socioeconomic trade-offs of zoning options. The brief mention that socioeconomic and institutional linkages and strategies will be recognized in Output 2.1.2 is not sufficient, particularly since it is unclear the source of this information given that Component 1 (the research component) is entirely focused on ecological aspects. The Components and Outcomes need to be modified to include socioeconomic and governance considerations.

7) The first component of the project is focused on establishing connectivity and presumably determining critical areas for marine conservation; however, it seems this information is already available. In fact section 1b. Project Map and Coordinates notes the various existing data that will be used. It, therefore, is unclear why an additional $1.5M from GEF and the $9.5M co-financing is needed. Please elaborate on the activities for this component and shift GEFTF resourcing balance downward accordingly.

8) The section 1b. Project Map and Coordinates section, particularly table 1b. indicates the sites have already been selected. What, then, is the purpose of component 1?

9) If Outcome 1.1 is about identifying priority locales for MPAs, including priority existing MPAs and priority new MPA locales, then please edit to reflect both new and existing prioritization.

10) Conducting the analyses in Output 1.1.1 is not sufficient. There needs to be an output that interprets the data to determine priority locales for existing and new MPAs.

11) As noted, it seems component 1 is the source of information/data; yet it's focused only on ecological analyses. Socioeconomic and governance analyses are also important and need to be included.

12) Please clarify the scale of component 1 work. Only 3 countries have endorsed so will the analyses only be for these 3 countries? Research cannot be conducted in countries that have not endorsed.

13) Please clarify if the analyses in Output 1.1.1 will include new data collection and analysis or is it all analysis of existing literature?

Component 2

14) The PIF identifies one of the key barriers to improved MPA coverage/management as: "inadequate investment in MPA management is seen as among the primary limitation in MPA upkeep and in scaling-up the area coverage of MPAs as increase in area of MPAs may also mean additional resources" (pg 26) but yet this project, and this component in particular is nearly silent on the issue. It is unclear how the project aims to both improve the management of MPAs, MPA networks and expand the coverage through MPA establishment without a robust effort aimed at the sustainable (e.g. long term) financing for the PA systems/networks. Please rework component 2, or add another component that explicitly addresses this challenge on which the results of the rest of the project directly depend.

15) Output 2.1.6 needs clarification, particularly how it links to Outputs 2.1.5. Presumably the entrepreneurial skill enhancement would be for the identified sustainable business practices which would somehow contribute to 'sustainably managed MPAs', but that's not clear.

16) Outcome 2.1 should build off the insights from Outcome 1.1; otherwise, what's the point of component 1? Please make that clear and that it will result in both improved management of existing MPAs and creating new MPAs. Additionally 2.1 refers to 1.1.2 which is not included in Outcome 1 in the table. Please correct/revise.

17) Please clarify the scale of outputs 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3 keeping in mind the project is focused in 3 countries. Are these activities for all 3 countries at a national scale? If it's at the LME scale, how will that be done when most countries are not part of the project?

18) Please expand Output 2.1.2 to include not only creating management plans, but executing them too.

19) For output 2.1.4, please clarify what is meant by "priority conservation investment projects". Also: what is the scale? Why only 2? What are the criteria for selecting sites? How are these different from the MPA sites selected/to be selected?

20) 2.1.5 Unclear what 2.1.5 is, including the meaning/purpose of : "to validate the assumptions and outputs of 2.1.4"? Please clarify/explain/justify this output.

21) Output 2.2.1 seems duplicative with Output 2.1.1 as both are pursuing partnerships and collaboration. Suggest to combine.

22) For Output 2.2.2, please clarify what this is and how this cooperation implementation is different from Output 2.1.2. It seems both are pursuing actual improved management.

23) Outcome 2.2 seems to be missing

Component 3

24) Outcome 3.1 overall: It is clear that there are significant capacity building needs in order to achieve the project goal over the long term, but it is unclear how "the use of the knowledge platform" will address these critical needs. What is 'the knowledge platform'? How will it 'inspire/embolden behavior change and mobilize local action? Is it a website? Training center? On-the-job training events? Further, the level of funding allocated is quite high, more information on outputs are needed to understand and justify this resource allocation.

25) Output 3.1.2 needs to include collaboration with LME platforms.

26) Output 3.1.3 needs to elaborate on activities through IWLEARN – webinars, results briefs, trainings, sharing, listserves, etc.

Misc

Please edit the title for the graph titled "Progress of AMS…" to spell out AMS.

Agency Response

Agency Response (21 Oct. 2021)

1) The first overview paragraph stresses ICM and MSPs, yet these aspects are only in one output. In contrast the conservation investments are 3 outputs. Please revise the objective to reflect the focus of the project.

Response: The overview paragraph is revised to reflect the substantive content.

- IW related outputs focus on strengthening the blue economy opportunities through sustaining healthy coastal and marine ecosystems and catalyzing sustainable fisheries management. The proposal contributes to restoring or sustaining ecosystem health along the identified ecologically linked areas or MPA networks. Collaborations with the fisheries sector may initiate biodiversity mainstreaming in the sector by applying innovative practices both in conservation and fisheries management.
- BD related outputs are mainstreaming biodiversity, and addressing direct drivers to protect habitats and species. The proposal contributes to these outputs through the establishing ecologically linked protected/ key biodiversity areas to expand bases for conservation/protection. The proposal will utilise collaborations with the relevant stakeholders including private sector, fisheries sector, among others. Aside from this, the proposal will link with various networks to synergise efforts in MPA management.
- But we recognize the overlaps/synergies between marine BD and IW. The proposal takes advantage of the close relationship between biodiversity and fisheries through linking marine protected areas to properly manage fisheries resources and practices along these expanded conservation corridors/ecologically linked areas.

2) Please ensure the substance in Table B is reflected in the PASS. For example, Outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 are not reflected in the PASS.

Response: The PASS section is rewritten extensively to show the Components, Outcomes and Outputs, including indicative activities for all outputs.

3) Also, please provide more detail on project plans in the PASS. There should be an explanation of the logic of the project, such as component 1 is the research to prioritize MPAs and then component 2 is about actual improved management and designation and then component 3 is about knowledge sharing. More detail is needed. Some of the details in the incremental reasoning section might be included here and the theory of change referenced.

Response: The PASS is expanded to show activities and the rationale for the framework adopted in this project. The logical flow of the 3 project components is explained below. The TOC for this project is added in the PIF.

The proposed project will have the following approaches reflected in the three project components:

Component 1 will establish science-based approaches that will determine the extent of ecological, socioeconomic and institutional connectivities within the identified LMEs. The results from this component will define MPA networks in each LME, identify new specifically the MPAs within each network and propose options in support of necessary management actions for MPAs and MPA networks including the corridors connecting MPAs within the network.

Component 2 will improve the management of individual MPAs and the network of MPAs taking into account the results from Component 1. This component through first Outcome will improve the management of individual MPAs within each network but these will focus only on the first category of MPAs mentioned in Component 1. The range of MPA interventions will include the preparation of management plans or refining where these already exist to enhance the connectivities and the implementation of the priority elements in those plans.

Component 3 will involve training, capacity development, knowledge management, learning exchanges and networking as part of this component. The project will engage the relevant capacity development experts personnel and networks such as the AHP Network of MPA Managers, the national focal points of the AWGCME and AWGNCB, the PEMSEA Network of Learning Centers and Regional Centers of Excellence in building and strengthening core capacities in MPA management and other management tools to be utilized in the project.

4) The second paragraph is an explanation of “connectivity” rather than an explanation of the project. Please move this context text elsewhere.

Response: The paragraph is deleted. The discussion of connectivity encompasses ecological, socioeconomic and institutional.

5) Please clarify the role of the LMEs in the alternative scenario text.

Response:
Discussion of LMEs is included in the section on PASS. LME considerations guided the Project Description Summary in Table B of the PIF, focusing on the Network of MPAs and Sustainable Fisheries within the priority LMEs or portions thereof.

6) The identification of new MPAs in Component 1 and the development of new MPAs in Component 2 require not only ecological connectivity data, but also understanding the biodiversity of the region as well as social, economic and governance conditions. Community dependence on marine-related livelihoods, the economic value of the marine resources and services and perceptions of the need for governance are a few examples of the importance of conducting social, economic and governance analyses and incorporating these insights into planning. Further, marine spatial planning typically involves assessing the ecological as well as socioeconomic trade-offs of zoning options. The brief mention that socioeconomic and institutional linkages and strategies will be recognized in Output 2.1.2 is not sufficient, particularly since it is unclear the source of this information given that Component 1 (the research component) is entirely focused on ecological aspects. The Components and Outcomes need to be modified to include socioeconomic and governance considerations.

Response: The comments are recognized. In response: a) the project title now drops the 'Ecological' in recognition of other connectivities; and b) Component 1 and in the rest of the PIF, connectivities are expanded to include ecological, socioeconomic and institutional connectivities.

7) The first component of the project is focused on establishing connectivity and presumably determining critical areas for marine conservation; however, it seems this information is already available. In fact section 1b. Project Map and Coordinates notes the various existing data that will be used. It, therefore, is unclear why an additional $1.5M from GEF and the $9.5M co-financing is needed. Please elaborate on the activities for this component and shift GEFTF resourcing balance downward accordingly.

Response: The rationale for and the outcomes from Component 1 are clarified in the PIF. The indicative activities are included in Output 1.1.1.

8) The section 1b. Project Map and Coordinates section, particularly table 1b. indicates the sites have already been selected. What, then, is the purpose of component 1?

Response: The PIF clearly indicates that all sites are 'candidates' which will be validated during the PPG. In response to other comments, considering the number of countries participating in this project which has implications on the MPA network within LMEs, existing MPAs supported by other GEF projects in the participating are including in the map. During the PPG, MPAs not supported by the GEF will be considered to form part of the network. However, it is emphasized that no GEF funding will go to these other sites.

9) If Outcome 1.1 is about identifying priority locales for MPAs, including priority existing MPAs and priority new MPA locales, then please edit to reflect both new and existing prioritization.

Response: This is clarified in the narrative description of Component 1 in the PIF.

10) Conducting the analyses in Output 1.1.1 is not sufficient. There needs to be an output that interprets the data to determine priority locales for existing and new MPAs.

Response: Output 1.1.1 is expanded to include the conduct of supplementary studies and analyses. Analyses pertain to the interpretation of the data.

11) As noted, it seems component 1 is the source of information/data; yet it's focused only on ecological analyses. Socioeconomic and

governance analyses are also important and need to be included.

Response: Refer to response to comment #6 and other preceding comments. The scope of linkages or connectivities is expanded.

12) Please clarify the scale of component 1 work. Only 3 countries have endorsed so will the analyses only be for these 3 countries? Research cannot be conducted in countries that have not endorsed.

Response: This is clarified in the narrative of Component 1. In analysing connectivities, the entire LME or portions thereof within the participating countries, will have to be covered. It is emphasized, however, that work on the ground in Component 2 will not be carried out in countries that are not part of the project. The final list of participating countries will be finalized during the PPG.

13) Please clarify if the analyses in Output 1.1.1 will include new data collection and analysis or is it all analysis of existing literature?

Response: It will include collection of primary and secondary data. During the PPG, the focus will be on secondary data and gaps will be identified. These gaps will be collected during project implementation within the constraints of the budget but should be adequate to be the basis for science-based decision making.

14) The PIF identifies one of the key barriers to improved MPA coverage/management as: "inadequate investment in MPA management is seen as among the primary limitation in MPA upkeep and in scaling-up the area coverage of MPAs as increase in area of MPAs may also mean additional resources" (pg 26) but yet this project, and this component in particular is nearly silent on the issue. It is unclear how the project aims to both improve the management of MPAs, MPA networks and expand the coverage through MPA establishment without a robust effort aimed at the sustainable (e.g. long term) financing for the PA systems/networks. Please rework component 2, or add another component that explicitly addresses this challenge on which the results of the rest of the project directly depend.

Response: Outcome 2.1 and Outputs 2.1.1, 2.1.3 and 2.1.4 are expanded to include this important consideration. Output 2.1.1 will include the implementation of priority elements of the enhanced management plans that will include financing. Outputs 2.1.3 and 2.1.4 could cover the sustainable financing. These will be firmed up during the PPG.

15) Output 2.1.6 needs clarification, particularly how it links to Outputs 2.1.5. Presumably the entrepreneurial skill enhancement would be for the identified sustainable business practices which would somehow contribute to 'sustainably managed MPAs', but that's not clear.

Response: Output 2.1.1 in the first submission of the PIF is merged with Output 2.2.2 in the revised PIF. The indicative activities Output 2.1.5 (Output 2.1.6 before) are included in the PIF in response to this comment.

16) Outcome 2.1 should build off the insights from Outcome 1.1; otherwise, what's the point of component 1? Please make that clear and that it will result in both improved management of existing MPAs and creating new MPAs. Additionally 2.1 refers to 1.1.2 which is not included in Outcome 1 in the table. Please correct/revise.

Response: The structure of the project components indicates some aspects chronology wherein the results from Component 1 feeds into Component 2. This is explained further in descriptions of Components 1 and 2 of the PIF.

17) Please clarify the scale of outputs 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3 keeping in mind the project is focused in 3 countries. Are these activities for all 3 countries at a national scale? If it's at the LME scale, how will that be done when most countries are not part of the project?

Response: As clarified in the section on PASS, these will be at the national level only. However, it is noted that countries that have not endorsed the project may participate on a self-financing basis. This will be confirmed during the PPG.

18) Please expand Output 2.1.2 to include not only creating management plans, but executing them too.

Response: Executing priority elements of the management plan is now included in the Output and in the Indicative Activities. Note that Outputs 2.1.2, 2.1.3 and 2.14 are expected to be captured in the enhanced management plans.

Outputs 2.1.2, 2.1.3 and 2.1.4 are expected to be captured in the enhanced management plans.

19) For output 2.1.4, please clarify what is meant by “priority conservation investment projects”. Also: what is the scale? Why only 2? What are the criteria for selecting sites? How are these different from the MPA sites selected/to be selected?

Response: The Output is now reworded to at least one investment project per country. The type of investment project, such as fish by-products development, ecotourism and other conservation enterprises, off-season livelihood opportunities, blue carbon offsets, among others, will be clarified during the PPG and revisited during project implementation.

20) 2.1.5 Unclear what 2.1.5 is, including the meaning/purpose of : “to validate the assumptions and outputs of 2.1.4”? Please clarify/explain/justify this output.

Response: The Outputs have been reworded for coherence.

21) Output 2.2.1 seems duplicative with Output 2.1.1 as both are pursuing partnerships and collaboration. Suggest to combine.

Response: These are now combined - Output 2.1.1 is subsumed under 2.2.1.

22) For Output 2.2.2, please clarify what this is and how this cooperation implementation is different from Output 2.1.2. It seems both are pursuing actual improved management.

Response The Indicative Activities are now included that serve to clarify the Output.

23) Outcome 2.2 seems to be missing

Response. Outcome 2.2, as with all the other Outcomes and Outputs will be uploaded in the GEF Portal.

24) Outcome 3.1 overall: It is clear that there are significant capacity building needs in order to achieve the project goal over the long term, but it is unclear how “the use of the knowledge platform” will address these critical needs. What is ‘the knowledge platform’? How will it ‘inspire/embolden behavior change and mobilize local action? Is it a website? Training center? On-the-job training events? Further, the level of funding allocated is quite high, more information on outputs are needed to understand and justify this resource allocation.

Response: The rationale for Outcome 3.1 is described. Indicative Activities for the two Outputs are now included which would provide clarification.

25) Output 3.1.2 needs to include collaboration with LME platforms.

Response: This is included in the Output and an activity is added.

26) Output 3.1.3 needs to elaborate on activities through IWLEARN – webinars, results briefs, trainings, sharing, listserves, etc.

Response: Refer to Indicative Activities for Output 3.1.3.

Misc

Please edit the title for the graph titled “Progress of AMS…” to spell out AMS.

Response: This is done.

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

(Karrer, October 25, 2021). Yes.

(Karrer, September 22, 2021). No.

The funding from Korea Fisheries Resources Agency to support Viet Nam needs to be removed since Viet Nam is no longer part of the project.

Agency Response

Agency Response (21 Oct. 2021)
The co-financing table is revised to address the comments.

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

(Karrer, September 22, 2021). 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

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

(Karrer, September 22, 2021). 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

(Karrer, Oct 25, 2021). Yes. During PPG BD mainstreaming results need to be considered, particularly with regard to fisheries such as subindicator 5.1, Number of fisheries that meet national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations.

(Karrer, September 22, 2021). No.Where are the BD mainstreaming results captured for this project? Can they be captured under CI 5.1? The project states that: "*This is especially important to the fisheries sector as one of the key sectors for biodiversity mainstreaming and promoting sustainability, which is lodged under the biodiversity and international waters focal areas.*"

Agency Response

Agency Response (21 Oct. 2021)

It is proposed that the entry for CI 5.1 will be determined during the PPG.

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

(Karrer, September 22, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

art 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

(Karrer, September 22, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, September 22, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 25, 2021). Yes.

(Karrer, September 22, 2021). No. See previous comments.

In addition, please clearly articulate the theory of change of this project in succinct narrative form based on the final diagram and referencing the STAP TOC primer as needed.

Agency Response

Agency Response (21 Oct. 2021)
The TOC narrative has been reworded to make it more succinct and reflected in the PASS section (Section iii) of the PIF. The TOC diagram was also revised accordingly. The TOC of the ASEAN ENMAPS follows a program level pathway as defined in the GEF Theory of Change Primer (GEF STAP C.57 Inf.04).

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, September 22, 2021). 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

(Karrer, September 22, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

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

(Karrer, September 22, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 25, 2021). Yes.

(Karrer, September 22, 2021). No.

Please see comments on sustainable financing of MPA and network management without which sustainability and scaling-up will be unattainable.

Agency Response

Agency Response (21 Oct. 2021)
Discussion is expanded in the relevant sections of the PIF where sustainable financing is emphasized, including in Output 2.1.3.

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

(Karrer, September 22, 2021). 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

(Karrer, Oct 25, 2021). Yes. During PPG as consultations are pursued, engagement needs to extend beyond fishing communities which are the noted focus in the PIF to include all relevant coastal communities.

(Karrer, September 22, 2021). No.

1) 1) The stakeholder list is too vague. This section needs to list which regional and national organizations will be engaged, including the LMEs, the government agencies, CSOs, businesses affected (positively and negatively) by MPA management, academia and other entities.
2) 2) It seems stakeholder engagement to date has been limited to the two ASEAN working groups. Given the project title and objective stresses LME engagement, it is surprising that there seems to have been non consultation with the LME projects and leadership. If other stakeholders have been consulted, please indicate.
3) 3) Information on how the stakeholders will be engaged in the project needs to be provided.

Agency Response

Agency Response (21 Oct. 2021)

1. The Stakeholder List is clarified in the PIF.

2. Considering the uncertainty surrounding this project, consultations have not been done. However, in the process of revising the PIF in response to the GEF Sec review, UNDP together with ACB has initiated discussions with FAO (BOBLME, Indonesian Seas) and UNEP (South China Sea) which have ongoing UNDP-GEF projects in the mentioned LMEs. For Sulu Celebes Seas, the follow-up UNDP project is still in the pipeline with CTI Secretariat. Further consultations will be done during the PPG with these institutions and the LME governance mechanisms.

Note that the organogram now includes the relevant LME governance mechanisms to the list of regional organizations.

Information on how the stakeholders will be engaged is added.

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

(Karrer, Oct 29, 2021). Yes.

(Karrer, Oct 25, 2021). No. Thanks for the additional information provided on planned activities for gender mainstreaming and completing the gender tags. As per my earlier comment, the project has still not included indicative information on important gender dimensions related to the project objectives, activities and components. Please provide additional information on gender dimensions and provide some indicative information on activities efforts expected to closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources.

(Karrer, September 22, 2021). No.

The statement with regard to gender equality and women's empowerment is generic and does not reflect even a basic understanding of how the genders may be affected by the project and measures to ensure adverse impacts are addressed. Please respond/revise with a more robust and specific articulation of gender dynamics and issues and plan a for PPG to undertake a gender assessment.

Agency Response

Agency Response (21 Oct. 2021)

Additional note was made to the revised PIF highlighting the planned activities for gender mainstreaming and related concerns.

Agency Response Oct 29, 2021

The gender aspects have been clarified and the overall approach and activities to addressing gender have been added in the PIF. Further work will be done during the PPG when the sites have been finalized as the gender concerns would have site-specific context.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 25, 2021). Yes. During PPG ensure all relevant private sector stakeholders are engaged.

(Karrer, September 22, 2021). No. As noted in the stakeholder question, the businesses that will be affected (positively and negatively) from improved MPA management need to be engaged. And please describe the role of the private sector in this project and how the PS will be engaged for long-term financial sustainability and improved MPA/network management.

Agency Response

Agency Response (21 Oct. 2021)

Potential private sector groups are listed and the prospective collaborative engagements are described in the PIF. These arrangements will be further determined once the candidate sites are finalized during the PPG.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

(Karrer, Oct 29, 2021). Yes.

(Karrer, Oct 25, 2021). No. The climate change risks require further investigation during PPG as proposed by UNDP. The COVID analysis is not sufficient. Please address the following questions, which are required of all projects:

1. Risk analysis: Briefly describe how risks from COVID-19 have been analyzed and mitigation strategies incorporated into the design. Project documents are expected to include consideration to the risks that COVID-19 poses for all aspects of project design and eventual implementation. Projects are required to identify and establish likely impacts and risks from COVID-19, and how they will be dealt with in the context of delivering GEBs and/or climate adaptation and resilience benefits.

2. Opportunity analysis: Describe further how the project has identified potential opportunities to mitigate impacts (if any) created by COVID-19 to deliver GEBs and/or climate adaptation and resilience benefits and contribute toward green recovery and building back better.

(Karrer, September 22, 2021). No.

The first part of #5 the risks section relates to sustainable financing but it isn't well aligned to project risks. Please revise, and see previous comments on sustainable financing.

The Risk section needs to discuss how COVID has already affected (positively and negatively) MPAs and ICM in the LMEs and what this means for the project. The text mentions that coastal communities may withdraw from conservation commitments in order to survive. Has that already occurred now that the pandemic has been underway for 1.5 years? How will the project activities address this concern? Are there new opportunities due to COVID, such as green recovery investments from which the project could benefit?

Please see STAP guidance on climate risk screening (link below) and provide at least a basic climate risk screening at PIF stage. At a minimum, at PIF stage, the climate risks should be identified, listed and described. This can include:

a.) Outlining the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project location (or as close to it with data available), which are relevant for the type of intervention being financed (e.g. changes in temperatures, rainfalls, increased flooding, sea level rise, saltwater acquirer contamination, increased soil erosion, etc).

b.) Time horizon if feasible/data available (e.g. up to 2050). Please refer to list of examples from STAP guidance.

c.) Listing key potential hazards for the project that are related to the aspects of the climate scenarios listed above (describe how the climate scenarios identified above are likely to affect the project, during 2020-2050).

d.) Describing plans for climate change risk assessment and mitigation measures during PPG.

(https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Climate%20Risk%20Screening%20web%20posting.pdf)

Agency Response

Agency Response (21 Oct. 2021)

1. Sustainable Financing is included in Output 2.1.3. Refer to responses to preceding comments.

2. Discussion of the impacts of COVID 19 is expanded.

Initial climate screening is done, however, it is proposed that this will be done during the PPG when the sites are finalized from the list of candidate sites which are scattered over a wide expanse of LMEs in the ASEAN region. This will provide site-specific risk assessment that would be more realistic leading to the design of appropriate mitigation/adaptation measures that will be included in the project document.

Agency Response Oct 29, 2021

COVID 19 analysis is expanded in the PIF. Both risks and opportunities have been identified. Further work will be done during PPG as the pandemic is still evolving.

Agency Response (21 Oct. 2021)

1. Sustainable Financing is included in Output 2.1.3. Refer to responses to preceding comments.

2. Discussion of the impacts of COVID 19 is expanded.

Initial climate screening is done, however, it is proposed that this will be done during the PPG when the sites are finalized from the list of candidate sites which are scattered over a wide expanse of LMEs in the ASEAN region. This will provide site-specific risk assessment that would be more realistic leading to the design of appropriate mitigation/adaptation measures that will be included in the project document

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

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

(Karrer, Oct 29, 2021). Yes.

(Karrer, Oct 25, 2021). No. Please review Viet Nam from the organogram. Coordination plans with the LMEs need to be clarified during PPG as noted.

(Karrer, September 22, 2021). No.

1) 1) Since the project plans to work within the LMEs (based on the title and goal), then it needs to interact with the entities responsible for the LMEs. This is not reflected in the institutional structure or even the stakeholder list.
2) 2) In discussing coordination with the LMEs, it needs to be clear: 1) to what extent MPAs and ICM are priorities for the LMEs based on their SAPs. An explanation of how each LME has prioritized MPAs and ICM needs to be provided; 2) what MPA and ICM activities the LME projects are already undertaking (e.g. MPA establishment through BOBLME project); and, 3) how this project will coordinate and not duplicate those existing MPA and ICM activities in those LME projects. Currently there is limited information regarding the 5 LMEs and ICM in the 3 countries in the project description section and a list of MPA in Table 1b. The requested detail may be most appropriate for the Synergies with Other Projects, Other GEF-Funded projects on LMEs section.
3) 3) Please ensure the list of LMEs is consistent throughout the document. The Other GEF-funded projects section includes Arafur Timor Seas, but not Gulf of Thailand; whereas the Project Description includes Gulf of Thailand but not Arafura Timor Seas.
4) 4) Unless Cambodia and Viet Nam are added into the project, they need to be removed from the Institutional Arrangements discussion of national coordination, including the table.

Agency Response

Agency Response (21 Oct. 2021)

1. Discussions have been initiated with the GEF implementing agencies that are supporting the LMEs, primarily UNEP and FAO. IUCN is supporting some of the FAO IW projects and will also be involved. Consultations will continue during the PPG to identify collaboration and coordination mechanisms. The Organogram now includes the LME governance mechanisms which will be specified during the PPG.

2. Once the project sites are finalized early in the PPG process, the areas suggested will be further looked into and will be covered in discussions with the LMEs. We propose that this comment will be more appropriately addressed during the PPG as it requires further consultations with the SAP implementation projects in the LMEs.

3. Arafura and Timor Seas project is now excluded in the PIF. The Gulf of Thailand is also excluded as the candidate sites for Thailand are all in the Andaman Sea. In addition, Cambodia has yet to make a final decision about participation in the project. As mentioned above, these will be tackled early in the PPG and Gulf of Thailand may be brought back.

References to VietNam and Cambodia are corrected in the PIF.

Agency Response Oct 29, 2021
The organogram is corrected. Viet Nam is now excluded.

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

(Karrer, Oct 25, 2021). Yes.

(Karrer, September 22, 2021). No.

Please update section on the post 2020 GBF to respond to Draft 1 of the GBF (it currently includes the Zero draft).

Please provide an overview of how this project aligns with each participating countries national priorities.

Agency Response

Agency Response (21 Oct. 2021)

The section on *Taking into consideration the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and global ambition* has been updated with the relevant provisions of the First Draft of the new Post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, in particular on Target 3 on the 30 per cent global target of land and sea areas.

Upon consultation with countries, Thailand, Indonesia, and Philippines have confirmed the project's objectives and activities are strategically aligned with their national priorities and commitments to relevant global and environmental conventions (see LOE issued 9 November 2021, 17 March 2021 and 30 March 2021 respectively). Specifically, the project is in accordance with the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPS).

The key elements of NBSAPS relevant to ASEAN ENMAPS activities are outlined for each participating country, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand. Similarly, the relevant NDC elements for each participating country, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand were elaborated in Section

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

(Karrer, Oct 25, 2021). Yes.

(Karrer, September 22, 2021). No. See points above related to component 3. Modifications to address the points need to be made in the KM section too. In addition it needs to be clear how the project will learn from other initiatives.

Agency Response

Agency Response (21 Oct. 2021)

Knowledge platforms elaborated in Output 3.1.2. which include the ASEAN Clearing House Mechanism (CHM), ASEAN Biodiversity Dashboard, PEMSEA's Seas of East Asia Knowledge Bank (SEAKB, other LME knowledge platforms and other online national platforms. IWLEARN is also listed.

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

with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, September 22, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

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

(Karrer, September 22, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

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

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

(Karrer, Oct 29, 2021). Yes.

(Karrer, September 22, 2021). No. Please see the previous points to be addressed.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

*i*ew Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	9/28/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/25/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval