



Strengthening of the Enabling Environment, Ecosystem-based Management and Governance to Support Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme of the Guinea Current Large Marine Ecosystem

Edit and Submit CEO Endorsement

Basic project information

GEF ID

9911

Countries

Regional (Benin, Cameroon, Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Gabon, Guinea, Ghana, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Nigeria, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Togo, Congo DR)

Project Name

Strengthening of the Enabling Environment, Ecosystem-based Management and Governance to Support Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme of the Guinea Current Large Marine Ecosystem

Agencies

UNEP, FAO, UNDP, UNIDO

Date received by PM

5/30/2019

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Leah Karrer

Focal Area

International Waters

Project Type

FSP

PIF **CEO Endorsement**

Project Design and Financing

1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request (Karrer, June 2 2021). No. The following are overall comments:

Please submit the Project Document, which is missing, although the annexes are uploaded.

Please submit the appendices.

The UNDP Audit Checklist needs to be submitted.

Please spellcheck and check grammar. For example, Component 2 first paragraph ends with an incomplete sentence. In the Justification section, please clarify units for Fish Production column in Table 1

Response to Secretariat comments

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, June 2 2021). No.

The theory of change is well articulated; however, there are some aspects that don't reflect the project logic. The statement references "testing coastal management approaches", which are not part of the project plans in the Alternative Scenario and in Table B. Instead, there are plans for pollution testing. And the "increase of and better targeted budget allocations and investments in the GCLME" are not a prominent aspect. Instead it would seem the intermediary state would reflect the main aspects of the project: policy development, capacity building, secured financing, partnerships/coordination and strong institutional governance, and understanding/assessments.

Regarding the project framework, unsustainable fishing and pollution are addressed, but not habitat degradation. Habitat degradation is indicated as a priority concern in the Justification section and in the GCLME SAP. Habitat conservation is also noted as an objective in the Alternative Scenario objective explanation. However, in consider the project outcomes and activities, there are clear plans for fisheries (component 2) and for pollution (component 4), but habitat conservation is lacking. Habitat conservation policies are only briefly mentioned in Output 1.2.2. Habitat conservation needs to be reflected more prominently. Capacity building plans related to habitat conservation also need to be included in the project.

There are inconsistencies and duplications in the framework as follows:

Components 1 and 3 ? Please clarify in the titles and texts if these component activities relate to fisheries, pollution, habitat and/or climate change or only some of these. This is important to clarify since Component 2 is focused on fisheries and Component 4 is focused on pollution.

Table B, Project Output 1.1.2 notes that operational guidance will be "available"; whereas the PIF noted it will be "adopted?". The latter ensures action; whereas is focused only on providing information. Please reconsider this verbiage as we want to foster change.

Outcome 1.2 ? the inclusion of ?national policies? in the title indicates that this outcome will work on policies and regulations; yet, the text suggests policies will not be pursued. Further, if national policies are pursued in this outcome they would duplicate the fisheries plans in Outcomes 2.2, 2.3 and 3.2 and related outputs. Please clarify.

Output 1.2.2 is focused on pollution and habitat degradation policy reforms. The pollution policies are in Component 4 so need to be removed from Output 1.2.2.

In Component 1 habitat degradation plans need to be more prominent than relegated to output level (output 1.1.2) given that fisheries and pollution are addressed at the component level.

The activities within Output 1.3.1 related to sustainable financing are to identify opportunities and develop guidelines. There also need to be activities to pursue long-term financing based on the guidelines i.e. execute the guidance.

Regarding Outcome 1.4, by ?an effective platform is developed? for implementation of the GCLME SAP?, does that mean the GCC secretariat? Or is ?platform? a website? Please clarify what is meant by a ?platform?.

Component 2 - please clarify if the GC Commission created in Component 1 will be responsible for fisheries or if another regional entity is being proposed here in Component 2.

Output 2.2.2 addresses capacity building, but this aspect is not reflected in any of the outcomes, Please add.

Output 2.3.1 is about studies, which are also not reflected in the outcomes. Please add.

The knowledge management plans in Component 2 need to be clarified with regard to similar knowledge management plans in Component 3, particularly Output 3.2.3. There seem to be duplicative efforts. Is Component 3 KM not addressing fisheries?

Component 3 ? the title (Assessments, stakeholder and inter-ministerial consultations) implies that it is addressing all aspects including fisheries, pollution and habitat degradation and climate change impacts. However, 3.1.1 focuses on CC and 3.1 discusses ?variability and change?. Please clarify in the title if C3 is related to all aspects or focused on climate change. This distinction needs to be clear for all outcomes and outputs.

Also the title for Component 3 notes ?inter-ministerial consultations?, which duplicates plans in Component 1. Such consultations are not reflected in the outcomes or outputs so please remove from title for Component 3.

The first paragraph under the Component 3 titles notes that ?The I NAP as the overarching framework at national level for coastal and marine environmental

management will incorporate proposed policy reforms and investment actions already proposed in e.g. NBASAPs, NPAs, NIOs, etc.? Please clarify what this means. Policy reforms and regulations are already planned for fisheries in component 2 and pollution in component 4. What will this aspect address?

The second paragraph in Component 3 notes that the IW:Learn platform will 'share pollution and climate information'? Please note IW:Learn is not responsible for knowledge sharing of the GCLME project. The GCLME project can post information through IW:Learn; however, it is up to the GCLME project to create content and determine how it is best shared. This sharing needs to go beyond IW:Learn and also consider other networks and mechanisms for sharing information, particularly in the region.

Climate change activities seem to be redundant in the project plans. Specifically, the new Output 3.1.1 addresses climate change across the project and, therefore, seems to be redundant with Component 2.3.1 at least with regard to fisheries climate change impact analyses. Please clarify how these will be coordinated or else modify.

Output 3.1.2 indicates plans to 'raise awareness about environmental variability' in gender responsive adaptive management?' indicating a focus on gender aspects. It would seem that the training needs to be on coastal management and not only gender aspects.

The text notes in Output 3.1.2 that Table 2 lists the institutions to be trained, their mandates and capacity building needs; however, the table only lists the agencies. Please add the missing information.

Output 3.2.1 notes information will be gathered on environmental and socioeconomic conditions, but then focuses on gender aspects. Please edit to ensure ecological aspects, including ecosystem conditions and threats are addressed, as well as the socioeconomic aspects beyond gender.

As noted under Component 2 comments, the activities under Output 3.2.3 seem duplicative with Output 2.2.2. Both are planning knowledge products and sharing.

Component 4 ? The title only notes hot spot analyses and private sector mobilization, but the outcomes and outputs include capacity building and policies, which need to also be noted in the title.

Component 4 needs to go beyond studies and private sector engagement It needs to include taking action through government regulations, policies and incentives to address pollution similar to how Component 2 includes fisheries policies and management strategies.

Finally, the Benefits section of the CER is quite scant. Please elaborate on the socioeconomic benefits with statistics and beyond food security. There are numerous stakeholders who benefit not only in livelihoods but economically.

Response to Secretariat comments

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, June 2 2021). No. The following comments relate to institutional arrangements (not financing).

Regarding institutional arrangements, the PIF noted that national authorities would be executing agencies; however, these are no longer listed. Only the National Cleaner Production Center Ghana is noted. It would seem that the government agencies would be included. Please include or else explain why they are not listed.

The plethora of organizations implementing and executing this project is concerning. It is good to see there will be overall responsibility through one organization where the PCU will sit; however, it seems the PCU will only constitute ? person and an administrative assistant. Given the complexity of this project with the leads for components dispersed in other organizations throughout the region, this position needs a full-time person. From experience, ? time PC and ? overseeing a piece of a project is not effective. The Project Coordinator needs to be a full-time position.

Appendix 10 is noted providing details on the PCU; yet this document is not in the Portal. Please post.

Please ensure it is clear that Abidjan Convention will be the overall lead agency. Also please clarify why the Abidjan Convention was selected for oversight instead of IGCC, which would seem appropriate.

Similarly, component 1, addresses governance and creation of the GCC. Please justify Abidjan Convention serving as EA instead of IGCC.

For Component 2 the role of FAO as implementing agency, not executing agency, needs to be clear for Component 2. There are a couple of places that imply FAO execution: 1) Output 2.1.1 notes that ?this action will be led by FAO??; and, 2) Output 2.1.2 notes??FAO? will work closely?? implying FAO is executing. Please clarify as FAO cannot serve as both IA and EA.

Component 3 needs a regional EA for oversight of the national activities and regional aspects. UNDP cannot be IA and EA.

Response to Secretariat comments

4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, June 2 2021). No.

COVID-19 considerations have not been addressed. Please briefly describe the impacts of COVID-19 to date on the project issues, the future likely impacts and risks from COVID-19 and how they will be addressed in the project. For example, has IUU fishing increased, is it expected to increase in the future and if so how will the project address this increase? Also, please describe how the project has identified potential opportunities to mitigate impacts (if any) created by COVID-19 to deliver GEBs and/or contribute toward green recovery and building back better.

Response to Secretariat comments

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, June 2 2021). No.

The amount of co-financing has increased dramatically since the PIF, which is greatly welcomed. However, it is all in-kind (except the UNIDO \$51.75K grant), which reflects a lack of commitment as well as raises concerns for the future financial sustainability of the work. Please consider other sources of co-financing beyond in-kind to ensure real commitment and future follow-on activities.

The listed co-financing needs to be split out by country.

The co-financing letters need to indicate what the co-financing will go towards, which is included in all the letters except UNIDO's letter. Please revise the UNIDO letter.

Response to Secretariat comments

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, June 2 2021). No.

Thank you for including an estimate related to fisheries (Indicator 8). However, it is noted as only 1 metric ton of globally over-exploited fisheries moved to sustainable levels (expected at CEO Endorsement). Please check this number as it seems very low. (Perhaps it is meant as ?1%??) In comparison the Gulf of Thailand LME implementation project anticipates 547,393 metric tons to move to more sustainable levels. And the BOBLME Implementation project (#10451) indicates 1,200,000 metric tons expected to move to more sustainable levels.

Regarding direct beneficiaries, only 96 people are noted which is from training. This is extremely low for a \$4.4M project with multiple capacity building activities.

For the Results Framework, please ensure the targets are quantified as much as possible. In particular please consider if pollution reduction targets can be quantified for Component 4.

Response to Secretariat comments

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Response to Secretariat comments

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, June 2 2021). No.

Consistency with national priorities needs more detail. As requested in the PIF review, for each country there needs to be an explanation of how the priorities addressed by the project are addressed in what key national strategies and policies. This information is not provided. Relatedly, clarification is needed regarding coastal-central government interaction as requested in the PIF review.

The section *Coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects* notes the WARFP; however, this project is now defunct. Please, therefore, remove this reference.

Response to Secretariat comments

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, June 2 2021). No.

In the M&E Plan and Budget, please remove the audit cost and include under the Project Management Cost.

Please include a budget for the entire project at the outcome level or more detailed. Be sure to indicate 1% for IWLEARN activities.

Response to Secretariat comments

10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, June 2 2021). No.

As described, the knowledge management plans are focused on communicating achievements. While this is important, it does not encompass a critical part of knowledge management, which is drawing out lessons learned (How did the project gain support from fishers? How were gender issues included? How did they adapt to XYZ??), sharing and discussing these insights among colleagues within the project and with colleagues outside the project. This aspect needs to be included.

The KM plans also focus on producing printed materials (newsletter, brochures, fliers, etc) and one-way products (e.g films, website), which limits learning. KM needs to include interactive dialogues where colleagues share and discuss ideas through for example, listserves, webinars, workshops and other fora.

Relatedly, the project is expected to not only share its lessons and experiences with counterparts in other relevant projects, but also learn from other projects. This aspect needs to be noted.

Finally, a regional knowledge sharing platform is noted, but it is unclear what this entails. Is this a website?

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Responses

11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:

GEFSEC

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Karrer, June 2 2021). No. The following comments relate to stakeholder, private sector and gender concerns in CER (not related to PIF).

Regarding stakeholder engagement, there is information regarding the types of stakeholder groups to contact in each country (see Table 3); however, it seems these groups have not been identified and consulted in the countries. The titles of the stakeholder organizations need to be specific to the countries ? e.g. the titles of ministries, the titles of fisheries organizations and other associations. The lack of specificity, particularly with regard to NGOs and fishing associations suggests that these organizations have not been consulted, which is a significant concern. Please specify entities and clarify state of consultations as we expect initial consultations to have already taken place.

Please ensure the stakeholder list is complete. The risk section notes the oil/gas companies may not engage; yet, they are not listed as stakeholders. Also, what about including city governments and farmers, especially in considering land planning and nutrient pollution?

Also please elaborate on how stakeholders will be consulted in the future. The text in this section focuses only on the industries related to pollution.

The responsibilities noted in Table 3 need to be specific to the project. For example, the first listed ministry notes developing aquaculture plans, which are not part of this project. The second agency (Min of Env) notes establishing a waste stock exchange mgt system, which is not mentioned in the project.

Regarding private sector engagement, the section is focused on manufacturing and processing industries (mining, steel mills, textile industries and pulp and paper industries), which do not reflect the focus of the project. The project addresses fisheries, land run-off and habitat degradation; consequently, fishers, farmers, developers and many others need to be considered, including those listed in the Stakeholder section.

Regarding gender, the A.4 Gender section provides a basic WEF-based analysis of gender inequities in the countries and the consideration of gender is limited to ensuring women participate in activities. At this stage there should be at least a basic analysis of how women are affected by LME issues (e.g. fisheries, pollution, habitat degradation),

analysis how they will be affected by project activities (e.g. fisheries restrictions) and clarification of measures that will be taken to ensure equitable benefits or to address disparities. Please add this insight.

Response to Secretariat comments

STAP

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Council

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Response to Secretariat comments

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Response to Secretariat comments

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(Karrer, June 2 2021). No. Please see comments above.

(6/19/2019 - please note the Council blackout period):

No. The submission is incomplete and cannot be reviewed as is. Please submit missing documents.

According to the GEF Project Cycle policy at time of endorsement the agency submits the endorsement request **and** the agency project document/s - please see the link to and reference/extract from the GEF policy below:

http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Project_Program_Cycle_Policy.pdf

See **Page 7, para 11:**

"11. After PIF approval and before the deadline for submission of a complete endorsement request, the Agency submits to the Secretariat a CEO Endorsement Request and associated Project Document that is in a form as submitted to the Agency's internal approving authorities. ..."

> Please note that as received in the Portal, the Project Document/s (covering the entirety of the project) have not been submitted.

> We also note that the co-finance letters are incomplete.

[Note: please also make sure that all letters of co-finance note how the co-finance is aligned to the project objective (e.g. provide some indication of what the co-finance is comprised off and align in time period and content; we noted at least one letter (by UNIDO) that e.g. states only an amount of '1.2. million in kind' but no indication of what this is finance is made up off); furthermore, please provide a country by country split of co-finance either in table C of the endorsement request or - if technically not possible in the portal to add enough lines - please attach a table listing a country by country overview of co-finance in the same attachment with the letters of co-finance].

> Further, we note that the LOE for Angola has not been submitted since PIF approval. Please submit a complete set of all LOEs, including the LOE for Angola. As submitted, the set of LOEs are not complete in the attached file.

Response to Secretariat comments

April 1, 2021

Additional co-finance Letters have been submitted. Angola have also endorsed and submitted a cofinance letter.

Review Dates

	Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	6/19/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/2/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		