

?BE-CLME+?: Promoting National Blue Economy Priorities Through Marine Spatial Planning in the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Plus

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10211

Countries

Regional (Barbados, Belize, Guyana, Jamaica, Panama, St. Lucia)

Project Name

?BE-CLME+?: Promoting National Blue Economy Priorities Through Marine Spatial Planning in the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Plus

Agencies

CAF, FAO

Date received by PM

5/18/2021

Review completed by PM

7/14/2022

Program Manager

Taylor Henshaw

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8th of June 2021 (cseverin): Yes, especially if the MSPs to be formulated will be cross sectoral and include all economic sectors in the coastal and EEZs of participating nations.

Agency Response -

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8th of June 2021 (cseverin): No, Please address following points:

1) Please amend the expected implementation starting date

2) Please formulate and include quantifiable indicators for component 2.1 and 3 and the associated outputs.

3) Please upload all co-financing letters with CONFIRMED co-financing.

4) Please upload a more detailed budget. It is hard to understand what the budget lines are, if they are hired staff outputs, project activities or something third. The PMU staff should be listed in the budget too, so that the reader can understand how the project funds will be spent.

5) Remove the Vehicle from the GEF budget, or have it transferred to be paid by co-financing (It makes no sense to have 1 vehicle in one island, when the project will be active in six different countries.)

6) Please insert proper amount needed for printer cartridges. The current amount seems to not be substantiated in reality. Cartridges and toner for >\$11k is WAY to high. If we estimate the cost of a printer cartridge to be \$50usd a piece (which is already a high average price), that will be equivalent to buying more than 220 cartridges. Assuming that most printers needs a change three times a year, each project office in the six countries will need to have an average of 12 printers in order to use this very large amount of cartridges.

7) Please upload TORs for the staff needed for the project

8) Please explain why project will not be delivering to curb hypoxia pollution any more, as that was indicated at PIF stage (core indicator).

9) please upload Theory of Change

10) text implies that the project will be implementing \$1.4 mio STAR financing, but budget table only includes \$1.286 mio. Please make sure that there is consistency between text and budget tables.

11) Strong MSPs, will need buy-in from all economic sectors, both private and public sectors. If MSPs are to be successful in triggering long term sustainable blue economies, it is imperative that they span over and engage with all stakeholders in the coastal zone and beyond. The description seems to have a tendency to focus more on fisheries. If this line of thinking is followed through, there is a great likeliness that the MSPs will not succeed on what they set out to do.

16th of August 2021 (cseverin): Most comments addressed, but some remaining:

Please ensure consistency between cofinancing letters and what is entered into the portal. Please specifically have a look at the Barbados and Jamaica cofinancing letters

Please review budget, and review following points 1) Inception Workshop and PSC meetings are not part of ME activities, but should be charged PMC budget. 2) Project execution costs are to be paid by PMC budget, not the separate component budget lines.

Please change start date of project implementation, as 1st of October is not viable anymore.

13th of October 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

19th of October 2021 (cseverin): No please address following points:

1) The expected implementation/completion does not match the duration. Please request the agency to correct the completion date to 11/30/2025.

2. The project is requesting more than 5 % from what was approved at PIF, if this is correct, that will pertain to a major amendment. Per our calculation there is a 5.88% increase between resources allocated at PIF stage vs. CEO Endorsement: $\$ 6,588,390 - \$ 6,222,018 = \$ 366,372$? $(366,372/6,222,018) \times 100 = 5.88\%$.

3. On Table B: Please remove the cents.

4. On proportionality of the PMC: There is no proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5.0%, for a co-financing of \$40,622,260 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$2,031,113 instead of \$1,731,409 (which is 4.2%).

5. On the PPG: Kindly note that the total amount for the PPG is \$200,000. Nonetheless, when looking at the Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) we can see that the amounts budgeted sum up to \$300,100. Please request the agency to double check the figures in order to match the \$200,000 requested at PIF Stage.

6. On the Budget: Margins are too short, it's not possible to read the budget properly and make an accurate revision. Please modify so that the table becomes readable. We will be in a position to provide comments by the resubmission.

7. On core indicators:

- One protected area WDPA ID remains TBD under CI 2.1 and two other WDPA IDs are missing under CI 2.2. Please add those, as these are mandatory at CEO Endorsement stage. In the event that these remain unknown, please provide a justification under the Core Indicator section,

clarifying why and confirming that the WDPA IDs will be updated in the Portal during the months following endorsement.

- Please provide a justification on the balance between men (80,000) and women (8,000) for Core Indicator.

- Please clarify if the risk ratings are focused on residual risks taking into account the implementation of indicated mitigation measures, or inherent risks without the mitigants. Residual risk has the advantage of highlighting the eventual risk to project objective once taking into account the mitigation measures. Kindly adjust the ratings as appropriate.

- Kindly consider inserting in Annex A the Core Indicators used. This will help ensure internal consistency in the project document, highlight that Core Indicators are part of the logical framework and help document means of verification and assumptions, as is already done for other indicators.

18th of April 2022 (thenshaw).

(1) Addressed. Expected implementation start/completion date now match project duration.

(2) Addressed. There is now only a 1.36% increase between resources allocated at PIF stage vs CEO Endorsement: \$6,308,400 - \$6,222,018 = \$86,382.

(3) Addressed. Cents removed from all tables.

(4) Not Addressed. There is still not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. The GEF contribution to PMC is now 4.76%, not 5%. The co-financing contribution to PMC is 5%. Please revise accordingly.

(5) Addressed. The PPG figures now total \$200,000.

(6) Addressed. Formatting issues are corrected. In the budget table please add a column that shows which entity is responsible for which budget line. Please see pg.45 of https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF_C.59_Inf.03_Guidelines%20on%20the%20Project%20and%20Program%20Cycle%20Policy.pdf for guidance.

(7) Partly Addressed.

Regarding the WDPA TBD issue: Partly Addressed. Please state in the Core Indicator explanation field that the WDPA IDs currently noted as "TBD" will be updated in the Portal once created (and registered) through project support.

Regarding the Core Indicator gender balance issue: Addressed.

Regarding the risk ratings: Not Addressed. Please state the clarification directly in the CEO Document-- that the risks are residual risks

Regarding the insertion in Annex A the Core Indicators used: Addressed.

13th of July 2022 (thenshaw)

(1) Please revise the start and end date to allow for Council review (i.e. October 1, 2022 - September 30, 2026).

*The new dates are incorrect: October 1, 2022 - Sept 30, 2022. Please revise to Sept 30, 2026

(4) Addressed

(7) Addressed

July 13th 2022 (thenshaw)

(1) Addressed.

Agency Response

Responses to the GEF's comments of 18th of April 2021:

Re to 4). The co-fin allocated to PMC was decreased to be approx. 4,7%, i.e. equal to the GEF grants allocated to PMC.

Re to 6). A new column was added to the budget table to indicate which entity is responsible for which budget line.

Re to 7). The sentence "The WDPA IDs currently noted as "TBD" will be updated in the Portal once created (and registered) through project support during the project execution.", was added in the Core Indicator explanation field in the portal. Regarding the risk ratings. To be addressed by CAF (1) CEO Document has been adjusted to indicate that identified risks are ?residual risks.

On the **risk** CEO Document has been adjusted to indicate that identified risks are ?residual risks.

Responses to the GEF's comments of 19th of October 2021:

1. The expected completion date has been changed to 11/30/2025.

2. The project budget has been adjusted to ensure compliance with GEF Rules. Adjustments have been made to sections A, B and C of the Request for CEO Endorsement, and the detailed updated project budget has been uploaded in the roadmap of the submission.
3. Cents have been removed from all tables in the Request for CEO Endorsement.
4. Co-financing for PMC has been revised to meet the 5% minimum requirement.
5. Annex C of the Request for CEO Endorsement has been revised by CAF and FAO to reflect the correct amount of US\$200,000.
6. Formatting issues of the budget have been fixed and reuploaded to the portal.
7. An explanation for missing WDPA IDs has been included below the Core Indicator Matrix in the Request for CEO Endorsement.

A justification on the balance between men (80,000) and women (8,000) for Core Indicator 11 has been included below the Core Indicator Matrix in the Request for CEO Endorsement.

The risks are to be interpreted as residual risks. The ratings have been adjusted where applicable in the Risk Matrix.

Core Indicators have been inserted in Annex A ? Results Framework.

-
- 1) Start date adjusted to 1st October 2021.
 - 2) The Results Framework in Annex A provides quantifiable Indicators with targets at baseline, mid-term and end of project stages. This information is also included for Outcome 2.1 and for the entire Component 3. Please refer to Annex A: Project Results Framework in the Portal submission.
 - 3) Letters of Co-Financing have been uploaded in the section C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by Name and by Type in the GEF portal.
 - 4) The project detailed budget has been inserted under the GEF Portal?s **ANNEX E: Project Budget Table** in the Annexure section.
 - a. The PMU costs are clearly indicated (now with a specific PMU tag) at line 47, 48 and 49 of the budget.
 - 5) Allocation of GEF grant for the vehicle has been removed from the budget.
 - 6) The funds allocated for printer cartridges have been reduced.
 - 7) The detailed ToRs of the proposed project?s Staff are available in Annex N: Terms of Reference for Staff of the Project Management Unit (PMU).

8) The Core Indicators 5.2: ?Number of Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs) with reduced pollutions and hypoxia? has been clicked in in the new submission. Text to explain how the project will contribute to it has been added to indicator PRODOC did not contain that core indicator. See inserted screenshot from that PIF. This has been added in the description of Component 1.

9) The TOC, also presented in the Annex K: Project Theory of Change was copied Part II. Project Justification/1a. Project Description in the portal.

10) The texts referring to the STAR funds allocated for the project have been consistently updated to USD 1,368,857. This is the amount also indicated in the table D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies)? in the portal. It includes the Project Grants and the Agencies Fees. It does not included the amount allocated for PPG (otherwise the total of STAR funds would be USD 1,368,857+USD 31,144=USD 1,400,000.

11) Texts have been added to explain how the process will make efforts to ensure MSP will be buy-in from all economic sectors, both private and public sectors to triggering long term sustainable blue economies.

August 16th

1. Cofinancing letter and the data entered into the portal have been reviewed.
2. The budget has been amended and the resources redistributed as per the GEF guidelines
2. The project implementation starting date has been updated for December 1st.

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

th of June 2021 (cseverin): No, please upload cofinancing letters

16th of August 2021 (cseverin): Thanks for uploading letters. However, there are still inconsistencies. Please paid specific attention to: 1) the Jamaican Cofinancing letter, as the letter is mentioning a different amount compared to what has been entered into the portal submission and 2) Please review the Barbadian cofinancing letter, as it appears to be mentioning two amounts of cofinancing, while the portal entry only have one number.

19th of october 2021 (cseverin): No, please address following points:

- a. On the co-financing from CAF: The letter was addressed to Naoko and it does not include a date or a time frame on when this co-financing is expected to be delivered. It would be worthwhile going back to CAF and requesting a new letter. Perhaps, since this letter was provided, they might have a more clear picture if these loan for local banks are expected to materialize. Per guidelines ?At CEO Endorsement/Approval Stage, supporting evidence should: (a) confirm the information provided by the Agency, including the name of the entity that provides the Co-Financing, the type of Co-Financing provided, the amount of Co-Financing, and the time frame over which the Co-Financing will be provided?
- b. The Grant co-financing from CFRM should be categorized as Investment mobilized and described how it was identified in the paragraph below the table.
- c. The co-financing from Dyear Aqua Panama was committed in November 2020 and has \$230,000 committed during calendar year 2021. Since this project has not been endorsed yet and we are close to the end of 2021, we should request the agency to re-confirm the commitment and see if these funds are still available. If not, table C should be updated.
- d. The same comment as above applies to the co-financing from Belize
- e. The same comment as above applies to the co-financing from Panama
- f. Please request the agency to remove the cents stipulated in table C.
- g. On the co-financing from Barbados: It looks like the funding source of this co-financing is partially from the Caribbean Partnership Facility and the Republic of South Korea. If this is the case I believe the co-financing should be split into two lines providing this information and not having this co-financing stipulated as funds coming from Barbados.
- h. Please request the agency to include the name of each ministry responsible for providing the funds of co-financing.
- i. On the co-financing from FAO: nowhere in the letter it stipulates that this co-financing of 4 million USD will be made in the form of a Grant. Please request the agency to clarify.

j. All co-financing sources categorized as Investment mobilized require a description on how they were identified below table C

19th of April 2022 (thenshaw):

(a) Not Addressed. The co-financing letter from CAF (as displayed in the Agency ProDoc) does not appear to be updated to reflect the requested changes. Please revise.

(b) Not Addressed. The grant co-financing from CFRM should be categorized as investment mobilized . How it was identified must be described in the description field. Please revise.

(c, d, e) Addressed. The Agency has reconfirmed the Dyer Aqua, Belize and Panama co-financing commitments and funds are still available. Please note this in the CEO Document in the Table C description field.

(f) Addressed.

(g) Not Apparent. Please describe in the review sheet how the co-financing from Barbados was changed and updated.

(h) Addressed.

(I) Partially Addressed. If this co-financing from FAO is in-kind, the co-financing should be classified as recurrent expenditures and not investment mobilized. Please revise accordingly.

(J) Not Addressed. Provide a description on how CRFM co-financing was identified, once it is reclassified as investment mobilized (per comment b).

13th of July 2022 (thenshaw)

(a) Addressed.

(b) Addressed.

(g) Addressed.

(i) Addressed.

(j) Addressed.

Agency Response

Responses to the GEF's comments of 18th of April 20221:

Re to a). A new co-financing letter of CAF was uploaded.

Re to b). The description of the co-financing pledged by CRFM has been added in both the portal submission and CEO request. Co-financing from CRFM has been recategorized as Investment Mobilized, and text regarding how it was identified has been added to the description field in the CEO Document.

Re to g). A new co-financing letter of Barbados including details on the different elements of the commitment has been uploaded in the portal .

The Government of Barbados initially committed USD 100,000 from its STAR Allocation to the project which is reflected in the PIF. The Government of Barbados following internal consultations and high-level policy review decided to elevate the priority accorded to marine spatial planning and marine protected area as tools for protection, conservation, management and sustainable use of marine biodiversity and marine living resources of Barbados. This led to a policy decision to increase the initial STAR allocation from USD 100,000 to USD 500,000. This occurred during the PPG phase of the project.

2. The co-financing letter submitted by Barbados in February 2021 had total co-financing of USD of: (i) USD 450,540 (in-kind contribution from government departments); (ii) USD 1,624,607 (Projects being implemented by the Government); and (iii) USD 500,000 (STAR allocation).

3. The co-financing of USD 1,624,607 included co-financing from two projects that were to be implemented by the Government of Barbados. The first project, entitled, "Strategic Roadmap for the Blue Economy in Barbados" (BA- T1063 (IDB TCP) ATN/CO-17589-BA), contributed Co-financing of USD 300,000 in co-financing. The Second project entitled, "Sustainable Fish Value Chains for Small Island Developing States" ((SVC4SIDS) GCP/GLO/098/ROK)), which was to be funded by the Government of Korea was earmarked to provide co-financing of USD 1,324,607. Unfortunately, this project and the expected co-financing did not materialize.

4. The Government of Barbados revised and submitted an updated co-financing letter (ref no 1300/5/10, dated 10 February 2022). The co-financing from the STAR Allocation (USD 500,000 and the in-kind contribution from the Government Departments directly connected the project (USD 450,540) remained the same. However, the Updated co-financing commitment of Barbados from "project co-financing" is now USD 1,021,822 instead of USD 1,624,607. This is a reduction USD 602,785.

5. The previous co-financing commitment of USD 1,324,607 from the Korean funded project entitled "Sustainable Fish Value Chains for Small Island Developing States" which was reflected in the co-financing letter of February 2021, was removed and is no longer a part of the commitment of Barbados. Three new sources of "project

co-financing? have been included in the updated co-financing letter of 10 February 2022. These are (i) Government of Barbados funded initiative on ?Food Security Project: Installation of Fish Aggregating Devices (FADS)? ? co-financing contribution of UDS 491,833; (ii) Government of Barbados funded project entitled ? BARNUFO DIGI-FISH Project? ? co-financing contribution of USD 30,000; and (iii) a project being implemented by the Government of Barbados with support from UNCTAD and DOALOS, entitled ?Evidence-based and policy coherent Oceans Economy and Trade Strategies?, (OETS project)? ? with co-financing of USD 200,000.

Re to i). The IN_KIND co-financing of FAO was classified as recurrent expenditures. Thanks for spotting the mistake.

Re to j). Addressed by responding to comment b). IN summary: (1) The USD 300,000 co-financing is regarded as investment mobilized and will be provided from the programmatic budget of the CRFM. These resources are for use across all three components of the project, including marine spatial planning and marine protected areas, and value chain development from the marine living resources. Activities will focus on communication, public relations, visibility, networking and sharing of information with stakeholders; gender equality, equity and mainstreaming; capacity building of public and private sector stakeholders; data collection, compilation, analysis and dissemination; fisheries and marine biodiversity conservation and management planning; preparation of policy advise and policy-making at the regional level; value chain analysis and development; support for regional and international meetings and workshops of direct relevance to the objectives and components of the project.

Responses to the GEF's comments of 19th of October 2021:

- a. The co-financing letter of CAF has been updated
- b. The Grant co-financing of CFRM should be categorized as Investment mobilized and described in the paragraph below the co-financing table.
- c. d. e. Co-financing letters from Dyer Aqua Panama, Belize and Panama has been reconfirmed, therefore should be included in the submission.
- f. The cents stipulated in table C have been removed.
- g. The co-financing from Barbados has been changed and updated.
- h. The name of each ministry/entity responsible for providing the funds of co-financing have been included.
- i. On the co-financing from FAO: we do confirm that the contribution is IN-KIND.
- j. The co-financing sources categorized as Investment mobilized have a description on how these were identified below table C

16th of August

cofinancing letter and the data entered into the portal have been reviewed.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8th of June 2021 (cseverin): Yes

27th of July 2022 (thenshaw):

(1) Please adjust the GEF financing to the same level of resources requested at PIF stage.

8th of October 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

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 8th of June 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

8th of June 2021 (cseverin): No, as alluded under point 2, please explain why the project will not be curbing hypoxia

16th of August 2021 (cseverin): addressed

Agency Response

The Core Indicators 5.2: ?Number of Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs) with reduced pollutions and hypoxia? has been clicked in in the new submission. Text to explain how the project will contribute to it has been added to indicator PRODOC did not contain that core indicator. See inserted screenshot from that PIF. This has been added in the description of Component 1.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8th of June 2021 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response -

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8th of June 2021 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response -

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

8th of June 2021 (cseverin): Partly, quantifiable outcomes missing for a number of components and subcomponents. Please add these in RF, as well as throughout submission.

16th of August 2021 (cseverin): addressed

Agency Response

The Results Framework in Annex A provides quantifiable Indicators with targets at baseline, mid-term and end of project stages. This information is also included for all Outcomes and Components. Please refer to Annex A: Project Results Framework in the Portal submission.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8th of June 2021 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response -

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8th of June 2021 (cseverin): Partly. It is hard to assess when the cofinancing letters have not been uploaded.

16th of August 2021 (cseverin): addressed

Agency Response

The letters of Co-Financing have been uploaded in the section C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by Name and by Type in the GEF portal.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8th of June 2021 (cseverin): Partly.

1) the GEF description mentions that the project will deliver to three shared marine ecosystems, and then mentions three different kind of interventions. As far as the project description goes and the number of countries, it seems that the project will only be contribution to the CLME.

2) Please make sure that the section also describes the delivery towards the GEBs. Eg on of the most central GEBs for IW funding is improving management of transboundary water resources. This seems to have been forgotten in the context of this section. Please double check also if all GEBs for BD funding has been properly elaborated upon. The GEBs are not necessary the same as SDGs and/or Core indicators.

16th of August 2021 (cseverin): addressed

Agency Response

Texts on purpose have been added to section 5) Global environmental benefits (GEFTF) in the PRODOC and it is available in both the GEF Portal relevant section and as annexes in the PDF of the PRODOC.

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8th of June 2021 (cseverin): No, Please expand on the innovative aspects of this investment. It would seem that one of the central pillars of this investment is the MSP and that this set of essential information to trigger political prioritization has not even been included, nor elaborated on in relation to innovative aspects. Please do so and considerably expand on the opportunities that the innovative approaches will provide to the countries and this regional project.

16th of August 2021 (cseverin): addressed

Agency Response

Texts on purpose have been added to section 6) Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up in the PRODOC and it is available in both the GEF Portal relevant section and as annexes in the PDF of the PRODOC.

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8th of June 2021 (cseverin): No

1) Please insert MAP and

2) Ensure to report on more precise locations of any demonstration sites during the 1st year of implementation.

16th of August 2021 (cseverin): addressed

Agency Response

1) MAPs and coordinates have been included in the Annexure/ ANNEX D: Project Map(s) and Coordinates of the GEF Portal.

2) We cannot provide a more precise locations of demonstration sites at this stage as any country would make commitment on such detail right now. These will have to be

defined over the inception phase and included in the work programme approved by the first project Steering Committee.

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

8th of June 2021 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response -
Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8th of June 2021 (cseverin): Yes

27th of July 2022 (thenshaw):

(1) It is well noted that the project has carried out a gender analysis and developed a gender action plan. In the section on gender the project has indicated that the project expects to contribute to closing gender gaps related (access/control of natural resources; (2) women's participation and leadership; and (3) socioeconomic benefits. It is however unclear from project activities how the project plans to contributing to closing these gaps. In addition the

expected direct benefits is heavily tilted towards benefiting men ?direct benefits to more than 80,000 males and nearly 8,000 females across the six countries participating in the project?. Please provide further details on project activities contributing to closing gender gaps and or revise the ticked boxes in the section on gender. Please also review the estimated direct beneficiaries of the project and or provide further justification

7th of October 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed. See Annex H.

Agency Response

The targets identified for Core Indicator 11 are based on fisheries statistics collected and reported by the CRFM and FAO in the ?CRFM Statistics and Information Report? plus FAO data for Panama. The ratio of male to female is a true representation of the ratio of male to female persons employed in the project?s primary intervention sector and areas in the six countries to be supported by the project, and who fits the GEF?s definition for ?Direct Beneficiaries?. The estimate of beneficiaries did not include any extrapolations or inflation, but rather the real participation of males and females as they currently exist. Specifically, the following persons were considered in the determination of the male and female beneficiaries: persons employed in direct production in the marine commercial capture fisheries, persons employed in direct production in aquaculture, persons employed in other fisheries dependent activities such as fish mongers, fish processors and distributors, fishing gear and fishing boat repair folks, and park rangers employed in already existing MPAs to receive project support for enhanced management effectiveness.

While the project will support the creation of 14 new MPAs and the expansion of 6 more, the potential new beneficiaries and their disaggregated distribution by sex cannot be determined at this time, but until the corresponding management plans are developed which will outline gender perspectives in MPA management and opportunities for nature-based tourism linked to MPAs, which will also provide numerous opportunities for gender mainstreaming.

It is important to that note that it is a statistical fact the gender distribution in the fisheries sector has historically been and continue to be heavily skewed towards males in project countries simply due to the nature of the activity and deeply rooted cultural norms, even though this is slowly changing towards increased female participation in the sector, especially in Belize, with all legal and economic incentives available to both male and female fishers. Most women are involved in the processing, distribution, and marketing of fisheries products, and have been considered in the estimate of

beneficiaries proposed in this project. The male to female distribution in the sector may be improved with regulatory and structural changes targeting female participation, however, that specific objective falls outside the scope of this project. Nevertheless, the project's Gender Action Plan goes to great length in mainstreaming gender in all the project's activities. The project proposes to revisit and revise the targets for Core Indicator 11 at the mid-term and project's end, once new MPAs have been established with project support and more gender mainstreaming has been outlined as part of the MPA management planning process.

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8th of June 2021 (cseverin): Partly, It is noteworthy that only one private sector entity is part taking in the project by contributing cofinancing (as according to co-financing table). Furthermore, the private sector engagement plans miss specificity, please add this.

16th of August 2021 (cseverin): addressed

Agency Response

Texts on purpose to describe 9 specific approaches for engaging the private sector during project implementation phase. The new text is under the relevant *4. Private Sector Engagement section* in both the GEF Portal relevant section and as annexes in the PDF of the 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

8th of June 2021 (cseverin): Partly.

1) The single biggest risk for this project will be relating to the rigors of the MSPs and how they are being mainstreamed into informing political priority setting. Please include in the risk matrix.

2) Please also elaborate on the risk of low private sector engagement from the multiple economic sectors active in the coastal zone.

3) Please produce a separate document that outlines the opportunities and constraints due to the current COVID pandemic, and associated measures/actions to be taken.

16th of August 2021 (cseverin): addressed

Agency Response

Points 1), 2) and 3) have been addressed with additional texts in the Risk matrix uploaded in both the relevant section of the GEF Portal and in the PDF of the PRODOC

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8th of June 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please upload what has been named figure 1, it does not show in the portal.

16th of August 2021 (cseverin): addressed

Agency Response

All relevant texts, sections, figures and tables have been reviewed and uploaded as new in the portal to make sure all the information is there.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8th of June 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

8th of June 2021 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response -

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

8th of June 2021 (cseverin): It is noted that a document named Safeguards has been uploaded as part of the Request for CEO Endorsement project document, it hard to assess if this document is indeed a document that reflects upon environmental and social safeguards, as it reads more like a project summary. Please clarify this.

Further, please upload the final EES document to the portal as a stand alone document.

16th of August 2021 (cseverin): addressed

Agency Response

The EES is elaborated in the Annex J. CAF/GEF Safeguards Screening. This has been uploaded as standalone file on section 11. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) of the GEF Portal.

Monitoring and Evaluation

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8th of June 2021 (cseverin): Yes

16th of August 2021 (cseverin): please note that some expenses included are not eligible under ME budget, such as PSC meetings and Inception workshop. Please amend budget.

13th of October 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

16th August

The budget has been amended and the resources redistributed as per the GEF guidelines

Benefits

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8th of June 2021 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response -
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8th of June 2021 (cseverin): No, please make sure that safeguards document, cofinancing letters, gender strategy and other key documents are uploaded as annexes.

Further, please make sure that the TOC is inserted into the portal submission online portal entry, while also sitting in the prodoc, where it is currently sitting.

16th of August 2021 (cseverin): addressed

Agency Response

The Safeguard documents, the budget, the LoEs have been uploaded in both the online submission and as a standalone file in the roadmap of the project.

The ToC is inserted into the portal submission online portal entry

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

27th of July 2022 (thenshaw):

(1) There is inconsistency in reporting target for core indicator 2 in the core indicator table and the results framework (annex a).

Core Indicator 2 in the core indicator table reads 540,774 ha expected at CEO Endorsement. Indicator 2.1 reads 290,239.01 ha expected at CEO Endorsement. Indicator 2.2 reads 250,535.31 ha expected at CEO Endorsement. Annex A reads 290,239 ha total. It should read 540,774 ha total. Please revise Annex A accordingly.

7th of October 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response -
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
8th of June 2021 (cseverin):

Please make sure to upload Budget table as annex E in the online template.

Please upload project map

16th of August 2021 (cseverin): addressed

Agency Response

The project detailed budget has been inserted under the GEF Portal's ANNEX E: Project Budget Table in the Annexure section.

The project maps have been uploaded in the relevant section of the online submission.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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 8th of June 2021
(cseverin): Report included. OK

Agency Response -
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response -
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

8th of June 2021 (cseverin): No, please address above points.

16th of August 2021 (cseverin): No, please address above points

30th of September 2021 (cseverin): Please address the points as identified

13th of October 2021 (cseverin): Yes CEO Endorsement is being recommended

19th of October 2021 (cseverin): No, Please address above comments and make sure to include responses to the comments in project documents, as well as in the review sheet in the comment section

19th of April 2022 (thenshaw): No, please address the above comments. Thank you.

13th of July 2022 (thenshaw): No, please address above comment and resubmit. Thank you

27th of July 2022 (thenshaw): No, please address above comment and resubmit. Thank you

8th of October 2022 (thenshaw): Yes

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

Coastal and marine ecosystems are of critical importance to countries in the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem, providing a host of economic, leisure and cultural services. These coastal ecosystems support sustainable fisheries and aquaculture, and marine eco-tourism, and are instrumental in mitigating the effects of climate change.

The Caribbean and North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystems Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (CLME TDA) found that the major transboundary environmental threats affecting the Wider Caribbean Region were: i) habitat degradation and ecosystem community modification; ii) unsustainable fisheries, and iii) pollution. On this basis, the countries bordering and/or located within the Caribbean and North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystems (CLME+ region) has adopted a 10-year Strategic Action Programme for the Sustainable Management of the Shared Living Marine Resources of the Caribbean and North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystems (CLME+ SAP) to contribute to the achievement of a long-term vision of 'a healthy marine environment in the CLME+ that provides benefits and livelihoods for the well-being of the people of the region.

This investment will be promoting blue economy development in the CLME+ through marine spatial planning and marine protected areas (MPAs), ecosystem approach to fisheries (EAF), and sustainable seafood value chains. Ultimately, this investment will be addressing priorities in the SAP and assist in delivering against the long-term vision in the SAP.

This project will address some of the gaps identified under the CLME Projects and build onto the activities to enhance the regional governance arrangements for the protection of the marine environment and sustainable fisheries and by operationalizing improved policy coordination mechanisms for ocean governance, including enhanced marine spatial planning efforts and strengthened ecosystem-based fisheries management efforts, and sharing of information and knowledge management thereby promoting blue economy priorities.