

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

Edit and Submit CEO Endorsement

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

Program Manager

Christian Severin

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.

Agency Response

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 8th of June 2021

(cseverin): No, please upload cofinancing letters

Agency Response

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

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

Agency Response

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.

Agency Response

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.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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.

Agency Response

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.

Agency Response

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.

Agency Response

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

Agency Response
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.

Agency Response
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.

Agency Response
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.

Agency Response

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.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8th of June 2021 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

Benefits

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 8th of June 2021

(cseverin): Yes

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

Agency Response
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.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**