

# Strengthening the Blue Economy: the Economic Case, Science-Informed Policy, and Transparency

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10424

**Countries**

Global

**Project Name**

Strengthening the Blue Economy: the Economic Case, Science-Informed Policy, and Transparency

**Agenices**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

10/28/2019

**Review completed by PM**

11/15/2019

**Program Manager**

Christian Severin

**Focal Area**

International Waters

**Project Type**

MSP

## CEO Approval Request

### Part I – Project Information

1. Focal area elements. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6th of November 2019 (cseverin): Yes

### Agency Response

2. Project description summary. 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

6th of November 2019 (cseverin): No, please address following items:

- 1) please adjust the project duration (front page of entry mentions 16 months duration) when portal submission in the text mentions project to be finishing December 2020.
- 2) Please ensure that portal entry can be read by it self and that annexs are only supporting evidence. Hence, sections can not be left blank with reference to annexes.
- 3) Please ensure that information in annexes are properly reflected upon in portal entry. (eg taxonomy and core indicators)
- 4) please consider to change project start date a bit further into the future, it may be hard to have this project CEO approved by the 15th of November.

15th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed.

26th of November 2019 (cseverin): Please change the categorization of the partner type of WRI as an executing agency. WRI is not a donor agency.

4th of December 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

### **Agency Response**

#### **Agency Response 7 November 2019**

- 1) The duration of the project is 13 months now from 02 December 2019 to 31 December 2020.
- 2) Note that the CEO documents that is appended file 01 contains all annexes A to W. Note as well at that B, C, D and E are not applicable in the context of this project. For ease of reference we have inserted Annex R right after the M&E blurb.
- 3) Note that there does not seem to be any option to upload Annex E and F *per se* hence please refer to the CEO Document file 01 accessible from the road map option on the portal.  
Note that Annex F has been amended in the portal. The suggested new tags as per question 9 below have been added.  
Further note that the gender indicator has also been added as requested in Question 9.

#### **Agency response 26 November 2019**

WRI now changed to Others

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

#### **Agency Response**

**4. Co-financing.** Are the confirmed 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, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

6th of November 2019 (cseverin): Yes

26th of November 2019 (cseverin): Please make following change. WRI is not a donor agency, but should be categorized as OTHERS.

4th of December 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

#### **Agency Response**

#### **Agency Response of 26 November 219**

WRI now categorized as others

**5. GEF resource availability.** 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**

6th of November 2019 (cseverin): Yes, funding is available under the IW focal area

**Agency Response**

STAR allocation?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Focal Area allocation?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

SCCF (Adaptation or Tech 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**

6. Project Preparation Grant. If PPG is requested in Table E.1, has its advanced programming and utilized been accounted for in Annex C of the document?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

NA

**Agency Response**

7. Non-Grant Instrument. If this an NGI, are the expected reflows indicated in Annex D?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

NA

**Agency Response**

8. Core Indicators. Are the targeted core indicators in Table E calculated using the methodology in the prescribed guidelines? (GEF/C.54/Infxxx)

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

6th of November 2019 (cseverin): No, please make sure that core indicators have both been captured in annex as well as in portal submission. Further, please make sure to include values under core indicator 11.

15th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

## **Agency Response**

### **Agency Response on 07 November 2019**

1) The core indicator 11 has been adjusted. Also note that there does not seem to be any option to upload Annex E *per se* hence please refer to the CEO Document file 01 accessible from the road map option on the portal for a copy of the same.

**9. Project taxonomy. Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as in Table G?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

6th of November 2019 (cseverin): No, please ensure that all relevant tags have been ticked, both in annex and in portal. It seems that among others, following tags would be relevant (climate change mitigation, climate finance (rio markers), ship, coastal, fisheries, SIDS, pollution, persistent toxic substances, plastics, nutrient pollution from all sectors except wastewater, nutrient pollution from wastewater, areas beyond national jurisdiction, large marine ecosystems, private sector, marine protected areas, biomes, mangroves, coral reefs, seagrasses, polar ecosystems, constructed wetlands etc, etc)

15th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

## **Agency Response**

### **Agency Response on 07 November 2019**

1) The taxonomy list has been adjusted.

## **Part II – Project Justification**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

6th of November 2019 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

6th of November 2019 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

6th of November 2019 (cseverin): yes

**Agency Response**

**4. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

6th of November 2019 (cseverin): Partly, under section 6 in the project document, only three projects has been identiifed as relevant projects for the project to be coordinating with and ensure that no overlap exists. The entire active GEF Investment portfolio is relevant to this proposed investment, hence please include some reference to this highly relevant portfolio in support of the proposed investment, and for supporting the outcomes of the investment.

15th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

## Agency Response

Agency Response on 07 November 2019

A paragraph has been added to section 6 as follows: “This project will be of significance to the entire GEF Large Marine Ecosystem (LME) Portfolio. Through component 4 and activities targeting engagement with IW LEARN, the project will ensure that the outcomes are shared with this LME community and the blue papers help inform other GEF initiatives, and thereby helping countries to transition into a blue economy. For those countries that are part of the High Level Panel and also part of an LME constituency (e.g. Jamaica, Kenya and Fiji), participation in this project will further benefit their projects and activate transition to a blue economy. “

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

## Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6th of November 2019 (cseverin): No, please make sure that sections in the portal is filled out, references to annexes etc is not enough.

15th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

## Agency Response

Agency Response on 07 November 2019

The Incremental Cost Annex N was added in the portal and is also available as part of the CEO document appended in the road map section.

**6. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration on the project’s expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

## Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6th of November 2019 (cseverin): yes

## Agency Response

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

## Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6th of November 2019 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response**

8. Project Map and Coordinates. Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

NA, this is a global project

**Agency Response**

9. Child Project. If this is a child project, an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

NA

**Agency Response**

10. 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

6th of November 2019 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response**

11. 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

6th of November 2019 (cseverin): Yes, however, please include values under core indicator 11.

15th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

### **Agency Response**

Agency Response on 07 November

This was done as mentioned above in question 2

**12. 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

6th of November 2019 (cseverin): Yes.

### **Agency Response**

**13. Risk. 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

6th of November 2019 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response**

**14. 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

6th of November 2019 (cseverin): Partly, please make reference to the entire active GEF marine investment portfolio, not by mentioning each and every project, but the portfolio in its entirety is indeed relevant to the project. The three projects referenced are not the only relevant projects for the project. Actually, it could be argued that the Active Large Marine Ecosystem project investments are equally, if not more relevant than the three highlighted examples.

15th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed

### **Agency Response**

Agency Response on 07 November

Section 6 in the CEO document was amended. See above and in the portal.

**15. Consistency with national priorities. Has the project described the consistency of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

6th of November 2019 (cseverin): Yes, the project, even though global, will be supporting national priorities on protection and sustainable management of the Ocean and its resources.

### **Agency Response**

**16. Knowledge management. Is the proposed “Knowledge Management Approach” for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

6th of November 2019 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response**

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

6th of November 2019 (cseverin): Partly, Please remove the \$8000 estimated to be used for Audit in the M&E budget, as that is to be financed out of the PM budget line.

15th of November 2019 (cseverin): Addressed. Even though the activity still shows in the ME budget, it is now funded out of the PM budget.

### **Agency Response**

Agency Response on 07 November

Please note that the Audit cost were charged to PMC and this has been specified in the M&E plan in section 9 on the portal.

**18. 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

6th of November 2019 (cseverin): yes

### **Agency Response**

**19. Annexes:**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

6th of November 2019 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response**

**Project Results Framework**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

### **Agency Response**

**GEF Secretariat comments**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Council comments

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

STAP comments

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Convention Secretariat comments

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Other Agencies comments

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

CSOs comments

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion****Agency Response**

Status of PPG utilization

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

NA

**Agency Response**

Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion****Agency Response**

Project maps and coordinates

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

NA, as this project is a global project

## **Agency Response**

### **Part III – Country and Agency Endorsements**

**1. 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**

NA

## **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**

**GEFSEC DECISION**

### **1. RECOMMENDATION.**

**Is CEO endorsement/ approval recommended?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

6th of November 2019 (cseverin): No, please address comments

15th of November 2019 (cseverin): Yes, CEO Approval is recommended.

26th of November 2019 (cseverin): No, please address the two issues identified

4th of December 2019 (cseverin): Yes, CEO Approval is being recommended.

**Review Dates**

**1SMSP CEO Approval**

**Response to Secretariat comments**

<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

The Ocean is the ultimate resource for all. It is the foundation for life and a healthy planet. Covering 70% of the Earth’s surface, the Ocean is the planet’s largest biosphere and is home to 50-80% of life on Earth. The Ocean generates 50% of the Earth’s oxygen, absorbs 25% of all carbon dioxide emissions, and captures 90% of the additional heat generated from those emissions—making it the largest carbon sink on the planet.

Fortunately, the Ocean has been rising rapidly up the international agenda in recent years. For example, in 2015, the UN's 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development agreed to a stand-alone "Goal 14" dedicated toward a vision to conserve and sustainably use the Ocean, seas, and marine resources. The UN has appointed a Special Envoy for the Ocean, Peter Thomson. And the UN has proclaimed 2021-2030 the "Decade of Ocean Science for Sustainable Development" to gather ocean stakeholders worldwide behind a common framework that will ensure ocean science can fully support countries in the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goal 14 on the Ocean.

This project will directly support the work of the High-Level Panel, which is a coalition of political leaders launched in 2018 by the Prime Minister of Norway and the President of Palau. The High-Level Panel for a Sustainable Ocean Economy is an initiative of standing heads of government committed to catalyzing bold, pragmatic solutions for Ocean health and wealth that support the Sustainable Development Goals and build a better future for people and the planet. Members of the Panel are the Head of Government of Australia, Canada, Chile, Fiji, Ghana, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Namibia, Norway, Palau, and Portugal, as well as the UN Special Envoy for the Ocean. The Panel seeks to shape the global debate on the conservation and sustainable use of the ocean and introduce a new narrative on what a "Sustainable Ocean Economy" is and how to achieve it

In detail the project "Strengthening the Blue Economy: The Economic Case, Science-Informed Policy, and Transparency", will be supporting development of (A) the High-Level Panel's landmark 2020 report on "Building a Sustainable Ocean Economy", (B) at least six underlying Blue Papers, and (C) a beta version "Ocean Watch" monitoring system. The outcome of this effort is that governments of at least 8 countries and 5 businesses adopt specific recommendations of the High-Level Panel (HLP) report and take a step towards transitioning into a sustainable ocean economy through creating processes that start implementing these recommendations (e.g., new policies, new investments, new programs).