

Sustainable management of fisheries, marine living resources and their habitats in the Bay of Bengal region for the benefit of coastal states and communities

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10069

Countries

Regional (Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Maldives, Sri Lanka, Thailand)

Project Name

Sustainable management of fisheries, marine living resources and their habitats in the Bay of Bengal region for the benefit of coastal states and communities

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

6/10/2021

Review completed by PM

2/17/2022

Program Manager

Steffen Hansen

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

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

SH (7.13.21):

(Refer to the review sheet titled "10069 BOBLME2 GEF RS" to be found under the list of project documents)

Changes have been sufficiently described and justified in the Portal Section 1.11. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments -

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (7.13.21):

(Refer to the review sheet titled "10069 BOBLME2 GEF RS" to be found under the list of project documents)

SH (7.13.21):

- Thank you for describing changes between PFD council approval and submission of this CP. There is a substantive decrease in budget targeted pollution reduction (plastics/nutrients) compared to PFD council approval phase. While noting that the core focus of the FAO Child Project is not nutrients/plastic pollution, please confirm that most of these type activities have been financed under the the ADB child project? Also, please

elaborate on the program level knowledge sharing and dissemination of lessons learnt between the FAO and ADB child projects.

SH (8.20.21): Cleared.

- In the portal submission section 1, pls include countries. Currently Zambia is mentioned.

SH (8.20.21): Cleared.

12.8.21: Please address the below comments:

1. The parent's PFD's table D show some differences (\$200k in GEF amount and \$18k in fee) with this child project for FAO:

Please confirm whether the parent PFD's envelope was approved inclusive of the PPG and PPG fee. If this is the case, based on the approved PPG document and as indicated in table F of the child project, the table D of the child project should be as indicated in the table sent to FAO via email.

2. Budget tables include several segregated tables by FA and by funding allocation which makes it impossible to reconcile with table B and to review. FAO did not use the template included in the Guidelines (see page 46 of the Guidelines) or include the template in Annex E of the CEO Endorsement Portal view. FAO is requested to please follow this format - the components must be presented in the columns (no need to do it by outcome). Please note that this budget must be the same budget to be appended to the documents' tab in the Portal (in excel format). Also, the totals per component have to be the same between Table B in the Portal and budget table. As there is no budget to review, we will only be in a position to provide comments on the budget by the resubmission.

3. Core Indicators:

a. Please add the METT Score to the project under the Core Indicator 2. If this is not feasible at the advanced stage of preparation, please elaborate further in the Target justification section under the Core Indicator section why this could not take place and indicate the steps to identify METT scores by inception stage.

b. Annex A 'Project Results Framework' - Please include GEF Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment (with the target disaggregated by gender)

SH (2.9.22): Please address the below comments and resubmit.

1. There is a column missed: M&E. Even if M&E activities are embedded within component 5, per Guidelines it is required to have the column for M&E. Please note that

the budget must be presented to allow the Secretariat assessing whether the budget categories (civil works, contractual services, consultants, salaries, etc.) are appropriately charged to the sources (project's components, M&E, PMC) ? in absence of M&E column, we cannot assess this. Please amend so all M&E Activities (i.e. see comment 4 below) will be properly charged to the M&E column.

SH (2.17.22): Not cleared. On the missed M&E column: The column M&E was added to the project budget but the amount from the M&E budget (\$423,750 ? \$121,750= **\$302,000**) does not match the amount provided in the project budget in Annex E (\$367,585) ? please amend this in all table budgets.

SH (2.22.22): Cleared.

2. The costs of the Senior Programme Officer / Regional Coordinator Technical + the Regional RCU Coordinator + National Coordinators + National Administrator Support + Sub -regional hub coordinator are charged either totally or partially to projects components. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. In this case, 3 million from the co-financing have been allocated to PMC - please note that 16% of the total co-financing resources are represented in grants, which would allow the executing costs to be fully covered by PMC. Please amend by addressing the above point. Also EAFM training embedded in national and regional training institutions was wrongly charged to PMC ? please properly charge it to the correspondent component.

SH (2.17.22): Cleared.

3. Computers and IT equipment office equipment are wrongly charged to the project components ? these items have to be charged to PMC. Also the budget item ?Add and estimate what will go under each item? (underlined in red color) is not an eligible item to be financed by GEF funds ? please remove it.

SH (2.17.22): Cleared.

4. Sub-regional hub operation costs lacks details ? please provide details of what activities are expected to be financed in this budget line, so one can assess whether these are eligible. Also Independent MTR, TE and Terminal report have to be fully charged to M&E, not to PMC ? please amend.

SH (2.17.22): Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

FAO Response (22.2.22):

Re to the M&E activities/budget: figures in both "*ANNEX G: Project Budget*" and section "*C. Describe The Budgeted M & E Plan*" in the submission are now consistent.

FAO Response (14.2.22):

1. A column for M&E was created to make it visible for the review. IN previous versions M&E was integrated into the technical components.

2. The cost of the Senior Programme Officer / Regional Coordinator Technical + the Regional RCU Coordinator + National Coordinators + National Administrator Support + Sub -regional hub coordinator are ALREADY MANLY charged on the cash (grant) co-financing of NORAD. **Please see the self-explanatory table below for ease reference.**

NORAD pays already 80% of the Project's staff. Kindly note that the detailed Budget of the co-financing provide by NORAD has been consistently uploaded in the submissions (over the past 14 months) for ease reference of the secretariat. This information must be considered as an integral part of the submission.

Kindly note that the \$285,283 charged on project GEF grant are justified by technical tasks detailed in Annex L: Terms of Reference for experts and committees. This Annex is uploaded as part of the Agency Project Document Annexes attachment and also as standalone project for ease reference.

Kindly note that the label "*EAFM training embedded in national and regional training institutions was wrongly charged to PMC*" was a wrong label. The correct label (now included in the submission) is *Sub-Regional hub GS support (South-East Asia)*. This is correctly charged on PMC.

		GEF Project	PMC (GEF)	NORAD Project	PMC (NORAD)	TOTAL
5011 Salaries Professionals	RCU and techncial regional Staff Costs	285,283	165,331	734,962	123,804	1,309,380
IUCN	Senior Programme Officer/ Regional Coordinator Technical	88,455	0	220,615	0	309,070
IUCN	Regional RCU Coordinator	196,828	13,058	508,314	0	718,200
IUCN	Regional Staffs to support Admin and Financial Management	0	152,273	6,033	123,804	282,110
5012 GS Salaries	RCU admin, Field office admin	0	88,597	1,206,802	11,500	1,306,899
BOBPIGO	Sub-Regional hub GS support (South Asia)	0	22,500	0	7,500	30,000
SEAFDEC	Sub-Regional hub GS support (South-East Asia)	0	36,000	148,649	4,000	188,649
IUCN	National Coordinators 7 countries	0	16,594	583,406		600,000
IUCN	National Administration Support 7 countries	0	13,503	474,747		488,250
Grand Total		285,283	253,928	1,941,764	135,304	2,616,279
Percentages:		21%		79%		
		GEF		NORAD		

3. Computers and IT equipment office equipment have been charged on PMC for all executing agencies. Kindly note that IUCN allocated \$50,000 on *?Equipments, Software*

and IT for field missions and measurements?. These funds are used to support the technical activities and cannot be charged on PMC.

We take note that "Add and estimate what will go under each item?" is not an eligible. The typo was fixed.

4. Detailed have been provided on the category 5028 Other Operating Costs

The costs for the Independent MTR, TE and Terminal report have been fully charged to M&E.

FAO Response (1.25.22):

1. All the figures in the submission have been reviewed and adjusted to ensure there is a match between the CEO Endorsement Request in the Portal and the parent's PFD's table D. The structures of the GEF grants and PPG is now as follows:

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Country Regional/Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in USD)		
					Program Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b)*	Total c=a+b
FAO		Regional			8,984,739	808,626	9,793,365
FAO	GEF TF	Bangladesh	CC-M		494,160	44,475	538,635
Total Grant Resources					9,478,899	853,101	10,332,000

+

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	(in \$)		
			Amount (\$)	Agency Fee (b)*	Total c=a+b
FAO			189,573	17,062	206,635
FAO	GEF TF	CC-M	10,427	938	11,365
Total Grant Resources			200,000	18,000	218,000

2. The Budget tables have been remade. In the Box Text of the Portal we copy/paste two tables summarizing the allocation of the GEF grants. The first table provides the breakdown of the IW and CCM grants per outcomes and budget lines organized following the GEF budget template and FAO codification of budget. The second table provides the sum of the budget per project's components. Both tables reconcile with table B in the submission.

To complete the information and ensure consistency, we also uploaded in the roadmap of the submission a new Excel file named Budgets BOBLMEII rev25Jan22.xlsx. This includes four spreadsheets, namely: 1). The summarized table copy/pasted in the portal; 2) the breakdown of the IW funds with more details in the budget lines definition; 3) the breakdown of the CCM funds with more details in the budget lines definition; and 4) the detailed budget of the NORAD co-financing.

Kindly also note that the four spreadsheets mentioned above are also uploaded in the roadmap of the submission as part of the document Annexes BOBLME2 rev25Jan22. This is a compilation of all the Annexes to the FAO ProDoc.

3. Core Indicators:

a. Re: METT Score to the project under the Core Indicator 2.2: Inserted the areas of the MPAs and their IUCN category. The actual sites are to be finalized and METT scores assigned during inception. These Marine Protected Areas (Marine Managed Areas - MMAs) will be validated and selected as part of the Inception Phase, at least two (2) per country. Participating countries will select the priority MPAs that they would like to focus on for Component 2 on MMAs with an anticipated total hectares 200,000 ha national MMA, 200,000 ha Mangrove. Alongside this, at least 1,600,000 ha of trans-boundary marine managed areas for fisheries will be incorporated into improved management. This should allow achieving the target of 2,000,000 ha MPAs created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use, i.e. slightly more than the target set for the submission for the CE Endorsement Request. MPA Sites will be at various levels of maturing in terms of MPA management effectiveness ? some newly established sites requiring the support to develop MPA management plans and others mature MPAs that have been monitored to some extent for a number of years. In each case, it will be important to consult with the MPA management teams and to develop a short plan of action for strengthening their respective MPAs. This likely involve undertaking a METT assessment using the new METT4 guidance (recently released and improved to incorporate more indicators that look at outcome and governance ? a weakness of the previous version). A major strategy of IUCN is to promote the "IUCN Green List standard" (which is designed to complement and build on the METT logic) in component 2. The Green list standard will be used as the principal framework and benchmark for assessing MPAs against international best practice, irrespective of which monitoring and assessment tools have been previously used (i.e. METT, MEAT or any other of the many site assessment tools). The IUCN Green List serves as a comprehensive and valuable tool for framing MPA management planning and gap analysis for MPA management improvement planning. The Green List also serves as an accreditation programme. The practical application of the GL as a practical management planning and gap analysis tool will be invaluable in the BOBLME Component 2 work. IUCN will also look at the application of the IUCN GL in connection to OECMs and meeting the anticipated 30x30 targets under the Global Biodiversity Framework (post 2020 CBD). The IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas is a meticulously elaborate process that aims at encompassing biodiversity rich sites under a certification mechanism so as to help in their conservation more efficiently and progressively. It considers the equations of adaption and flexibility in order to suit the needs of individual cases and conditions and endeavours to outline a near-exhaustive detailed process that can be used and applied as a global ?Standard of Conservation and Sustainability?. It is an accreditation programme that recognizes effectively and equitably managed and fairly governed terrestrial and marine protected and conserved areas that are achieving their conservation outcomes. If this is not feasible at the advanced stage of preparation, please elaborate further in the Target justification section under the Core Indicator section why this could not take place and indicate the steps to identify METT scores by inception stage.

b. Annex A ?Project Results Framework? now includes the gender disaggregated figures as requested.

FAO (7.20.21)

- Noting that the ADB Child project will have its own implementation and governance arrangements (PSC and reporting to the Government of Myanmar), the child project ?Demonstration Investments in Eco-Waste Infrastructure Solutions: Thanlyin and Ayeyarwady Watersheds? aims to strengthen policy, regulatory and technical capacity in the water sector covering nutrients and solid waste (including plastic) pollution. Whilst this child project is focused on Mandalay City and Thanlyin in Myanmar its innovative approaches will have relevance and applicability across the BOBLME. The knowledge

generation and the first phase of dissemination to the sub-regional hubs of the FAO child project will be the task of the ADB child project. The BOBLME 2 national steering committee will coordinate closely with the ADB child project to ensure lessons learned can be taken up and shared with other BOBLME partner countries. The sub-regional hubs will further disseminate to concerned national agencies and partners (also local governments) in the participating countries. The RPSC will also ensure coordination with the FAO programme and ADB child project at its annual meeting. Once opportunities have been identified, national partners, with the support of the project, will facilitate exchange visits for on-site learning to the waste management intervention locations in Myanmar. Under the modest IW and NORAD funding, there is focused work to reduce pollution and plastic waste in fishing harbours that arise as a direct result of fishing and fishery post harvest activity. The outcome of these activities will be shared within the BOBLME 2 framework by the executing agencies. The expected outcome of this knowledge sharing is the identification of comparable activities for other BOBLME countries.

- The correct countries have been included in the portal submission.

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

SH (7.13.21):

(Refer to the review sheet titled "10069 BOBLME2 GEF RS") to be found under the list of project documents)

SH (7.13.21): Thank you for providing the additional budgets. Cleared.

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

SH (7.13.21):

(Refer to the review sheet titled "10069 BOBLME2 GEF RS") to be found under the list of project documents)

SH (7.13.21): Cleared, however, GEF notes that the information provided specific to the Environmental and Social Risk Assessment is limited, while the ESM plan is largely identical to the risk assessment. AT the time of project inception FAO will need to consider as part of the plan all government restrictions in place specific to COVID-19, including the

risks pertaining to spread of the disease to local communities/IPs. Also, new developments specific to political instability and implications for execution of project activities should be fully considered etc.

SH (8.20.21): Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

FAO (7.20.21)

FAO will liaise with all governments to assess and prepare contingencies measures to restrictions that may be put in place specific to COVID-19.

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (7.13.21):

(Refer to the review sheet titled "10069 BOBLME2 GEF RS") to be found under the list of project documents)

SH (7.13.21): GEF recognizes challenges pertaining to the ongoing COVID pandemic. Cleared with the expectation that co-finance letters from both Sri Lanka and Indonesia will be sought by project inception stage. These letters should be documented in the project PIR.

Response to Secretariat comments

FAO (7.20.21)

The co-finance letters from both Sri Lanka and Indonesia are and will be sought by project inception stage. These letters will be documented in the first PIR delivered by the project.

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (7.13.21):

(Refer to the review sheet titled "10069 BOBLME2 GEF RS") to be found under the list of project documents)

SH (7.13.21):

- it is unclear how the 100 tons plastics avoided (GEF indicator 5) is captured in the project results framework? Please address.

SH (8.20.21): Cleared.

- Please adjust the CCM Rio Marker to 1.

SH (8.20.21): Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

FAO (7.20.21)

- The estimated total of 100 tonnes of plastics avoided is a relatively modest target, and in line with the foreseen emphasis on preparation and dissemination of guidelines and similar knowledge or information products. The focussed activities under component 3.1 will target 8 fishing harbours in the BOBLME area. The estimated reduction of plastic waste entering the environment from improved solid waste management in harbours, gear disposal and plastic waste from fish trading activities is estimated at 1 tonne per month in each harbour. This equates to 12 tonnes per harbour per year and an annual project-wide total of 100 tonnes plastics avoided (GEF indicator 5) across the project. Subsequent scaling up will be achieved through partnership with the GloLitter Project and further national (co-finance) activities.

- The CCM Rio Marker has been set to 1.

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

SH (7.13.21):

(Refer to the review sheet titled "10069 BOBLME2 GEF RS") to be found under the list of project documents)

SH (7.13.21): cleared.

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

SH (7.13.21):

(Refer to the review sheet titled "10069 BOBLME2 GEF RS") to be found under the list of project documents)

SH (7.13.21): cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments -

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (7.13.21):

(Refer to the review sheet titled "10069 BOBLME2 GEF RS") to be found under the list of project documents)

SH (7.13.21): The current KM section remains limited in scope. The project aims to develop a knowledge management and communication strategy at the outset of the project implementation, with participation of all BOBLME partners.

Response to Secretariat comments

FAO (7.20.21)

The project will develop a knowledge management and communication strategy at the outset of the project implementation in synergy with the programme partners.

Agency Responses

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

GEFSEC

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (7.13.21):

(Refer to the review sheet titled "10069 BOBLME2 GEF RS") to be found under the list of project documents)

SH (7.13.21): cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments -

STAP

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (7.13.21):

(Refer to the review sheet titled "10069 BOBLME2 GEF RS") to be found under the list of project documents)

SH (7.13.21): cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments -

GEF Council

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (7.13.21):

(Refer to the review sheet titled "10069 BOBLME2 GEF RS") to be found under the list of project documents)

SH (7.13.21): cleared, thank you for incorporating into the RF a sub-indicator specific to tracking of IPP engagement and the development of FPIC plans in the results framework. IPP engagement plan completed within first year and any IPP relevant issues identified and included in the FPIC process.

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

SH (7.13.21):

Please address comments and resubmit.

SH (10.8.21): Please address the below remaining comment.

We don't consider that conditions exist for the execution of GEF projects in Myanmar at this time and we recommend removing this country from the project.

SH (12.8.21): Please address remaining comments in the review sheet box 2 and resubmit.

SH (2.9.22): Please address remaining comments in review sheet box 2 and resubmit.

SH (2.17.22): Please address remaining comments in review sheet box 2 and resubmit.

SH (2.22.22): PM recommends for CEO Endorsement.

Response to Secretariat comments

FAO (14.2.22)

The comments in review sheet box 2 have been addressed. Relevant reviewed information and files were uploaded in the Portal.

FAO (11.13.21)

Comment on Myanmar is addressed. In application of the request of the GEF, the Prodoc and Annexes have been reviewed removing references to and activities in Myanmar.

Kindly note that Myanmar is still referred to in some texts of the CEO ER - but these references are general background, and unrelated to project activities.

FAO(7.20.21)

All the comments included in the revision of 7.13.21 have been addressed.

Re to Myanmar, FAO would also like to note that: the recent political crisis in the country has resulted in the UN CT (country Team) issuing policy guidance to UN agencies regarding engagement in Myanmar. UN agencies have been given clear instruction to desist from engaging with the de facto authorities on any matters pertaining to policy or direct cooperation with government agencies. Given this guidance, Myanmar will be kept in the list of countries covered by the Bay of Bengal project, but engagement with the country by the project will be put on hold. For the time being, no execution agreement will be signed with the defacto authorities and Myanmar's involvement in project activities

will be suspended, until such time as the advice from the UNCT on engagement with Myanmar changes.

Review Dates

	Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		7/21/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)		11/13/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)		1/26/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)		2/15/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)		2/22/2022

CEO Recommendation

Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations