

Inclusive conservation of sea turtles and seagrass habitats in the north and north-west of Madagascar

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10696

Countries

Madagascar

Project Name

Inclusive conservation of sea turtles and seagrass habitats in the north and north-west of Madagascar

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

11/26/2021

Review completed by PM

2/25/2022

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

Focal Area

Biodiversity

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 **30 November 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

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 **3 December 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

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 N/A

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

30 November 2021:

1. The co-financing letter from the Foundation for Biodiversity and Protected Areas of Madagascar (FAPBM) refers its contribution as "Grant/loan/Investment Mobilized co-financing" while it is reported in Table C as "In-kind" and "Recurrent expenditures". This is not consistent. Please clarify.
2. The co-financing letter from Community Centered Conservation (C3) doesn't include the name of the entity in the top of the letter nor with the signature. In addition, this letter identify 2 kind of co-financing ("In-kind" and ""Grant/loan/Investment Mobilized co-financing") while there is only one kind in Table C. Also, there is no name of who signed the letter. Please adjust the letter and Table C as needed.
3. The co-financer Sahamalaza National Park is referred as "COSAP Sahamalaza" in Table C. Please ensure the name of the co-financer is the same in Table C and in the co-financing letter.
4. The co-financer Analalava Fisheries Circumscription is referred as "Analalava Fisheries Association" in Table C. Please ensure the name of the co-financer is the same in Table C and in the co-financing letter.
5. The tables in the co-financing letters from Analalava Fisheries Circumscription and Cantonnement de l'Environnement et Developpement Durable include inconsistent information with in-kind contributions to the project components and a total amount reported as grant/loan/investment mobilized. Please revise the letters as needed and ensure they are consistent with Table C.
6. Please elaborate further below the Table C on how the "investments mobilized" were identified, being more specific for each investment mobilized.

February 1st, 2022:

- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. Thank you for the amendments and clarifications. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Thank you. The letter has been corrected as "Grant/investment Mobilized?". Same edits have been done in ProDoc, Table 11. Project co-financing, p. 93; and CEO ER Table C, p.4.

2. Thank you. Completed signature in the letter and corrected Table C to include both In-kind and Grant/Investments mobilized. CEO ER Table C, p.4.

3. Thank you. The entry was corrected as "Sahamalaza National Park?". The edit was made in the ProDoc, Title Page, p.2; Table 11. Project co-financing, p. 93; and CEO ER Table C, p.4.

4. Thank you. Corrected as "Analalava Fisheries Circumscription?". The edit was made in the ProDoc, Title Page, p.2; Table 11. Project co-financing, p. 93; and CEO ER Table C, p.4.

5. Corrected as In-kind/Recurrent expenditures in the co-financing letters. No need to make edits in the Table C, CEO ER.

6. Table C has been complemented with how each of the investments mobilized were identified in the CEO ER.

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

30 November 2021:

There is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 4.98%, for a co-financing of \$19,124,189 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$952,384 instead of \$243,000 (which is 1.3%). As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and/or the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

February 1st, 2022:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you. The PMC co-financing has been corrected as \$952,000 to be proportional. Edits have been made in the Prodoc, Table 10. Distribution of GEF and Co-Financing Resources by Component p. 92; and CEO ER, PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY, pp. 2-3

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

30 November 2021:

Yes, cleared.

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

30 November 2021:

In the core indicator section of the Portal entry, the "Indicator 2.2 Marine Protected Areas Under improved management effectiveness" target is 0 while it should be 428,134 ha, as informed in the project description and results framework. Please correct.

February 1st, 2022:

Thank you for the correction. Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you. The issue has been corrected

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

3 December 2021:

1. There is no Annex G in the Portal entry nor in the Prodoc. Please clarify.
2. All the necessary information should be included in the Portal entry (instead of only relying on the Prodoc). The Portal entry is the main project document of the CEO

endorsement request for the GEF. So please, complete this section with the full description of the context, problems, root causes and barriers.

February 1st, 2022:

1. Cleared.
2. We don't see any changes in the text. Please clarify.

February 23, 2022:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

February 1st, 2022:

2. We have pasted again the full description of the context, problems, root causes and barriers both in the CEO ER and the portal.

1. Apologies for the mistake. The reference for taxonomy was for annex F in the CEO ER.
2. Thank you. This has been completed.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3 December 2021:

1. The baseline mainly focuses on national regulatory framework and initiatives. Please complete the presentation with the baseline in the local context where the project will be implemented (local governance, main stakeholders and their mandate).
2. Please also complete the description with local initiatives and projects from the international cooperation.

February 1st, 2022:

1 and 2. Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Thank you. Subsection **Baseline situation in the project area and project sites** has been added to the CEO ER, section 2 **The baseline scenario and any associated baseline initiatives**, pp. 10-12. Additionally, national and local stakeholders are described in the section **Stakeholders** of the CEO ER, pp. 34-43.

2. Subsection **Key baseline initiatives in the project area and entire Madagascar** has been added to the CEO ER, section 2 **The baseline scenario and any associated baseline initiatives**, pp. 12-17.

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

3 December 2021:

Yes, cleared.

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

3 December 2021:

The presentation is limited to the names of the project components aligning with the GEF focal strategies. Please elaborate on how the project is aligned with each focal area strategy used in this project.

February 1st, 2022:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you. The explanation how each Component will contribute to relevant Focal Area has added to the ProDoc, section **Alignment of the project with the GEF Focal Areas**, p. 50; and CEO ER, section (4) alignment with GEF focal area and/or impact program strategies, pp. 28-29., as the following:

Component 1: Strengthening the policy, legal and institutional framework for sound management of sea turtles and seagrass habitats. The Component will contribute to BD-1-1 through (1) development/update of inter-sectoral policy, strategic and legislation documents for conservation of sea turtles and seagrass at the national and provincial levels; and (2) reestablishment of the Fisheries-Environment Commission as the inter-agency and inter-sectoral collaboration mechanism for sustainable management of mangroves, sea turtles and seagrass at national level and strengthening the roles of the NC-ICZM (National Committee for Integrated Coastal Zone Management) and its members RC-ICZM (Regional Committee for Integrated Coastal Zone Management), through reviving the Regional Environment Committees (Cellules Environnementales Regionales).

Component 3: Incentives for local communities and private sector to conserve sea turtles and seagrasses. Component will contribute to BD-1-1 through (1) assistance to local communities in the project sites to develop community-based projects targeting conservation of sea turtles, seagrass and mangroves through Blue Carbon mechanisms and

other sustainable livelihood approaches; and (2) cooperation with a private sector (hotels, tourist companies, fishery product collectors, and fishing companies) to integrate sustainable practices and mechanisms incorporating sea turtle and sea grass conservation into business practices in the project area.

Component 3: Incentives for local communities and private sector to conserve sea turtles and seagrasses. The Component will also contribute to BD-1-5 through full involvement of local coastal communities in establishment of sustainable livelihood and income generated models based on biodiversity/ecosystem conservation and sustainable use.

Component 2: Effective management of sea turtle and seagrasses habitats. The Component will contribute to BD-2-7 through (1) establishment and operationalization of two new MPAs/LMMAs in the sea turtle and seagrass habitat ? Bobaomby and Analalava; and (2) improvement of the management of Nosy Hara and Sahamalaza National Parks, and Ankarea and Ankivonjy MPAs through systematic training programs, equipment, support, and operationalized community-based monitoring and patrolling with focus on sea turtles and seagrass conservation?.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3 December 2021:

Yes, cleared.

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

30 November 2021:

Yes, cleared.

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

3 December 2021:

1. We learn that the FEIMC was liquidated for political reasons and this project aims at re-establishing it. Please explain what will make this key coordination structure sustainable and prevent it to be liquidated in the future.

2. There is no clear consideration on the project potential for scaling up. Please elaborate on this aspect too.

February 1st, 2022:

1 and 2. Thank you for the clarification and complement. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. The texts governing this Commission are still in force. Although it is already planned to set up a new Institution to replace it, the legislative texts concerning it have not yet been signed so far. The project document foresees to revitalize **the Fisheries-Environment Commission, currently dormant (not liquidated)**, while waiting for the promulgation of the new texts during the implementation of the Project. Should the promulgation be done before the launching of the Project, the Fisheries-Environment Commission will be replaced by the new Institution. If the current structure of Madagascar Government/Ministries does not change the Commission will be a sustainable entity for a long period (up to 10 years).

2. The subsection **Innovativeness** has been renamed into the **Innovativeness and potential for scaling up** as the subsection considers both innovative approaches and their replication. Additionally, a mechanism for replication of the best practices has been added to the subsection (CEO ER, pp. 31-32). Same edits have been made in the Prodoc, in the section **3.9. Replication and Innovation**, pp. 72-73, as the following:

?The development and implementation of these innovative mechanisms as well as other successful project practices can be replicated in Madagascar as well as other countries of Africa and Asia. To make it possible the project will:

- *Conduct quarterly lessons learning session to systemize positive and negative experiences from the project implementation and identify best practices for potential replication;*
- *Develop detailed algorithm for each of the best practice models generated by the project with consideration of factors contributing to the practice success and failure;*
- *Disseminate best practice models among national and international stakeholders through different communication channels and assist them in their replication providing on demand technical support to interested parties?.*

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

30 November 2021:

Yes, cleared.

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

N/A

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

3 December 2021:

1. In addition to the gender consideration, please provide a summary of the main lessons learned from the consultation process.
2. The engagement of several partners in the project is said to be "co-financing" (such as KfW, USAID, US Fish and Wildlife Service) but they are not mentioned among the co-financiers in Table C. Please clarify.

February 1st, 2022:

Thank you for the additional information and clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Thank you. The following edits have been made to the CEO ER (Stakeholders section, p. 35) and ProDoc (section 2.5. Stakeholder mapping and analysis, p. 29) to summarize briefly key lessons learned from stakeholder consultations:

Additionally, stakeholder consultations at local level (Diana and Sofia Regions and in the project sites) demonstrated high level of support to the project among local communities as well as their willingness to participate in the project activities; relatively rich experience of local communities and community associations in participation in other similar projects conducted by NGOs in the project area; high interest of local communities in establishment of MPAs/LMMAs as a form of active protection and ownership of coastal resources by communities; and necessity to establish local inter-sectoral structures for the project implementation (e.g., Technical Working Committees at Regional level)?.

2. These organizations were identified as potential co-financiers for the project at the initial PPG stage, however, later they did not confirm their co-financing commitments. ?Co-Financing? has been deleted from the roles of these organizations in the project implementation. Relevant edits have been made in the Table 1. Key project stakeholders and their roles in the project implementation (CEO ER, pp. 35-43; and ProDoc, pp. 29-38).

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

3 December 2021:

The table 9 of the Prodoc provides a good overview of how gender issues will be considered under each component. Please attach this table in this section of the Portal entry.

February 1st, 2022:

No, the Table 9 hasn't been attached under the gender section of the Portal entry. Please insert it.

February 23, 2022:

Thank you for adding the table 9 in the Portal entry. Cleared.

Agency Response

February 1st, 2022:

Thank you. Done both on the CEO ER and portal.

Thank you. Done.

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

3 December 2021:

Yes, cleared.

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

1st December 2021:

1. The climate change risk needs to be deeper analyzed. More clarification on threats and impacts, along with their appropriate mitigation measures is needed. Please outline the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project location or at country level if not available at local scale (including a time horizon, ideally 2050, if the data is available) and list key potential hazards for the project that are related to the climate scenarios. For further guidance, the Agency may want to refer to STAP guidance available here: <https://www.stapgef.org/stap-guidance-climate-risk-screening>.

2. Please complete the Covid-19 the risk analysis with an opportunity analysis, considering eventual opportunities this project can provide to enhance the resilience of the beneficiaries against possible future pandemics (it can be a specific separate note after the risk table). For further clarification, we advice to refer to the note "Project Design and Review Considerations in Response to the COVID-19 Crisis and the Mitigation of Future Pandemics" shared by GEF Secretariat with the GEF Agencies on September 14, 2020 and available here: <https://www.thegef.org/documents/project-design-and-review-considerations-response-covid-19-crisis-and-mitigation-future>.

February 1st, 2022:

1 and 2. Thank you for the additional analyses. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Thank you. The Brief Climate Change Impact analysis is included in the Threats section of the Project Document, Climate Change Effects subsection, pp. 15-16. Reference to this subsection has been added to Table 6. Project Risks and Risk Management Measures, pp. 66-68, in the ProDoc. Additionally, subsection **Climate Change Effects projected in the project area and entire Madagascar coastal waters** has been added to the section **Risks** of the CEO ER, pp. 45-48. As suggested by the project climate risk management measures have not been changed as they seem to be sufficient for the project.

2. Thank you. An additional **Appendix 26. COVID-19 Analysis and Recommended Measures** have been included in the project package. Reference to the appendix has been added in **Table 6. Project Risks and Risk Management Measures**, pp. 66-68, and **Table 8. ESSF Risks and Risk Management Measures** in the ProDoc, pp. 76-80; and **Risk** section in the CEO ER, pp. 44-48

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

1st December 2021:

The Project Coordinator should be charged under the PMC and not under a component. We understand his/her role in Component 1 as presented in the TORs in Appendix 9 but considering the PMU has a technical assistant already charged under the components and as we expect such key assignment should be a full time job, this technical role should be relatively limited. Please revise accordingly the cost of the Project Coordinator charged under Component 1.

February 1st, 2022:

Thank you for the clarification provided. Nevertheless, considering the management of a nearly \$3.4 million project should be a full time job, please clarify how the tasks corresponding to the missing 64% of the Project Manager work time will be carried out and by whom. Also, as the Program Manager is expected to work so much time on technical issues, please consider adjusting the name of the Project Manager title adding a technical qualification which corresponds to component 1 focused on policy issues. In general, it is difficult to understand that 36% of a work time would suffice to manage this project and such a low share may not be accepted depending on the justification provided (the technical assistant will use only 28% of his/her time for PMC-related activities).

March 3, 2022:

Thank you for providing an explanation of the reasons why project manager and technical assistant have been charged to the component and to PMC saying that these positions will provide both managerial and component's deliverables. However, when one reads the TORs, it is clear that both positions' responsibilities are mainly managerial in nature. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. Please consider utilizing both portions allocated to PMC (GEF portion and co-financing portion). For this project, the co-financing portion allocated to PMC is \$952,000 and out of 19.3 million of co-financing, 7.8 million (40%) are presented in grants. There should be enough room for these costs to be covered by the co-financing resources. Please amend as needed.

March 17, 2022:

Thank you for the justification. We understand that due to the lack of adequate financial resources in cash, it is not possible to support management staff with the co-financing portion of the PMC which is only in-kind and the option proposed by the Agency is the

best possible one. Considering the mix role of the project manager and the technical assistant (both managerial and technical) and in the interest of the project and its beneficiaries, the justification provided is accepted. Cleared.

Agency Response

March 17, 2022

To clarify further, the GEF project has no grant (cash) funds to support the Project Manager and Technical Assistant salaries from the co-financing. The co-financing for PMC mentioned in the project package represents in-kind co-financing only. Also, MEDD has no resources to directly support the PMC (Madagascar is one of the poorest countries in the world). At the same time, MEDD claims both positions to be critical for the project's effective management. So, we have no other option but support these two positions from the GEF funds. The Project Manager position was renamed in the Project Coordinator and Policy Expert to strengthen his/her input to Outcome 1. ToRs for the Project Coordinator and Policy Expert and Technical Assistant have been edited to underline their role in the delivery of the project Outputs.

The changes have been made in Appendix 9. Terms of Reference for key personnel; ProDoc's SECTION 4: INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS, pp. 88-89; and CEO ER's Section 6. Institutional Arrangements and Coordination, pp. 67-68

February 1st, 2022:

Thank you for the comment. We are happy to provide further clarifications and have adjusted the name of the Project Manager to "Project Manager and Policy Coordinator" to better capture his/her role as covering also policy coordination for the delivery of Component 1. In our experience project management is premised on teamwork and so should not be an exclusive responsibility of the Project Manager. The Project Manager is not able to implement this function without the support of other PMU members and will spend 36% of her/his time directly on project management, while the Technical Assistant will spend 28% of his/her time, the two Regional Coordinators 23% of their time each, the M&E, KM and Communication Officer 9%, and the Finance & Administration Assistant will be fully dedicated (100%) to project management. We consider this as a sufficient collective effort to ensure effective project management of this project.

Thank you for the comment. The Project Coordinator will implement project management functions, but also will provide direct technical support to the delivery of the project Outputs under Outcome 1. In accordance with Table B - Execution Functions eligible for funding by the GEF portion of PMC of the Guidelines, direct technical support to the delivery of the project Outputs is a not eligible function for the PMC funding. That is why the Project Coordinator was partially budgeted from project Component 1 (these functions cannot be budgeted under PMC in accordance with Tables B and C of the Guidelines). The Technical Assistant will provide advisory support to all project Outcomes and PMC. He/she will not be able to ensure full delivery of the project Outputs under Outcome 1. That is why that will be a function of the Project Coordinator in addition to his PMC function. Similar management arrangements have successfully been implemented for other GEF projects. No changes have been made to the project budget.

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

30 November 2021:

Yes, cleared.

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

1st December 2021:

1. Please provide more details for the expense of \$141,000 for "Budget to organize stakeholders consultations and meetings on the project Outputs and extraction of lessons learned".

2. In the budget, the same amount is used for items that don't clearly relate to K&M activities ("Budget for the MEDD to organize stakeholder workshops to discuss and finalize policy and legislation documents developed under Output 1.1 (Year 2); and "Budget to organize stakeholder meeting on re-establishment of the Fishery-Environmental Commission, Inception Meeting of the commission, and some initial working meetings of the Commission and Regional Committees for Integrated Coastal Zone Management in Diana and Sofia Region (Output 1.2)"). Please clarify if these budget items are the same expenses as those reported in the M&E budget.

3. We learn in the risk analysis that the project will use already proved and tested models to deliver Output 3.1 to make sure they will work in the project area. As this is key to incentivize local communities, please provide more details on these proved and tested models.

February 1st, 2022:

1 and 2. Thank you for the amendment. Nevertheless, by requesting more details we expected the budget and timeline of specific knowledge and learning outputs/deliverables, such as the ones presented in this section under "To systemize and share its lessons and knowledge, the project will use different communication means including:". In the added table, please be more specific in terms of deliverables and time line ("Years 1-5" means

any time during project implementation: it can be relevant for some KM expenses, but not nearly all of them). Many useful information is in the Appendix 4. Apologies if it was not clear enough in the previous comment.

3. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

February 23, 2022:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

February 1st, 2022:

1 and 2. Thank you. The KM Budget Table in the CEO ER (p. 57) has been updated as requested on Feb 1:

KM Activities/Expenses	Timeline	Budget USD
<p>Travel expenses for the PMU to monitor PRF and GEF indicators (M&E), ESMP, stakeholder involvement plan, Gender Mainstreaming Strategy, and GRM implementation (M&E), and extract and share lessons learned, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monitoring meetings with the project partners to discuss Output related project progress and lessons learned; - Collaborative and experience exchange meetings with other sea turtle and seagrass conservation projects in Africa and Asia and other relevant projects (on demand) 	<p>Years 1-5 Quarterly Annually</p>	<p>45,000 20,000 25,000</p>
<p>Part of the salary of the M&E, KM and Communication Officer (~20% of the work time for KM activities), that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development and update of the project Communication and KM Strategy; - Development and update project page on the MEDD web-site with available project reports, publications, press-releases, datasets, draft and final legislative documents, developed management plans, etc; - Development of the annual project bulletin (with input from all PMU members); - Collection and storage of geospatial data related to the project (with input from all PMU members); - Development publications and presentations at the Virtual Knowledge Exchange hosted by the Global Wildlife Programme and other international platforms (with input from all PMU members); - Facilitation of the lesson extraction session with the PMU and project partners and lessons description and systematization 	<p>Years 1-5 Year 1, and update annually Year 1, and update quarterly Annually Quarterly Semi-annually Quarterly</p>	<p>15,000</p>

<p>Approximately 10% of the Sub-Contracts budget (Outputs 1.3, 2.1-2.3, and 3.1) will be used for extraction and description of the lessons learned by the Responsible Parties, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Exchange visits for local communities, NPs and LMMAs to demonstrate the best practices (on demand); - Development of the Output related manuals, guidelines, publications, instructions, etc (on demand); - Quarterly Output related lessons learning sessions and systematization of the lessons; - Participation in the lessons exchange meetings between the project partners 	<p>Years 1-5</p> <p>Annually</p> <p>Annually</p> <p>Quarterly</p> <p>Annually</p>	<p>181,800</p> <p>100,000</p> <p>30,000</p> <p>10,000</p> <p>41,800</p>
<p>Approximately 10% of the budget(work time) for Mid-Term Review and Terminal Evaluation (M&E, International Consultants) will be used for extraction of the lessons learned, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lesson extraction sessions with the PMU and project partners; - Review of the project lessons in the Evaluation Reports 	<p>Years 3 and 5</p>	<p>6,000</p>
<p>Publication of the project materials, including lessons learned; print out for the project KM events, Years 1-5 (M&E), including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Special paper and online publications, including manuals, guidance, methodologies, etc. (on demand) - Publications in mass media, conservation, and scientific journals (on demand) 	<p>Years 1-5</p> <p>Annually</p> <p>Annually</p>	<p>25,320</p> <p>20,000</p> <p>5,320</p>
<p>Stakeholders Knowledge Exchange Events hosted by MEDD</p>	<p>Years 1-5</p> <p>Annually</p>	<p>MEDD Co-financing</p>
Total (GEF):		273,120

1 and 2. Thank you. The KM Budget Table in the CEO ER (p. 54) has been updated as follows:

KM Activities/Expenses	Timeline	Budget, USD
Travel expenses for the PMU to monitor PRF and GEF indicators (M&E), ESMP, stakeholder involvement plan, Gender Mainstreaming Strategy, and GRM implementation (M&E), and extract lessons learned	Years 1-5	45,000
Part of the salary of the M&E, KM and Communication Officer (~20% of the work time for KM activities)	Years 1-5	15,000
Approximately 10% of the Sub-Contracts budget (Outputs 1.3, 2.1-2.3, and 3.1) will be used for extraction and description of the lessons learned by the Responsible Parties	Years 1-5	181,800
Approximately 10% of the budget(work time) for Mid-Term Review and Terminal Evaluation (M&E, International Consultants) will be used for extraction of the lessons learned	Years 3 and 5	6,000
Publication of the project materials, including lessons learned; print out for the project KM events, Years 1-5 (M&E)	Years 1-5	25,320

3. Thank you. We have included a clarification on Output 3.1 in **Table 6. Project Risks and Risk Management Measures**, pp. 66-68, in the ProDoc; and the section **Risks** of the CEO ER, pp. 45-48, as follows:

?The project will use already proved and tested models to deliver Output 3.1 to make sure they will work in the project area (e.g., the Guiding Principles for Delivering Coastal Wetland Carbon Projects (UNEP 2014) and experience of the similar Blue Carbon project in Kwale County, Kenya, and Blue Ventures? Tahiry Honko Community Mangrove Project in Madagascar; sustainable fishing and collection of sea products approaches that are friendly for sea turtles, seagrass, mangroves, and coral reefs; and community-based ecotourism initiatives in cooperation with local tourist companies that includes monitoring of sea turtles and seagrass based on the successful experience of Blue Ventures, C3, WWF and WCS in the project area and other parts of Madagascar)?

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

1st December 2021:

The uploaded document doesn't seem to be the last version as it is titled "DRAFT Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF)", some information is missing (fields highlighted in yellow) and it is not signed. Please explain and complete as needed.

February 1st, 2022:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Apologies for the confusion. The final version has been uploaded. The ESMF however should not be signed (please, see Appendix 17. UNEP Environmental and Social Safeguards Assessment ? SRIF that is the one duly signed).

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

1st December 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

March 17, 2022: Agency Response to Comment Below on M&E Budget

1. Thank you! As you suggested we added an Outcome and two Outputs for Component 4. M&E, and Knowledge Management, as the following:

?Outcome 4: Project lessons learned through effective M&E and Knowledge Management are applied by the project stakeholders and other projects in Madagascar and abroad

Output 4.1. Participatory M&E and learning framework developed and implemented for the project

Output 4.2. Lessons learned by the project are applied for adaptive management and shared nationally and internationally?

The changes above have been made throughout the ProDoc, CEO ER, and Annexes.

2. Thank you for the comment! The project M&E, KM budget is 6.6% of the GEF grant because the project has 6 project sites that are located in two remote districts. The following footnote has been added to the project ProDoc (Section 7.1. Overall project budget, p. 93), Appendix 6. Costed Monitoring & Evaluation Plan, and CEO ER (Section 9. Monitoring and Evaluation, pp. 69-70):

?The M&E budget takes 6.6% of the GEF budget (more than recommended 5%) because the project has 6 project sites and the sites are located in two remote regions (Diana and Sofia) and available mainly by sea. So, because of that the project M&E will require slightly more funding than an average GEF project of the same size?.

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

1st December 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1st December 2021:

1. The tables under the Annex A and the Annex E go beyond to the page limit of the Portal entry (on the right side). Please adjust the format of these tables so that they fit within the limits of the Portal entry.

2. Please attach in Annex E and upload in the documents section a budget including the entities responsible for executing the activities. The Agency is invited to use the GEF budget format available in GEF guidelines accessible through the following link: https://www.thegef.org/sites/www.thegef.org/files/documents/GEF_Guidelines_Project_Program_Cycle_Policy_20200731.pdf (Appendix A page 46).

February 1st, 2022:

1. No, unfortunately the Annex A and E still go beyond to the page limit of the Portal entry. It may be a Portal issue but as it can be done with the other projects submitted in the Portal, please try again to adjust the format of these tables. If the problem persists, please do not hesitate to reach out to GEF Sec and we will see how we can solve it with GEF IT support team.

2. Thank you for the clarification. As "Responsible entity", the GEF means the entity which receives the funds from the GEF Agency (UNEP) and which is responsible for the activities. In this case, we understand it will be only the MEDD. If this is correct, the MEDD can be indicated as executing entity for all the project activities.

February 23, 2022:

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared

Agency Response

February 1st, 2022:

1. Many thanks. We have fixed Annexes A and E so that they fit the Portal entry.
2. We have revised the budget accordingly to reflect MEDD only.

1. **Appendix 1. Budget by UNEP budget lines and components** has been abridged as requested to fit the GEF Portal Entry.

2. Under each project Output the project indicates key partners/Responsible Parties who can **potentially** deliver the project Outputs or Activities. The actual entities responsible for executing the activities will be selected by the PMU/MEDD during the project implementation through follow a standard recruitment and advertising process to have at least three competitors for each contract. Selection will be based on qualifications, technical experience and financial proposal, to ensure hiring the best consultant (individual or organization) for an optimal price. We have provided an indicative response in the project budget table.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1st December 2021:

1. The GEF core indicators are missing in the Project Result Framework. Please add the 3 core indicators 2.1, 2.2 and 11 mentioning their exact name.
2. The gender consideration is only included in component 3 while it is also considered with targets in the components 1, 2 and 4. Please complete to include all the gender consideration across all the components.

February 1st, 2022:

Thank you for the complement and clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. GEF Core Indicators have been added to the Appendix 3. Project Results Framework and Annex E of the CEO ER.
2. The indicator **Percentage of women participating in the project activities** under Outcome 3 indicates women participation in delivery of all project Outputs. The clarification has been added to the Indicator name. This indicator was included under Outcome 3 because there we have a relevant project **Output 3.3. Project gender mainstreaming action plan is developed and implemented**. Additionally, **Appendix 19. Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan** includes a set of Output indicators indicating the project gender mainstreaming targets for each project Output.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1st December 2021:

In the PIF review sheet, the GEF Secretariat had the following comments:

"During PPG phase, please:

- continue working with the identified partners to confirm the expected additional co-financiers' engagements;
- conduct the necessary IPLCs, CSOs and Private sector consultations to develop the modalities of their engagement in the project;
- Gender: go beyond species actions for women and girls, and disaggregated data, identifying the potential inequalities between males and females and define a project strategy to reduce these inequalities (access to project opportunities ? resources, training, decision making entities, etc.)
- Further analyze the climate risk and the COVID-19 possible consequences on the project and develop appropriate mitigation measures

- Core indicators: Consider the eventual opportunity to include areas of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity out of protected areas to enhance the justification of the BD1.1 objective (core indicator 5)."

Please indicate how these comments were addressed in Annex B.

February 1st, 2022:

Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you. The comments have been addressed in the CEO ER's Annex B.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1st December 2021:

The responses to Council comments (from USA, Germany and France) are missing. Please complete the Annex B as needed.

February 1st, 2022:

Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you. The comments have been addressed in the CEO ER's Annex B.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1st December 2021:

The responses to STAP comments are missing. Please complete the Annex B as needed.

February 1st, 2022:

Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you. The comments have been addressed in the CEO ER's Annex B.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

30 November 2021:

Out of a total budget of \$100,000, \$50,005 have been spent to date and \$49,995 are committed. Cleared.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

30 November 2021:

Yes, cleared.

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

N/A

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 N/A

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 N/A

Agency Response

AGENCY RESPONSE TO THE COMMENTS BELOW:

Documents have been renamed/uploaded accordingly.

March 17, 2022: Agency Response to Comment Below on M&E

1. Thank you! As you suggested we added an Outcome and two Outputs for Component 4. M&E, and Knowledge Management, as the following:

?Outcome 4: Project lessons learned through effective M&E and Knowledge Management are applied by the project stakeholders and other projects in Madagascar and abroad

Output 4.1. Participatory M&E and learning framework developed and implemented for the project

Output 4.2. Lessons learned by the project are applied for adaptive management and shared nationally and internationally?

The changes above have been made throughout the ProDoc, CEO ER, and Annexes.

2. Thank you for the comment! The project M&E, KM budget is 6.6% of the GEF grant because the project has 6 project sites that are located in two remote districts. The following footnote has been added to the project ProDoc (Section 7.1. Overall project budget, p. 93), Appendix 6. Costed Monitoring & Evaluation Plan, and CEO ER (Section 9. Monitoring and Evaluation, pp. 69-70):

?The M&E budget takes 6.6% of the GEF budget (more than recommended 5%) because the project has 6 project sites and the sites are located in two remote regions (Diana and Sofia) and available mainly by sea. So, because of that the project M&E will require slightly more funding than an average GEF project of the same size?.

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1st December 2021:

Not yet. Please address the comments raised above. In doing so, please indicated in the review sheet where the changes are made and highlight in yellow the modified or added text.

In addition: Some uploaded documents in the documents sections are titled "Appendix 1", 2, 11, 12, 15, 18, 23, 24 and 25. Please rename these documents with an explicit title so that we can know their content without opening them.

February 1st, 2022:

Not yet. Please address the few remaining comments.

March 3, 2022:

Not yet. Please address the remaining comment above on the Project Manager and Technical Assistant. In addition, further checking revealed the need to address the 2 following comments:

1. On Table B: please include the expected outcomes and outputs for the M&E component.

M&E, Knowledge Management	Technical Assistance	N/A	N/A	GET	225,320.00
---------------------------	----------------------	-----	-----	-----	------------

2. On M&E: M&E budget (\$225,320) represents 6.6% of the overall budget. For a FSPs up to 5 million, we usually expect a percentage around 5%. Please reconsider the M&E budget accordingly or justify this relatively higher cost (per GEF Guidelines, key determinants for the preparation of the M&E budget can be the project size and the number and remoteness of project locations, which could be relevant for this project). In case M&E cost is revised, please ensure it is reported and consistent throughout all the information provided (table B, budget, project description...).

March 17, 2022:

Thank you for addressing the remaining comments. The CEO endorsement is now recommended.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/3/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/1/2022	

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)	3/3/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/17/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations