

# Strengthening the Palau National Marine Sanctuary for the Conservation and Management of Global Marine Biodiversity and Sustainable Fisheries

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10611

**Countries**

Palau

**Project Name**

Strengthening the Palau National Marine Sanctuary for the Conservation and Management of Global Marine Biodiversity and Sustainable Fisheries

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

6/11/2020

**Review completed by PM**

2/3/2021

**Program Manager**

Sarah Wyatt

**Focal Area**

Biodiversity

**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 CEO Endorsement Request

9/22/2020

Yes, thank you for the revisions.

### Agency Response

UNDP Response, 15 January 2021: The GEF checklist is attached

UNDP Response, 15 December 2020

### Amendments to Project Document to address COVID 19 constraints and impacts

All additions and amendments are highlighted in yellow.

P. 13 Financial and Socio-Economic Constraints and Challenges

P.31 ? New Section at end of Results ?COVID 19 and the Project Outputs?

P. 43 Results Framework ? Component 3 (N.B. these were in the previous Response but not highlighted)

P.46 Additional GEF Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

P.47 GEF PIR

P.51 Responsibilities of the Project Board

P. 53 Responsibilities of the Project Manager

P. 54 General statement relating to project Management

P. 56-57 Co-financing Table 5 and Co-financing text

P. 80 ?85 Annex 3 Monitoring Plan ? numerous references

P. 86-90 Annex 4. UNDP Risk Log. Description of Risk relating to ?Impacts of ongoing COVID19 pandemic and any new human disease outbreaks on project implementation?  
Description of Risk relating to Inadequate and/or unsustainable long-term funding

P. 92. Annex 5. Project Managers tasks, Inputs and Outputs

P. 108. Annex 6: Stakeholder Engagement Plan . Activity and Frequency

P. 111. Annex 7: Gender Analysis and Gender Mainstreaming Plan

#### **Amendments to CEO ER to address COVID 19 constraints and impacts**

P. 1 Project Description Summary

P. 14 Baseline Scenario and/or any associated baseline projects

P.20 New Section at end of Proposed Alternative Scenario - COVID 19 and the Project Outputs

P.22 Incremental/additional cost reasoning, contributions for baseline and co-financing

P.31 Project Stakeholders

P.34 Stakeholder Activities

P. 36 Monitoring and Reporting

P. 37 Gender Analysis and Mainstreaming Plan

P.43- 44 Risks (various)

P.45 Function of Project Board

P. 47 Monitoring and Evaluation

P.48 GEF Project Implementation Report

**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 CEO Endorsement Request

9/22/2020

Yes, however please note the comments on the over promising of the project's alternative scenario.

Agency Response

UNDP Response 10/09/2020

-

Comments under Part 2. Item 3 Project Description have been noted and addressed in that section below

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**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 CEO Endorsement Request  
12/1/2020

Yes, thank you.

9/22/2020

No, please explain how investment mobilized was identified.

11/11/2020

No, the explanation is not included in the section titled "Explain how Investment Mobilized was Identified". Also, the project objective is much too long in the Portal (it appears that the Project description was put in this area instead.

Agency Response

UNDP Response 10/09/2020

-

This explanation has now been included through expanded text under Section VIII ? Financial Planning and Management in the Project Document for the two sources of ?Investment Mobilized?

Appropriate changes have been made in Table C of the CEO Approval Form with additional explanatory text on P. 22 under 4. Incremental/additional cost reasoning, contributions for baseline and co-financing

UNDP Response 27/11/2020

This explanation has now been included through expanded text under Section VIII ? Financial Planning and Management in the Project Document for the two sources of ?Investment Mobilized?

Appropriate changes and additions have been made in Table C of the CEO Approval Form and below under ?**Explain how Investment Mobilized was identified?**?.

Detailed explanation for all co-financing is included in the main ProDoc under Section VIII ? Financial Planning and Management in the Project Document for the two sources of ?Investment Mobilized?

**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 CEO Endorsement Request  
9/22/2020

Yes.

Agency Response  
**STAR allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/22/2020

Yes.

Agency Response  
**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/22/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

**SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

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 CEO Endorsement Request

9/25/2020

No PPG.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 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 CEO Endorsement Request  
9/22/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/22/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

**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 CEO Endorsement Request  
9/25/2020

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 CEO Endorsement Request  
9/25/2020

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 CEO Endorsement Request

12/1/2020

Yes, thank you for the revisions.

11/11/2020

No, the outcome "PNMS and its associated administrative and management arrangements are financially sustainable and secure for the long-term" as an example seems like it is overpromising what this project can reasonably deliver. Not to belabor this point, but a project will be evaluated based on whether it achieves its outcomes so while it is important to aim high it is also important to be reasonable.

9/25/2020

No. While the description is largely good, it seems likely that this document is overpromising on what this MSP with a reasonable amount of cofinancing can do particularly in the face of COVID-related reductions in tourism and, therefore, associated revenues.

## Agency Response

UNDP Response 10/09/2020

More detail has now been provided concerning the co-financing and its very real and concrete contribution to outputs and activities. This provides stronger explanation defining how the funds will be used to support the PNMS by way of science, research, monitoring and enforcement. This provides a clearer picture now of the very real funding input to PNMS of approximately \$4 million per year (being the total co-financing of \$17.25 million and the total GEF Funding of 1.83 million spread across 4 years ? see Tables C and D of the CEO Endorsement Request). This has been added within the Project Document on p.52 under **VIII Financial Planning and Management**.

The implications of COVID-19 on financial sustainability are clearly a concern for all GEF Projects. The issue is addressed on P.9 of the Project Document in the section **Institutional Management Baseline ? 5. Sustainable Funding**. It is also addressed as part of the **Mid-Term and End of Project Targets for Component 3, Outcome 3.1 in the Results Framework**. Additional text relating to this has also been added to the CEO Endorsement Request on P.21 under **4. Incremental/additional cost reasoning**.



#### UNDP Response 27/11/2020

More detail has now been provided concerning the co-financing and its very real and concrete contribution to outputs and activities. This provides stronger explanation defining how the funds will be used to support the PNMS by way of science, research, monitoring and enforcement. This provides a clearer picture now of the very real funding input to PNMS of approximately \$4 million per year (being the total co-financing of \$17.25 million and the total GEF Funding of 1.83 million spread across 4 years ? see Tables C and D of the CEO Endorsement Request). This has been added within the Project Document on p.52 under VIII Financial Planning and Management. Further discussion of the ?sustainable financing? requirements for the Project are also given under that section heading on P. 10 which considers the implications of the COVID 19 Pandemic within the context of the Project lifetime.

It is noted that the outcome "PNMS and its associated administrative and management arrangements are financially sustainable and secure for the long-term" is based on the situation existing pre-pandemic. However, this Outcome would not be expected to be achieved within the earlier stages of the Project and the delivery on possible options for long-term financial support and security would realistically be made available sometime toward the mid-term i.e. in 2022-23 by which time tourism would have been expected to be back up and running and other sources would also have been identified where possible. It is essentially a ?given? that a full-time source(s) of funding to support the long-term objectives of this project and the PNMS would need to be identified. The only other option would be for the project to arrive at a conclusion that the PNMS is not sustainable. The Outcome and associated targets within the RF have been somewhat modified in the Project Document to take into account some of the uncertainty now thrown up by the pandemic. This is also reflected in the wording in Table B of the CEO ER and in the ToC in both the ProDoc and the CEO ER

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/1/2020

Yes.

11/11/2020

No, please upload the new ProDoc. The TOC should be included in the PIF as per STAP guidance.

9/24/2020

No. While broadly good, there is significant information on the tuna fisheries that make it necessary for us to emphasize that the purpose of biodiversity resources is not protect or promote the tuna fishery but rather biodiversity more generally. This also goes for

domestic fishing. It's important to make the link to how the work of the project will have a bottom line result of biodiversity benefits. Please provide more information on these connections. A well-written theory of change would help explain the logic.

## Agency Response

UNDP Response 10/09/2020

Several references and discussion have now been added to support the importance of why protecting top predators such as tuna and associated bycatch (sharks, turtles, etc.) is directly beneficial to the sustainability of this large area around Palau, following the ecosystem approach to managing biodiversity.

Furthermore, there are existing references on P. 22 of the Project Document on how this project will directly address the CBD Aichi target 11 on increasing global protected areas as well as the SDG Goal 14 targets, especially target 2: By 2020, sustainably manage and protect marine and coastal ecosystems to avoid significant adverse impacts, including by strengthening their resilience, and take action for their restoration in order to achieve healthy and productive oceans and its associated Indicator - Proportion of national exclusive economic zones managed using ecosystem-based approaches. The details of how the project addresses SDG 14 are provided in a table in the Annex. A Theory of Change is also included in the Annexes.

Amendments to Project Document to address this Review concern:

P.1 - Brief Project Description

P. 5-6. II ? Development Challenge

P. 17 Explanation of how the Causal Chain Analysis leads to the ToC

Amendments to CEO Request

P. 1 B. Project Description Summary

P8-10 Global environmental problems, threats, root causes and barriers to be addressed

P.16 ? Refers to ToC in main Project Document

UNDP Response 27/11/2020

ProDoc was uploaded to Portal as confirmed by UNDP. ToC has now been added as an Annex to the CEO ER and referenced on P. 16 of same.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/25/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/25/2020

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 CEO Endorsement Request

9/25/2020

Yes. This project includes working on sustainable financing mechanisms as well as working to create a model for how a small country can manage a large MPA.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

9/25/2020

Yes.

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 CEO Endorsement Request 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 CEO Endorsement Request

11/11/2020

Yes, thank you.

9/25/2020

No, as this is a one-step MSP it would be helpful to understand better the consultations related to this project or at least relevant consultative processes that included project activities (understanding COVID limitations).

Agency Response

UNDP Response 10/09/2020

There is a full **Stakeholder Engagement Plan as Annex 5 of the Project Document**. Reference to this has now been added to the **CEO Request on P. 16** and further reference made in the **CEO Request on p.27 under Stakeholder Engagement** to the detailed section on Stakeholder Engagement within the Project Document

In the **Project Document - P.34** - The section on **Stakeholder Engagement** in the main text has been expanded further to confirm that consultations took place through in-country workshops and to list some of the stakeholders that have been engaged in the Project development process and will continue to be engaged during the Project lifetime. The same section on P. 34 also opens with an explanation of the detailed and widespread consultations that took place before enacting the PNMS in the first instance and this has also been added to the Stakeholder discussion on P. 27 of the CEO Request.

**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 CEO Endorsement Request

12/1/2020

Yes, thank you for the project specific information.

11/11/2020

No, again much of the text is generic and not specific to the project and its activities. It is important to note that the GEF Gender Policy is more than a "do no harm" policy. We understand that DWF has limited involvement of women and may be exploitative when they are present, so it is not something we are necessarily looking to encourage. We encourage shortening the PIF text to project specific information focusing on how the project will ensure the involvement and empowerment of women. A new project document was not uploaded with revisions described in other sections, so the referenced annex has not been included in the current documents provided.

9/25/2020

No, there is a lot of information on gender in the document but much of it is not specific to this project. A previous gender analysis by UNDP in Palau noted that gender stats are actually going backwards with the growth of the tourism economy and many of the better paying jobs in typically male areas. Differences in fishing activities are noted, but not how they will be addressed in planning as reef fishing seems to be more a women's activity (to be banned) while men do more pelagic fisheries.

## Agency Response

### Agency Response 10/09/2020

Because this Project is dealing with the PNMS primarily it is therefore addressing the control and elimination of commercial fisheries within the EEZ but beyond the territorial coastal waters. This fishing has primarily been the target of Distant Water Fishing fleets/Nations and not local smaller scale fishing. The Project will not be dealing with reef fishing as such, although the positive consequences of this Project should be to help take pressure of the reef fishery which would be advantageous to reef collectors (i.e. women). In essence, the no-take legislation for the PNMS affects the DWFNs and not the local communities. The establishment of the Domestic Fishing Zone represents a smaller part of the EEZ where foreign fishing vessels will be strictly controlled, and catches will remain predominantly within the domestic market (with some exportation allowed subject to associated taxation). This will strengthen the opportunities for more engagement in offshore fishing by local communities which will increase opportunities for women's employment and involvement.

Further text explaining this situation has been added to the Project Document section on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (P. 35) and also captured in the Gender Analysis and Mainstreaming Plan in Annex 7: P. 111-112 and in the CEO Request P. 42-43.

### UNDP Response 27/11/2020

It appears that the ProDoc was not accessed for this review and most of the changes were made in that document. On P.112 under **Activities and Goals of the Plan to Incorporate Gender into the Project** the explanation has been made that the govt plan to REQUIRE DWFNs to offload and process the tuna (that will be caught in the 20% Domestic Fishing Zone) in Palau? This will certainly create jobs and probably the majority of them for women which is the normal case for processing facilities in the Pacific. The previous response is repeated now within the context of an uploaded Project Document and the Annex as referred.

Because this Project is dealing with the PNMS primarily it is therefore addressing the control and elimination of commercial fisheries within the EEZ but beyond the territorial coastal waters. This fishing has primarily been the target of Distant Water Fishing fleets/Nations and not local smaller scale fishing. The Project will not be dealing

with reef fishing as such, although the positive consequences of this Project should be to help take pressure of the reef fishery which would be advantageous to reef collectors (i.e. women). In essence, the no-take legislation for the PNMS affects the DWFNs and not the local communities. The establishment of the Domestic Fishing Zone represents a smaller part of the EEZ where foreign fishing vessels will be strictly controlled, and catches will remain predominantly within the domestic market (with some exportation allowed subject to associated taxation). This will strengthen the opportunities for more engagement in offshore fishing by local communities which will increase opportunities for women's employment and involvement. Further text explaining this situation has been added to the Project Document section on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (P. 35) and also captured in the Gender Analysis and Mainstreaming Plan in Annex 7: P. 111-112 and in the CEO Request P. 42-43.

As noted in the prodoc and in the CEO ER, Gender Analysis and a Gender Mainstreaming Plan will be prepared during project implementation. Additional text pertaining to the sector is included on page 41 of the CEO AR. This approach recognizes the dearth of information and absence of gender-related policy that is specific to the fisheries sector. A gender expert is included in the Project Coordination Unit and budgeting to adequately address gender consideration.

**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 CEO Endorsement Request

9/25/2020

Yes, there is discussion about the role of fisherpeople (both large and small scale, foreign and domestic).

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 CEO Endorsement Request

12/1/2020

Yes.

11/11/2020

No, please note that STAP provided specific guidance on climate risk in June 2019. We appreciate the information provided of climate on fish in the PIF, but it is a requirement to consider and address climate risks to project outcomes.

9/25/2020

No, climate change or climate change impacts have not been discussed. It would also be good to discuss how the project will adjust to some of the challenges related to COVID and the uncertainty it brings.

#### Agency Response

UNDP Response 10/09/2020

Climate change issues and impacts are presented in a number of places in the Project Document. However, a more specific section has now been added to focus this discussion on **P. 5 of the Project Document** under **II. Development Challenge** and on **P. 24 of the CEO Request** under the discussion of **Regional and Global Environmental Benefits**

COVID 19 concerns have been addressed in the response above under Part II ? Project Justification - Response to Question 3 and subsequently within the documents

UNDP Response 27/11/2020

The Project Document has now addressed the climate issues in more detail as noted in the previous response. Furthermore, acting on the guidance from the Secretariat as provided above. The ProDoc now includes a new Annex (annex 11) that discusses **Climate Change Screening and Risks as per the STAP guidance from earlier this year.**

**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 CEO Endorsement Request

9/25/2020

Yes.

#### Agency Response

**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 CEO Endorsement Request

9/25/2020

Yes.

#### 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 CEO Endorsement Request  
9/25/2020

Yes, it's uncommon for BD projects to work with [IW:LEARN](#) but it's a good use of an existing platform and probably should be more common.

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 CEO Endorsement Request  
9/25/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

**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 CEO Endorsement Request  
9/25/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

**19. Annexes:**  
**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/25/2020

Yes.

Agency Response



**20. 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

9/25/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Council comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**STAP comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/11/2020

Yes.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

9/25/2020

Yes.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

RECOMMENDATION.

Is CEO endorsement/approval recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/17/2021

No, please make the following revisions:

1. Project expected implementation start time and project duration: Expected Implementation Start needs to be adjusted to a more realistic date ? otherwise when running reports, there will be a discrepancy that will go against the Agencies? performance indicators. Also, as it is presented now in Portal, the elapsed time between expected implementation start and expected completion date is 54 months instead of 48.

UNDP Response 26/2/2021: Implementation start is moved to July 2021 for a 48-month duration.

2. A Budgeted M&E Plan is missed in Portal. However, the M&E Plan in ProDoc (same that needs to be included in Portal) includes one item that requires some adjustments: Translations are not an eligible item to be financed by GEF resources ? please remove it or finance it using co-financing resources.

UNDP Response 26/2/2021: Translation cost is now deleted. The M&E Plan will be uploaded in the portal.

### 3. Co-financing:

(i) The letter from Ministry of Justice informs that the \$10M co-financing is in-kind. In the table C this has been divided into grant and in-kind. Please revise or provide a confirmation (e.g. by email) of the different types of cofinancing from the co-financier.

UNDP Response 26/2/2021: An email confirmation providing clarity on the cofinancing is attached.

(ii) The letter from Global Oceans does not specify the type of co-financing. It is not clear if the expected co-financing will be related to research and expedition (in-kind) or equipment (which can be considered investment mobilized).

UNDP Response 26/2/2021: A revised letter clarifying the cofinancing is attached.

4. On budget: some budget lines don't match ? i.e.in M&E plan the MTR and TE are costed at \$20,000+\$30,000 while in budget in ProDoc is costed at \$45,000 (see screenshots below). Additionally the Audit was not budgeted but is mentioned several times in the ProDoc. Will the project be audited? If so, it has to be charged to PMC.

UNDP Response 26/2/2021: The evaluation budgets are now made consistent in the ProDoc ? refer to Table 4, Budget Note 25 and International Consultants line item in Component 4. Audit cost is added in PMC ? refer to PMC Budget and Budget note 39.

### 5. On the GEF Checklist:

(i) Please ask the Agency to assign a number to each question as provided.

UNDP Response 26/2/2021: This is done.

(ii) Please ask the Agency to answer all the questions with YES ? NO ? N/A as appropriate - for example, questions in pages 2, 3, 4, 5 , 6 , 7, 8 and 9 (out of 11) are unanswered.

UNDP Response 26/2/2021: This is done.

## GEFSEC DECISION

### 1. RECOMMENDATION.

**Is CEO endorsement/approval recommended?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/5/2021

Yes, the project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.

2/17/2021

No, please make the following revisions:

1. Project expected implementation start time and project duration: Expected Implementation Start needs to be adjusted to a more realistic date ? otherwise when running reports, there will be a discrepancy that will go against the Agencies? performance indicators. Also, as it is presented now in Portal, the elapsed time between expected implementation start and expected completion date is 54 months instead of 48.

2. A Budgeted M&E Plan is missed in Portal. However, the M&E Plan in ProDoc (same that needs to be included in Portal) includes one item that requires some adjustments: Translations are not an eligible item to be financed by GEF resources ? please remove it or finance it using co-financing resources.

3. Co-financing:

(i) The letter from Ministry of Justice informs that the \$10M co-financing is in-kind. In the table C this has been divided into grant and in-kind. Please revise or provide a confirmation (e.g. by email) of the different types of co-financing from the co-financier.

(ii) The letter from Global Oceans does not specify the type of co-financing. It is not clear if the expected co-financing will be related to research and expedition (in-kind) or equipment (which can be considered investment mobilized).

4. On budget: some budget lines don?t match ? i.e.in M&E plan the MTR and TE are costed at \$20,000+\$30,000 while in budget in ProDoc is costed at \$45,000 (see screenshots below). Additionally the Audit was not budgeted but is mentioned several times in the ProDoc. Will the project be audited? If so, it has to be charged to PMC.

5. On the GEF Checklist:

(i) Please ask the Agency to assign a number to each question as provided.

(ii) Please ask the Agency to answer all the questions with YES ? NO ? N/A

as appropriate - for example, questions in pages 2, 3, 4, 5 , 6 , 7, 8 and 9 (out of 11) are unanswered.

12/1/2020

While the project is quite good, please provide information on adjustments and planning given the challenges of COVID.

11/11/2020

Not at this time. Please revise and resubmit.

9/25/2020

Not at this time. Please revise and resubmit.

#### Review Dates

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>First Review</b>	<b>9/25/2020</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/11/2020</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>2/17/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

#### CEO Recommendation

#### Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations