

# Fisheries and Ecosystem Based Management for the Blue Economy of the Mediterranean - (FishEBM MED)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10560

**Countries**

Regional (Albania, Algeria, Lebanon, Libya, Montenegro, Morocco, Tunisia, Türkiye)

**Project Name**

Fisheries and Ecosystem Based Management for the Blue Economy of the Mediterranean - (FishEBM MED)

**Agencies**

FAO, UNEP

**Date received by PM**

11/26/2021

**Review completed by PM**

5/12/2022

**Program Manager**

Taylor Henshaw

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

**PIF** ☐

**CEO Endorsement** ☐

**Part I ? Project Information**

**Focal area elements**

**1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

SH (12.13.21): Yes, the project remain aligned with the GEF IW and BD focal areas. Cleared.

**Agency Response NA**

**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**

SH (12.13.21): Overall yes, however, please:

1. Provide an update specific to Egypt's and Bosnia-Herzegovina's aspirations to join the project during PPG phase. GEF notes that Egypt plays a significant role in the Mediterranean specific to fisheries.

SH (4.28.22): Considering Egypt's important role in the Med Sea specific to fisheries, GEF encourages GFCM to continue engaging Egyptian counterparts during execution. Cleared.

2. For clarity, please in the "Summary of changes in alignment with the project design with the original PIF?" include a matrix that clearly shows changes between PIF and CEO End stage specific to outcomes, outputs and indicators.

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.

3. Portal submission table B: Component 2 is placed before component 1. Please correct.

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.

4. To what extent does this project consider support for new marine value chains specific to low input/lower tropic aquaculture systems, and which show higher degrees of pandemic value chain resilience? Analytical support could be provided as part of an overall ecosystem approach, while taking into account future needs to re-train (small scale fishermen) and develop investment plans for the repurposing of existing infrastructure (boats, processing plants, cold storage facilities etc.). A significant push towards alternative/sust./middle income livelihoods creation may be necessary in some marine areas.

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.

5. The formatting of the Theory of Change figure in the Portal submission leaves out details/descriptions. The same seems to be the case for the PDF versions provided in the list of supporting documents. Please upload a complete version to the portal list of documents.

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.

6. Little reference is made to the Montenegro NBSAP and the necessary alignment of the NAP+ activities with the NBSAP framework. Please also indicate in the PRODOC and portal submission if the foreseen NAP+ process will feed into a future NBSAP update process.

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.

7. Please refine the Results Framework Component 2 and its output description to include concrete targets specific to each output listed.

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.

8. Please note that part of the PRODOC needs updating, including the PRODOC table of content and some annexes (see comment specific to annexes). Updates to the GEF portal submission should be reflected in a revised version of the PRODOC.

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.

## Agency Response

### FAO/UNEP Responses 06-Apr-22

1) The project will engage with Bosnia and Herzegovina for those regional activities that may benefit the entire LME in the context of the GFCM's processes and initiatives. Regarding Egypt, contacts were made with the country but, despite reminders sent by the GFCM, the LoE has not been received during the PPG phase.

2) A matrix was included in the 'Summary of changes in alignment with the project design with the original PIF' that shows changes between PIF and CEO End stage specific to outcomes, outputs and indicators.

3) Table B in the portal was updated accordingly.

4) While aquaculture is potentially one alternative or complementary livelihood opportunity, the project will not focus specifically on this, but keeps it as one option among others with regard to diversification. For diversification of small-scale fisheries livelihoods, participatory approaches are required to ensure sustainability. Although aquaculture is still about fish, capture fishers do not necessarily see it as a closely related activity that can readily substitute fishing. Where aquaculture is identified as a viable alternative, low input/lower trophic level aquaculture would be preferred to avoid further pressure on fishery resources by a need for fish-based feeds. A dimension that needs to be carefully considered with the development of any alternative economic activity is the competition for space in the coastal area.

5) The ToC has been updated in both the portal submission and in the PDF version of the Agencies ProDoc attached in the roadmap of the submission.

6) Wording provided by Montenegro was included in the ProDoc. This is: "*Montenegro developed its first National Biodiversity Strategy with the Action Plan for the period 2011-2015 in 2010 and updated it for the period 2016-2020 in 2015. The planned NAP+ will build upon the general principles of biodiversity protection and conservation indicated in the NBSAP especially on the provisions related to marine ecosystems and will reflect its strategic targets, especially the ones related to inter-sectoral cooperation, information management, illegal fisheries, invasive species and protected areas. The outcomes achieved through the NAP+ will also contribute to improved integration of fisheries and other economic activities in the future releases of the NBSAP.*"

7) The Results Framework has been updated accordingly.

8) The PRODOC and Portal have been updated.

**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 NA

**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

SH (12.13.21):

- Please note that for cofinance to qualify, it must fall within the project implementation timeline. Please revise cofinance letters as needed and adjust the project cofinance number.

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.

- As evidence of buy-in to the project please provide a co-finance letter from Algeria and Tunisia.

SH (4.28.22): Please aim for letters to be submitted and documented via PIR submission by the time of project inception.

- Please translate the Morocco cofinance letter and ensure that the letter references the cofinancing category and amount.

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.

- The component wise co-finance split seems to be wrong specific to Catapult CX cofinance letter.

SH (4.28.22): Cleared

18th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Please address following comments:

- (1) CIHEAM Bari: Please revisit the split between "in-kind" and "grant".
- The co-financing letter lists 13 projects, and the majority of the projects are already closed (meaning there will not be any co-financing available for disbursement during the GEF project implementation). For these projects which have been closed, please report the amount as "in-kind / recurrent expenditures".
- The eligible amount for "Grant/Investment Mobilized" needs to reflect (i) the amount which will be available for distribution during the GEF project implementation, and (ii) the reasonable proportion out of the entire project which will be supporting the GEF project implementation.
- (2) IUCN. Please change "Other" to "Donor agency". Please revise the co-financing categories. The co-financing letter lists 4 projects (2 projects have been closed and the other 2 projects do not have the implementation timeline. Same as above -- please report the amount for the closed projects as "in-kind / recurrent expenditures".
- (3) Libya. Please change "Beneficiaries" to "Recipient country government"
- (4) Montenegro. Please change "Grant" to "Public investment".
- (5) University of Alicante. Please clarify how the university will contribute \$800,000 - cash, research, data collection/analysis, etc. If the work will be done by research, data work, etc, report as "in-kind / recurrent expenditures"
- (6) WWF Mediterranean Marine Initiative. Please change "Other" to "CSO".

7th of July 2022 (thenshaw):

- (1) Addressed.
- (2) Addressed.
- (3) Addressed.
- (4) Addressed.
- (5) Addressed.
- (6) Addressed.

d

## Agency Response

### FAO/UNEP Responses 10-June-22

- 1) For CIHEAM Bari, after consulting the institution, it was decided to report the entire co-financing as "in-kind / recurrent". All the projects included in the letter will prepare the ground for the successful implementation of the FishEBM Med project. For this reason, they may be considered as co-financing. However, some of them will be finished, and the other already started by when the FishEBM Med will kick-start the execution - therefore it is correct to report this as *recurrent*.
- 2) The label for IUCN was changed to "Donor agency". After consulting the institution, it was decided to report the entire co-financing as "in-kind / recurrent" for consistency of the timeline of the 4 projects reported by the organization with that of the FishEBM Med project.
- 3) The label for Libya was changed to "Recipient country government"
- 4) The category for Montenegro was changed to "Public investment".
- 5) for the University of Alicante the work will be done by research, data work, etc. For this reason, the 800k has been reported as "in-kind/recurrent expenditures"
- 6) Label for WWF Mediterranean Marine Initiative was changed to "CSO".

### FAO/UNEP Responses 06-Apr-22

1. The timelines of each co-financing letter has been reviewed. Those that did not match the project's timeline were excluded. We would like mentioning that the co-financing that was removed do not affect the capacity of the project to achieve its objectives. The co-financiers that are not included in this version of the project document will still be engaged in the project execution, proving their inputs and contributions during stakeholders meetings, steering committees, workshops, etc.

A NEW PDF file grouping the 21 letters remaining in the project have been uploaded in the roadmap of the submission for ease reference.

2. Despite several attempts made by FAO and UNEP over the past months, Algeria and Tunisia did not submit any co-financing letter. The project PMU will insist with the two countries over the project execution. As soon as any additional letter would be received (from Algeria and Tunisia or any other partner), this will be included in the project and duly reported through the annual PIR.

3. The letter of Morocco has been translated. The translation from French to English and the convention from Moroccan MAD and USD was done. The translated letter has been attached as PDF in the portal submission.

4. The letter of Catapult contains a typo. However, the letter clearly indicates a commitment of 11,500,000 USD that has been accounted for.

#### **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 SH (12.13.21): Cleared.

Agency Response NA

**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 SH (12.13.21): Cleared.

Agency Response NA

**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  
SH (12.13.21):

- Please change the indicator # specific to 7.4 from 4 to 1.

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.



- Indicator 2.1 ?Marine Protected Areas Under improved management effectiveness? has increased manifolds since PIF stage. In the ?Provide additional explanation on targets, other methodologies used, and other focal area specifics (i.e., Aichi targets in BD) including justification where core indicator targets are not provided? section, please add text explaining the reasoning behind the increase and methodologies applied. Please also note that that this indicator should be measured in hectares and is specific to MPAs. Note that some sections of the Portal/Prodoc submission contain the number 1,700,000 square kilometers, while the RF include the number 22,000,00 million HA. Please clarify and ensure alignment across Portal submission/PRODOC/RF.

SH (4.28.22): Not cleared. Both the Portal and Prodoc submission text sections still contain reference to the 1,700,000 square kilometers number.

SH (5.11.22): Thank you, cleared.

- For Indicator 2.1 ?Marine Protected Areas Under improved management effectiveness?, in the Portal submission please provide the name of each of the protected areas and the associated IUCN category, METT score etc.

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.

- Note that at PIF stage the CI 8 tonnage estimate provided in the Portal submission was set at 238,000. The Portal CEO endorsement submission CI 8 tonnage estimate remains at 238,000 tons. Likewise, the fisheries details section specific to CI 8 (name of targeted stocks and associated volumes etc.) remains the same between PIF and CEO end stage. However, this information does not align with info provided in the ?Summary of changes in alignment with the project design with the original PIF? section, which states that ?...It was considered that the best way to accurately track and reflect fisheries moved to more sustainable levels would be to assess the tonnes for stocks (combination of species and spatial areas) under adaptive management plans, rather than simply a select list of key species. The newly proposed fishery details (as outlined in Annex F) therefore includes only a subset of those species (and areas) initially proposed. Although this reduces the baseline, the targets set are nevertheless highly ambitious (but realistic), as they imply tonnes of stocks to be under new fully adaptive management plans (targets anticipate an increase of approximately +100% and +300%).?.

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.

- Please include in the Fisheries details section (indicator 8) a description of the source of the estimate of tonnage, and a justification for including the fisheries to be considered overexploited.

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.

- In addition to addressing the above points, in the "Provide additional explanation on targets, other methodologies used, and other focal area specifics (i.e., Aichi targets in BD) including justification where core indicator targets are not provided" section, please include the methodology applied when reaching the 202,000 expected project beneficiaries number.

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.

## Agency Response

### FAO/UNEP Responses 06-May-22

The reference to the 1,700,000 square kilometres number has been removed from both the ProDoc and the Portal.

### FAO/UNEP Responses 06-Apr-22

1. Indicator 7.4 changed to 1

2 Core Indicator 2 was confirmed as it was at PIF stage, i.e. 128,850 hectares. All the references to any other figure were removed. These were left by mistake from intermediated versions in the previous submission of the Agency Prodoc. Details about the 20 MPAs that will allow reaching the 128,850 hectares target were included in the GEF7 CI template (name of each of the protected areas and the associated IUCN category) The METT score is not available for any of this area. We will calculate during the project execution.

3. Regarding CI8, based on the GEF Sec comments, and reading the PIF and PRODOC, the text has been significantly revised to explain that during the PPG phase, consultations with experts who took another approach to analyse which fisheries to include in the project, confirmed the original list and volumes of fish (as indicated in the PIF) that will move to more sustainable management and under adaptive management were indeed appropriate for project execution. Some of the text included in the previous submission about this CI was left by mistake from intermediated versions of the Agency Prodoc.

4. The source of the estimate of tonnage, and a justification for including the fisheries to be considered overexploited has been included below the Core Indicators table in the Portal (<https://www.fao.org/3/cb2429en/online/cb2429en.html>). The link is also included in the agencies ProDoc uploaded in the roadmap of the submission.

5. Text has been added to explain why we moved to 505,000 (353.000 Man + 152.000 Women) project beneficiaries. A brief rational for this change has been provided at the end of the GEF7 CI section, as well as in the table summarizing the changes of the CEO Endorsement request vs. the PIF.

## 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

SH (12.13.21): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response NA

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (12.13.21): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response NA

**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

SH (12.13.21): Yes, however the portal submission and PRODOC would benefit from a rough presentation of the activities planned specific to each output. Such output level descriptions could follow each of the existing component descriptions.

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.

Agency Response

**FAO/UNEP Responses 06-Apr-22**

Additional texts were added to present the activities planned specific to each output.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (12.13.21): Sufficiently described, cleared.

Agency Response NA

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (12.13.21): Yes, cleared.

#### Agency Response NA

**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

SH (12.13.2021):

- Global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) section: As it stands this section focuses mainly on SDG 14. While it can be okay with such a narrow focus, please include more text specific to the GEF IW GEB mandate: e.g., transboundary work delivered by the project, strengthening of regional / cross regional collaboration etc.

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.

#### Agency Response

#### **FAO/UNEP Responses 06-Apr-22**

The following text has been added to the Global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) section of the ProDoc and in the Portal.

*"Due to its regional dimension and to the tight interconnections among Mediterranean marine ecosystems the project is also expected to generate Global Environmental Benefits related to the GEF IW mandate. The expected Outcomes (1,3,5) involving information management activities are aimed at creating an informed and common understanding among the participating countries on the pressures that the Mediterranean marine ecosystems are facing together with the potential negative consequences on the linked economic sectors, such as fisheries, and the possible alternative and more integrated ecosystem-based management options. Also the expected Outcomes (1,2,3,4) involving activities for devising and supporting the introduction of more sustainable and integrated fisheries and marine ecosystem services management approaches and tools are expected to support transboundary cooperation among participating countries in the conservation and sustainable use of shared and interconnected marine ecosystems and related services. By promoting intersectoral collaboration, at national level, to the identification and development of Blue Economy opportunities the project is supporting the incorporation of the market value of marine resources and ecosystem services into national economies potentially resulting in sustainable economic and social benefits for the coastal communities."*

**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

SH (12.13.2021): An elaborate description specific to both innovation and scaling up has been added. Cleared.

Agency Response NA  
**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  
SH (4.10.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response NA  
**Child Project**

**If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
NA

Agency Response NA  
**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  
SH (12.13.2021): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response NA  
**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

SH (12.13.2021): Yes, however, the link provided in the portal submission gender section does not work. Please make sure to annex the PPG phase comprehensive gender analysis: <https://gfcf.sharepoint.com/GEF/FishEBM-MED-2020/PPG documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx?id=%2FGEF%2FFishEBM-MED-2020%2FPPG documents%2FFishEBM MED - Gender analysis%2Epdf&parent=%2FGEF%2FFishEBM-MED-2020%2FPPG documents&p=true>

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.

18th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Please address the following:

- (1) Please reflect how gender considerations will be addressed at the project component level (for example, in terms of beneficiaries, sex-disaggregated data, knowledge products, awareness-raising and trainings that reflect gender perspective, among others).
- (2) It is recommended that to achieve gender equality, the numbers of beneficiaries (Core Indicator 11) should approximate 5/50 men/women. At the moment, the project has 70/30 men/women. Please adjust to be closer to the 50/50 gender parity goal.
- (3) Under stakeholders/stakeholder roles, include gender expertise and women's representation.

7th of July 2022 (thenshaw):

- (1) Addressed.
- (2) Addressed.
- (3) Addressed.

#### Agency Response

##### **FAO/UNEP Responses 10-June-22**

1) Within the section ?3. Gender Equality and Women?s Empowerment? in both the CEO Endorsement Request and Agency Project Document, there is a text box describing how the gender considerations will be included/addressed by each component of the project.

The box is reported hereunder:

### **3.2 Gender Action Plan**

A draft Gender Action Plan (GAP) for the project has been prepared also on the basis of the provisions related to the role of women in the fisheries and in the biodiversity protection sector indicated in the Malta MedFish4Ever Ministerial Declaration, in the Regional Plan of Action for Small-Scale Fisheries in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea (RPOA-SSF) and in the Post2020 SAPBIO and integrated into proposed activities. This GAP will be developed fully during inception work planning period on the basis of the MedProgramme Gender Mainstreaming Strategy and in line with its Action Plan and based on country needs and consultations with implementing partners. Based on this GAP, gender inclusive outcomes, outputs and activities, budgets and revised indicators for the project have been included (Annex A1 refers), including an updated project baseline. Gender focal points and/or champions in each country will be identified and consulted throughout the GAP elaboration process. In particular, the following tentative targets relating to gender equality have been integrated into the project design through the activities to be carried out and the outcomes to be achieved:

#### **Component 1: Strengthened capacity to manage commercial fisheries, with particular focus on SSF**

Outcome 1: Fisheries managers and stakeholders use sound information generated on the status of key commercial fisheries to support improved management and selected value chain interventions, particularly for SSF, in view of maximizing the sustainability of production.

- Socio-economic fisheries data collection include gender-disaggregated data, as well as data on coastal and marine harvest sectors and post-harvest sector. Additionally, data on informal and unpaid contributions by women and men is also included.
- Both women and men have access to stock status information and use this information for fisheries management and value-chain improvements
- Priority species for which the quality of stock assessments have improved include also those species of special interest for women, for example gleaning or important for processing. The local and traditional knowledge used to improve these stock assessments considers both women and men's experiences.
- The participatory development of co-management plans in the fishery counts on the active involvement and participation of both women and men.
- Improved understanding of value-chains and good practices identified, as well as gender-sensitive value-chain upgrading strategies that reflect the different needs and priorities of women and men.
- Female and male value-chain actors are supported to improve their market access, through e.g. the implementation of catch certification schemes, business skills training, and improved access to credit and other inputs. In order to do so, the engagement of women in women's organisations is supported.
- SSF organisations, and especially women's groups, receive support to participate in decision-making processes and establish partnerships.
- Women and men benefit equally from social protection initiatives, while special consideration is given to the nature of women's work (part-time, informal, unpaid) that may traditionally limit their participation in these schemes.

#### **Component 2: Enhanced integration of emerging monitoring, control and surveillance technologies in the fight against IUU fishing.**

Outcome 2. Fisheries management better accounts for the quantity and magnitude of IUU fishing in the Mediterranean Sea and incorporates control measures, including through the use of emerging technologies.

- The measures put in place to reduce by-catch, discards and abandoned fishing gear take into account their different impact on female and male fishers and fish workers, due to their different roles in the fishery and their unequal access to resources (credit, inputs)
- The collection of information on IUU fishing and fisheries crimes and its analysis is done through a gender and equality lens that assesses the role of gender in this matter.
- Women and men have equal knowledge of and access to the technological systems and solutions for control and surveillance that are applied at country level. The lower access of women to knowledge and technology is improved by, for example, providing training when appropriate.

**Component 3: Integrated ecosystem-based management tools and ecosystem approach to biodiversity protection and sustainable fisheries.**

Outcome 3: Healthier marine ecosystems with more productive fisheries in place, through the synergistic application of ecosystem-based conservation/ management tools and improvements in fisheries tenure governance.

- Area-based management tools take into account the different roles and needs of both women and men.
- Formulated strategies for climate change adaptation respond to the different needs and priorities of female and male fishers and fish workers, and other marine ecosystems and blue economy stakeholders and affected communities
- Women and men are involved in the activities on the identification and adoption of appropriate measures for the reduction of new introductions and for eradication/control and valorisation of NIS in priority sites
- Women and men participate actively in training programmes to develop capacity towards the development of fisheries tenure interventions

**Component 4 Innovative blue economy solutions accounting for the fishery sector.**

Outcome 4. Blue economy at the regional and country level promoted through the identification of existing hurdles via a concerted approach among relevant stakeholders.

- Investment opportunities within a blue economy context are presented within a gender-sensitive lens and offer equitable opportunities for women and men
- The analysis of diversification of livelihoods to mobilize investment in fishery communities consider the gender differences in terms of roles and access to resources.
- Factsheets on innovative solutions for the fishery and marine sector that attract blue economy related investments are developed with the participation of both women and men, so their different experiences, views and priorities enrich these plans.
- Both women and men are involved in the discussions for the identification of Blue Economy priorities and in the elaboration of the NAP+
- The active participation of women and men in new governance partnerships is strongly encouraged

**Component 5: Knowledge management and outscaling.**

Outcome 5. Integrated pathways conducive of conservation and sustainable management promoted at the regional and global level.

- National FishEBM Med stakeholders platforms equally involve women and men. Women and men are involved in the communication of best practices and lessons learned of the project.
- Women and men participate actively in awareness-raising meetings with co-financing partners
- Women and men have equal access to the knowledge disseminated through the outreach and communication strategy and the knowledge sharing platform



Success stories and best practices for women in fisheries are disseminated in view of raising awareness of their role in the sector

2) The explanation of why the project has 70/30 men/women is included at the end of the GEF7 Core Indicator table. This is *?In summary (202.000 employed onboard fish vessels (all Mediterranean countries) + 303.000 estimated non vessels based employed (pre and post-harvest sectors, gleaners and other on-shore based activities including ?invisible women?). Men are estimated at 100 % of onboard fisheries workers + 50% of on shore workers totalling some 353.000 units and women are estimated at 50% of on shore workers totalling 152.000 units. Please refer to Annex F for the detailed explanation.?* Since the FishEBM Med project will target specifically on-board employed and non-vessels based employed, it is not realistic to set a target of 50/50 for a sector that cannot be changed by this investment of the GEF and FAO. However, through its Gender Action Plan, the project will pay great attention to the achievement of gender equality whenever it is possible.

3) Gender expertise and women's representation have been included in **Table 2: Mapping of stakeholders interest in the project and examples of stakeholder engagement activities** in both the CEO Endorsement Request and Agency Project Document.

#### **FAO/UNEP Responses 06-Apr-22**

The Gender Annex (labelled as [FishEBM MED - Gender analysis](#)) is available in the roadmap of the submission.

#### **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

SH (12.13.2021): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response NA

#### **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

SH (12.13.2021): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response NA  
**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**

SH (12.13.2021): Yes, however, please address the below two points:

- In the project organization structure figure, please more clearly indicate how GFCM and MAP are fully separate from FAO/UNEP. This could be done by placing the GFCM/MAP box below the FAO/UNEP box.

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.

-The GEF has supported the CI implemented project titled "Long-term Financial Mechanism to Enhance Mediterranean MPA Management Effectiveness". A second MPA implementation phase is about to commence. Therefore, please add the CI implemented project titled "Build back a blue and stronger Mediterranean" (GEF ID 10685), which is implemented across Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, Lebanon, Montenegro, and which might offer valuable synergies with this project, including specific to Montenegro (NAP+ pilot country).

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.

Agency Response  
**FAO/UNEP Responses 06-Apr-22**

1) The project organization structure figure has been updated in the Prodoc including a short narrative.

2) Relevant text has been added in both the PRODOC and submission in the portal

*"FishEBM Med will establish synergies and coordinate actions with the GEF funded CI project "Build back a blue and stronger Mediterranean" (GEF ID 10685), which is implemented by MedPAN, the network of Mediterranean MPA managers and the MedFund, the environmental fund for Mediterranean MPAs, and aims at supporting the development of management capacity for 20 nationally designated MPAs and new MPAs under designation in Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, Lebanon, Montenegro. It also*

*aims at strengthening regional / national cooperation to promote MPAs as solutions to address global conservation challenges and provide socio-ecological benefits and at creating a supportive environment for implementing policy commitments towards MPAs in the Mediterranean. This collaboration is particularly relevant for the Output 4.3 related to the development of the pilot NAP+ in Montenegro."*

#### **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

SH (12.13.2021):

Consistency with National Priorities Portal section: Only five countries are mentioned in the table. Please add the remaining two countries.

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.

Agency Response

**FAO/UNEP Responses 06-Apr-22**

The National Priorities of Algeria and Bosnia and Herzegovina have been added in the ProDoc table and submission in the portal.

#### **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

SH (12.13.21): Yes, well elaborated. Cleared.

Agency Response NA

**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

SH (12.13.21):

GEF notes that the project has been rated "low risk". Please provide and include as an annex the environmental and social assessments carried out, and any Environmental and Social Management Plans or the equivalent.

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.

Agency Response  
**FAO/UNEP Responses 06-Apr-22**

The FAO Environmental and Social Risk Identification ? Screening Checklist has been added as annex in the roadmap of the submission.

**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

SH (12.13.21): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response NA  
**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

SH (12.13.21): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response NA  
**Annexes**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (12.13.21):

Overall comment specific to budget table: Project staff (e.g. technical manager, Finance/Admin officer/expert, operations logistics experts) are charged across components and PMC. Per Guidelines, project's staff has to be charged to the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC ? please charge these personnel also to the co-financing portion.

SH (4.28.22): Not cleared. Please:

1. Revisit the different ToR and make sure that splits indicated between TA and PMC are correct and in alignment with budget information.

SH (5.11.22): Thank you, cleared.

2. Please explain the expected PMU cost sharing arrangements between this Med Sea Project and the soon to be re-submitted Black Sea Fisheries CEO endorsement project submission (GEF ID 10558)?

SH (5.11.22): Thank you, cleared.

Additional points:

- Please note that parts of the PRODOC project budget cannot be viewed due to formatting issues.

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.

- Please look at the Portal submission annex E and expand budget fields containing "xxxxxxx"

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.

- Responses to council comments should be included as an annex.

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.

- As part of annex II, please include the Environmental and Social Risk assessment.

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.

18th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Please address the following:

(1) Budget table. The Finance/Administration Officer and Expert are being charged to project components and PMC. Per Guidelines, the costs with the project's execution

have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. The co-financing portion allocated to PMC is \$3.6 million and co-financing for \$22.96 million represented in grants. Some portion of this could be used to cover the costs of the project's staff.

7th of July 2022 (thenshaw)

(1) Addressed.

## Agency Response

### **FAO/UNEP Responses 10-June-22**

1. The Co-Financing listed in table C cannot support any staff cost because these grants will support activities related to the FishEBM Med project independently of the GEF project. For this reason, the grants are already allocated to other partners? projects/initiatives who have they own pre-defined-closed budget which cannot support staff costs for the GEF project.

Moreover, the proposed co-shared PMU (with the sister project GEF ID 10558 FishEBM BS), will be heavily supported by the secretariats of GFCM and MAP will already provide a lot of support through their staff to the project. This is duly accounted in the in-kind contributions for the two-execution agency.

Finally, Annex N ? Terms of references of the key project staff have been revised to include the qualifications and accurately reflect the technical and administrative tasks, their costs and reason for allocation under the technical components. The Project Technical Manager (\$227,077 charged to technical components. Ratio is 28% PM: 72% technical). The Annex N ToR includes the following technical duties and responsibilities for the Project Technical Manager: 1) Backstop the coordination and close monitoring of the implementation of project activities assigned to GFCM, including overseeing the technical execution and development of technical products, and providing technical support to assessing the outputs produced and the products generated in the implementation of the project; 2) Identify priorities, problems and issues to be addressed in the course of project implementation and proposes corrective and follow-up actions in liaison with relevant parties; 3) Support a high level of collaboration among participating institutions and organizations at national and local levels, including through coordination with relevant initiatives, such as other GEF projects in the region and co-financing partner projects; 4) Provide constant liaison across the related technical activities of the germane FishEBM-Med and FishEBM-BS projects to ensure good coordination and efficient resource planning towards common objectives; 5) Promote consistency and technical coordination in the areas of data collection along the value chain, including the socio-economic issues, certification of selected fisheries, market and trade requirements taking also into consideration the role of women in the fishing sector; 6) Support and assists in the development of activities toward the progress on regional standards for Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) with the objective to fight against IUU fishing in the GFCM area of application in line with the GFCM Regional Plan of Action for the fight against IUU fishing (RPOA-IUU); 7) Participate in the development of Integrated ecosystem based management tools and ecosystem approach to biodiversity protection and sustainable fisheries with the support of the GFCM and UNEP partners including the development of adaptation strategies to climate change formulated and cope with the negative effects

of non-indigenous species on biodiversity; 8) Promote technical coordination in the areas of blue economy solutions in the fisheries sector for the preparation of analysis on the mobilization of investments, involvement of the private sector including the development of NAP; 9) Coordinate the dissemination of technical material on GFCM-MAP approach in aligning different national and regional priorities including the preparation of a complete communication plan covering the activities of the German FishEBM-Med and FishEBM-BS projects. This will produce the following key deliverables: a) Relevant technical products produced as a result of project outputs; b) Documentation (meeting reports and summaries, etc.) of partner coordination; c) Organisation of trainings on data collection on the fisheries value chain and fish quality/sanitary requirements; d) Develop technology platforms to perform IUU risk analysis and surveys for the identification of illegal gears; e) Technical surveys to assess for target countries including relevant pilot studies (e.g. fishing for litter); f) Factsheet useful for investment plans in the fisheries sector; g) IW:LERN material and knowledge sharing tools (e.g. communication tools, audiovisual material).

The Finance/Administrative Officer (\$101,012 charged to technical components. Ratio is 60% PM: 40% technical). The Annex N ToR includes the following technical duties and responsibilities for the Finance/Administrative Officer: 1) Support the Project Technical Manager in the overall coordination of project activities through a variety of performance-based assessments aiming to align project implementation of technical activities with FAO and GEF rules and procedures, including maintaining appropriate monitoring of executed actions vis-à-vis the Project Results Framework indicators and results-based management targets. Ensure this monitoring mechanism is maintained and duly documented with the aim to facilitate the reporting of project results and the preparation of annual revisions of workplans and budgets, as appropriate; 2) Participate in PSC annual meetings and related preparation works. Under the direct guidance of the PTM, support the elaboration of work programs and ad-hoc technical reports and materials to showcase project results during PSC sessions. Collect relevant inputs, assist the elaboration of annual reports and undertake appropriate ex-post follow-ups; 3) Support decision-making of the PTM and involved technical staff for the identification of operational needs relating to the execution of fisheries data collection campaigns (including surveys-at-sea and exploratory surveys), for the effective implementation of field activities at sub-regional level in GEF-eligible Mediterranean countries (outputs 1.1.1 and 1.1.2). Further support the PTM in implementing assigned oversight responsibilities over internal control and compliance issues pertaining alignment of mentioned performances with agreed workplans and expected results; 4) Participate during the planning phase of selected field activities and participate/collaborate during technical meetings to the identification of requirements for the testing and application of tailored MCS technologies at sub-regional level and for GEF-eligible Mediterranean countries. Run feasibility assessments vis-à-vis adopted workplans and take the lead in setting up effective monitoring mechanisms to identify the progress of mentioned field activities and include achieved results/performances in appropriate reports, spotting any potential risk or bottleneck and propose corrective actions. Disseminate the findings of mentioned analysis to leading technical officers and undertake appropriate follow-ups with relevant technical staff (output 2.4.2, 2.4.3 and 2.5.3); 5) In line with adopted strategies, participate in the planning, organization and monitoring of relevant technical actions and activities, by supporting the Project Technical Manager in transversally coordinate different teams within the GFCM and across the EAs, providing technical inputs, contributing to the development of relevant materials and drafting of reports (outputs 1.1, 2.4 and 2.5); 6) Gather relevant information from stakeholders and integrate those inputs in ad-hoc monitoring templates to be used for and during technical assistance meetings with counterparts (e.g. country briefs, progress of field activities by country, performance assessment and informative notes on corrective actions, funding trends by component and alignment with expected financial delivery). Inform the Project Technical Manager on potential improvements and assess the existence of

economies of scale, ensuring appropriate dissemination when and if needed (outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 2.4.1, 2.4.2 and 2.4.3).

## **FAO/UNEP Responses 06-May-22**

1. The **Annex N** (ToRs of the staff) have been revised to be consistent with the budget. The splits indicated between TA and PMC were aligned with budget information.
2. The expected PMU cost sharing arrangements between this Med Sea Project and the already re-submitted Black Sea Fisheries CEO endorsement project submission (GEF ID 10558), were explained in both Annex N (ToR for staff) and the Coordination section in the ProDoc and Portal. The following text was added to explain the staff allocation for the FishEBM-MED and its sister project, GEF ID 10558 FishEBM-BS:

*"One of the values added for the GEF and the countries of investing in the FishEBM-MED (and its sister project, GEF ID 10558 FishEBM-BS), is the support provided by the Secretariat of the GFCM and that of the MAP. These two Secretariats provide well established entry points with the countries, their decision-making processes and machineries. Moreover, the two Secretariats provide a solid administrative and financial framework supporting the execution of the two projects. This allows the establishment of a joint Programme Management Unit (PMU) composed by two Staff members for the execution of the two projects. The PMU will be hosted by GFCM.*

*Specifically, the FishEBM-MED project will operate under the overall supervision of the Executive Secretary of the GFCM, who will support the execution of the project with its staff, processes, meetings and communication channels with the relevant ministries, regional and national services and supranational organization who deal with sustainable fisheries in the Mediterranean. The MAP will also provide its support to the technical execution of the project and access points to the contracting parties to the Barcelona Convention for any issue related to the environment.*

*The GFCM Project Technical Manager will perform a variety of technical and managerial tasks and will coordinate the Project Management Units (PMUs) of the GEF Mediterranean (FishEBM-Med) and Black Sea (FishEBM-Black Sea) projects with a view to promote efficient use of GEF resources; avoiding duplication of functions and costs and to ensure full coordination between these two sister projects who have been supported by the GEF under the GEF7 replenishment.*

*The PMU of the GEF Mediterranean (FishEBM-Med) and Black Sea (FishEBM-Black Sea) projects will be composed by a Project Technical Manager (PTM), assisted by a full-time Finance/Administrative Officer. The remaining staff will be engaged as consultants providing made on measure support to the needs of the two projects, backstopping the activities to be implemented vis-à-vis the adopted Project Results Framework (Annex A1) and workplan (Annex H)."*



## **FAO/UNEP Responses 06-Apr-22**

- The project co-financing allocated to the PMC reflects funds already allocated by the project partnership to staff and actions that will indirectly support the execution of the project over its lifespan. These funds cannot be used to pay the staff of the GEF project.

The staff costs charged over the technical components reflect technical work done by the staff instrumental to the execution of technical actions. A **new Annex N** has been developed to provide a clear explanation of why the Project Technical Manager (P-3 or equivalent) and Finance/Administrative Officer (P-2 or equivalent) costs are charged on both PMC and technical components. All the remaining staff is hired as technical consultants.

- The project budget has been updated to be readable.

- Annex E in the portal has been updated.

- Responses to the council comments have been added to the Annex B after the response to the STAP.

- The FAO Environmental and Social Risk Identification ? Screening Checklist has been included in the roadmap of the submission.

### **Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SH (12.13.21): Please see previous comments specific to the RF.

### **Agency Response**

## **FAO/UNEP Responses 06-Apr-22**

Addressed as response to previous comments

### **GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

### **Agency Response NA**

### **Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (12.13.2021):

Please revise annex B to include comments/responses to comments from council members.

SH (4.28.22): Cleared.

Agency Response Annex B has been updated; responses to UK and Germany's comments was provided.

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SH (12.13.2021): Yes cleared.

Agency Response NA

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response NA

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response NA

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response NA

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SH (12.13.21): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response NA

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SH (12.13.21): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response NA

**Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

NA

**Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response NA

**Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response NA

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (12.13.21): Please address comments and resubmit.

SH (4.28.22): Please address comments and resubmit.

18th of May 2022 (thenshaw): No. Please address above comments and resubmit. Thank you.

7th of July 2022 (thenshaw): Yes.

**Review Dates**

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

**First Review**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**