

# Building and Enhancing Sectoral and Cross-sectoral capacity to support sustainable resource use and biodiversity conservation in marine areas beyond national jurisdiction

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10697

**Countries**

Global

**Project Name**

Building and Enhancing Sectoral and Cross-sectoral capacity to support sustainable resource use and biodiversity conservation in marine areas beyond national jurisdiction

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

12/2/2021

**Review completed by PM**

4/29/2022

**Program Manager**

Taylor Henshaw

**Focal Area**

International Waters

**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

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

27th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Please address the following:

(1) In the project information section, the duration of the project seems to be 61 months if calculated from expected implementation to expected completion. If the project is expected to last 60 months please correct the completion date to 11/30/2027.

4th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

Response 01 April 2022

The dates have been corrected accordingly on the portal and in the road map (see revised CEO document and Prodoc).

**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**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address following comments:

- 1) Please ensure that the figures included in the GEF Core Indicator section are reflected in Table B.
- 2) Please label Monitoring and Evaluation as 'Component 3' and include associated outcomes and outputs in Table B.
- 3) The project objective is stated as an outcome. Please consider rephrasing as 'To enhance awareness...' rather than 'Enhanced awareness...'
- 4) The M&E Component 3 should have a co-financing contribution. Please revise accordingly.
- 5) The results framework is primarily consisting of qualitative output indicators. please reformulate these output indicators so that they become quantitative

5th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

27th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Please address the following:

- (1) The budget table under Annex E and the Portal entry's table B show some differences between components and M&E. Please verify and corroborate that all budget tables (in Portal, in ProDoc, appended to documents tab) are harmonized.
- (2) The co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportionate compared with the GEF contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$21,331,437 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$1,066,572 instead of \$833,336 (which is 3.9%). 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 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.

6th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Not addressed. Discrepancies are still observed in the component figures between Table B and Annex E. Please consider including a new Component 3 for M&E in Table B to fix the representation issue.

29th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

### Agency Response

- 1) The GEF Core indicator 7 (2 regionally-defined ecosystems (Pacific Islands and South East Pacific) within one ocean basin with enhanced capacity and knowledge to improve cooperative management of ABNJ) and GEF Core indicator 11 on number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender (1750 Women, 1750 Men) are now reflected in Table B.
- 2) We apologize for the error of including M&E as a separate item in Table B. We decided to keep just the 2 components and distributed the M&E budget between the 2 components since adding M&E as a third component does not contribute to the overall efficiency of the project. However, a stand-alone budget for M&E is shown in the costed budget outline for transparency and ease in administration -see revised budget.
- 3) The project objective was revised as suggested.
- 4) The M&E co-financing has been added to the co-financing for each of the two components in Table B.
- 5) This project is a process-oriented project hence with process indicators, including quantitative ones which are already included in the results framework, e.g., a capacity building program, number of regional and national staff trained/participated in workshop and working groups, step-change in level of cooperation.

### Response 01 April 2022

1. The budget in Annex E and Table B as well as in the road map do tally. The representation are however different. In Table B unlike Annex E, the M&E budget is not presented as a standalone line, it is embedded in the component as to follow the Table B format. Also note that at the request of GEF Sec date 21 December 2021 we removed the added M&E entry in Table B. In contrast, the UNEP budget as presented in Annex E and in the road map (App 01) is following the GEF policy guideline and presents PMC and M&E costs separately and split across budget categories.
2. The PMC GEF ? Co-financing ratio has been adjusted accordingly. See Table B on portal and in revised CEO doc in the road map.

### Response 27 April 2022

As remarked on 01 April 2022, there is no discrepancies *per se*. This is purely due to a difference in presentations between the budget following GEF guidelines and the format of table B which might in the future perhaps benefit from being adjusted to allow for a simple M&E line just like the PMC. A new M&E component 3 was therefore created although seemingly a rather artificial construct. Accordingly, the CEO document Table B, the corresponding narrative section 3 on page 56, Table 6 on information and knowledge flows were amended. An explanation about component 3 for the ToC (Figure 3 in section 3.1) and Figure 4 with the connections of project with the Program level Theory of Change on page 63 was added. The result framework (Annex A and Appendix 02), the Prodoc, the workplan in Appendix 3 and the budget in Appendix 1

were also modified accordingly. Changes are highlighted in blue and new documents uploaded in the road map.

**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

**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 21st of December 2021

(cseverin):Partly. Please address following comments:

1) Per GEF policy, where co-financing truly meets the definition of "in-kind", it should typically be classified as "recurrent expenditures" rather than "investment mobilized". Please justify why in-kind co-financing from Office of the Pacific Ocean Commissioner, Mar-Viva Foundation, UBO, OFB, Sasakawa Peace Foundation, Duke University, One Ocean Hub, University of Queensland, University of Portsmouth, IUCN, GFCM, CBD, GRID-Arendal and UNEP-WCMC are classified as "investment mobilized" instead of "recurrent expenditures". Only in exceptional cases should in-kind co-finance be classified as investment mobilized.

2) Further to this point, of the \$22,164,773 of co-financing, \$0 (0%) is classified as grant/investment mobilized. Please review the definition/guidelines for GEF co-financing and reconsider if some of the co-financing would classify as other than "in-kind" (which refers to operational recurrent costs).

3) Please include more detail on the specifics of each investment mobilized, rather than referring the reader to letters of co-finance for these details.

4) Please spell out all acronyms in Table C.

5) Please correct "University of Duke" to "Duke University".

6) As mentioned above, the M&E Component 3 should also have a co-financing contribution. Please revise accordingly.

5th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Partly. Items 3, 4, 5 and 6 are addressed. Please again reconsider the "in-kind/investment mobilized" classifications to "in-kind/recurrent expenditures", as the explanation provided does not offer strong enough justification. Thank you.

16th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

27th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Please address the following:

(1) French Biodiversity Agency should be categorized as Donor Agency (not "Others").

4th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

### Agency Response

- 1) The co-financing which is characterized as in-kind investment mobilized corresponds to existing parallel initiatives funded by other donors and whose objectives align with those of this child project hence multiplying transformation impact opportunities. Nevertheless, those financial resources will not be administered by GoF as EA along-side with the GEF grant but rather will continue to be administered by the respective co-financiers. Given the lack of a precise definition for investment mobilized in the GEF co-financing policy which essentially states that the GEF defines investment mobilized as "co-financing that excludes recurrent expenditures", the above-mentioned approach seems to be a safe reflection of the co-financing reality.
- 2) See above response. None of the investment mobilized resources will serve as cash/grant contributions to be blended to and administered directly with the GEF resources. Hence consequently, all of the co-financing has been kept as in-kind investment mobilized as also captured in the co-financing letters.
- 3) Brief descriptions on investments mobilized were included immediately below Table C.
- 4) All acronyms were spelled-out in Table C.
- 5) Corrected.
- 6) M&E co-financing was added to each component in Table B.

### Response 07 March 2022

As stated previously, please note that the co-financing truly corresponds to investments which are mobilized through other donors i.e. co-financiers and will work hand in hand with the GEF grant although such investments will not be managed by the EA *per se* but rather will continue to be managed by the respective co-financiers. Hence it was not acknowledged as a cash contributions to the project but rather in-kind ones. Also note that such co-financing, as described in each co-financing letter which were carefully discussed with each co-financier, does not meet the policy definition of recurring expenditure stating that recurring expenditure refers to the costs an organization incurs in its day-to-day operations. The most frequent examples include salaries/wages of staff, office space, utilities and operating expenses, etc. In Sum, the reported co-financing is truly activity based hence truly investment mobilized. It will not be added to and managed alongside with the GEF Grant by the EA hence considered as in-kind. It is thus believed that the way the co-financing is currently reported in the portal continues to be the most adequate reflection of the reality.

**Response 01 April 2022**

The French Biodiversity Agency has been categorized as Donor Agency in Table C.

**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 21st of December 2021  
(cseverin): Yes

Agency Response  
**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  
21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes. All PPG funds have been utilized.

27th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Please address the following:

(1) If the amount budgeted has been spent, then the amount committed column should show \$0. Please revise accordingly.

6th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Partially addressed. The discrepancy between the spent and committed amounts is amended correctly. However, there is an ineligible expenditure in the PPG Utilization table. Per Guidelines, it is not possible to cover costs associated with the GEF Implementing Agency. As these funds were already spent, please cover these costs from the co-financing and cancel the amount.

29th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed

Agency Response  
**Response 01 April 2022**

Annex C in the portal and in the revised CEO document in the road map have been amended.

**Response 27 April 2022**

Please note that while WCMC is a UNEP collaborating center, it is not UNEP *per se*. The WCMC staff who contributed to the design of the project are not on the UNEP payroll.

#### **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

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly. Please address following comments:

- 1) Please include the core indicator worksheet as an annex in the portal.
- 2) Please include targets under Core Indicator 7.

(Notably, the project includes reference to core indicator 7 in the project results framework and M&E plan).

5th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

##### Agency Response

- 1) The core indicator worksheet is Annex F in the portal.
- 2) There are targets already included for Core Indicator 7 (see also Annex F)

#### **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

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly. Please address following comments:

- 1) There is a wealth of information in the Agency Project Document (specifically section 2.2) that has not been included in this section, which would be beneficial to the reader to better understand the problem context. Please better incorporate 2.2 to this section so that the GEF CEO Endorsement document can be read as a standalone document.



2) Please include a summary of the problem context specific to the two pilot regions. To this end, please include a short description of the geographic and institutional scope of the two pilot regions (which is also present in the Agency Project Document).

5th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

#### Agency Response

- 1) Text from Section 2.2 of the project document now included in the CEO document
- 2) Problem context specific to the two pilot regions now included in the CEO document

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

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly. Please address following points:

1) Please include, as the foundational baseline, the detailed description in the Agency Project Document of the first phase of the GEF-5 Common Oceans Program (including recommendations from the terminal evaluation) and the particular relevance of the ABNJ Deep Seas Project to this project.

2) It is recognized that the pilot region baseline is present in appendix 11 to the Agency Project Document. Please briefly summarize the pilot region baseline so that the GEF CEO Endorsement Document can be read as a standalone document.

5th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

#### Agency Response

- 1) Foundational baseline now included in the CEO document
- 2) Pilot region baseline now included in the CEO document

**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

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly. Please address following points:

- 1) Please include the write up under section 2.1.2 in the Agency Project Document 'About the Program?', at the beginning of this section to properly introduce the proposed alternative scenario.
- 2) The level of detail included in the GEF CEO Endorsement document to clarify the outcomes and outputs under each component is not sufficient. Please include the detailed descriptions in the Agency Project Document (section 3.3) for each component here so that the GEF CEO Endorsement document can be read as a standalone document.
- 3) Please describe how outputs under Components 1 and 2 will link to the other child projects under the Common Ocean program
- 4) Please include and describe Component 3 - M&E, ensuring outcomes and outputs are linked to the umbrella coordination project.
- 5) Please provide a short narrative of the project's theory of change to accompany the diagram.
- 6) Please describe how/why the two pilot regions were selected (summarizing appendix 13 of the Agency Project Document).

5th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

#### Agency Response

- 1) About the Program now included in the CEO document
- 2) Text from Section 3.3 of the project document now included in the CEO document
- 3) A paragraph describing how the Cross-sectoral Project's components will link to the other child projects has been inserted (see *Link to Other Child Projects* pages 65-66 1c.)
- 4) A paragraph describing how, through the progress reports and annual PIRs, the Cross-sectoral Project's outcomes and outputs are linked to the umbrella coordination project has been inserted in Section 9 on M&E of the CEO document.
- 5) The two paragraphs above the figure depicting the Project's ToC as well as footnotes below the figure provide the narrative on the ToC.
- 6) A sub-section on 'The Where' was added to the About the Cross-sectoral Project in the CEO document which includes the description of the pilot regions selection process. The same text was added to Appendix 13 of the Project Document.

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

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address following comments:

1) Please pinpoint project alignment with phrasing in paragraphs 194 and 195 of the GEF-7 Programming Directions, which set out the overarching ABNJ strategy and the types of investments that are supported.

2) Please describe how the project contributes to the GEF's Response to Covid-19 (supports transformational change to restore a balance between natural systems and human systems)?

5th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

#### Agency Response

1) A paragraph was inserted stating alignment of the Project with paragraphs 194 and 195 of the GEF-7 Programming Directions.

2) A paragraph was inserted describing how the Project contributes to the GEF Response to COVID-19 in the risk section 5 including table 9.

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

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

#### 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

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please provide quantified detail on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits (including those documented in the parent Common Oceans submission).

5th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

#### Agency Response

A paragraph was inserted in section 10 providing some quantifiable measures on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits.

**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

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response  
**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  
21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

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  
21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

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  
21st of December 2021 (cseverin):Partly. please address following comment:

1) Please include a summary of the stakeholder engagement plan outlined in section 5 of the UNEP prodoc so that the GEF CEO Endorsement document can be read as a standalone document.

5th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Partly. Please include a condensed version of Appendix 10 Table 1, which provides information on which stakeholders will be engaged, the means of engagement and dissemination of information. Please also remove duplicated text in the portal submission.

16th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

#### Agency Response

1) The stakeholder engagement plan is already substantively summarized in the CEO document (see section 2)

#### Response 07 March 2022

A summary table 1 was added into the portal as requested. At our end, we however do not note any duplicated text in the portal.

#### 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

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly. Please address following point:

1) There is a wealth of information in the Agency Project Document (specifically section 5.2) that has not been included in this section, which would be beneficial to the reader to better understand the gender aspects of the project. Please better incorporate 5.2 to this section so that the GEF CEO Endorsement document can be read as a standalone document.

5th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

27th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Please address the following:

(1) It is well noted that the project has developed and submitted a draft gender action plan. The GEF Policy on gender equality requires, however, that projects carry out a gender analysis or equivalent prior to CEO endorsement. This project states that a gender assessment will be carried out in early project development. This is not in line with the GEF Policy. While it might be difficult to carry out a meaningful gender analysis at this stage and the GAP provides good evidence of careful gender considerations, please at least provide some additional information on consultations and consideration in project development.

6th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Not addressed. Please include this 1st of April 2022 response directly in the section on gender in the portal.

4th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Not addressed. The GEF Policy on gender equality requires that projects carry out a gender analysis or equivalent prior to CEO Endorsement. Please provide further details on the desktop analysis and its findings and more detailed information on consultations and consideration in project development.

4th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed. Strengthened gender analysis added to portal and Appendix 9 Gender Action Plan document.

### Agency Response

1) More information on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment from Section 5.2 of the project document has been added in the CEO document in section 3.

#### Response 01 April 2022

Indeed, generally due to Covid restrictions the project team was unable to conduct a meaningful gender analysis at the stage of the PPG. By the same token, a gender analysis involving stakeholders in the two regions has not also been undertaken due to the logistical constraints related to the Covid-19 pandemic. Instead, in-house expertise at the UNEP-WCMC and other project partners collaborated in the development of a preliminary gender action plan (Appendix 9 of project document) based on a desktop review of policy guidance such as the GEF's gender policy as well as documents from the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) who adopted a resolution on [?Mainstreaming a Gender Perspective into all policies and programmes in the UN System? \(E/RES/2016/2\)](#). The PPG team also considered reports of activities in the two regions to identify gender-relevant indicators of gender balance/imbalance in the list of participants such as the series of workshop reports from the [STRONG High Seas workshops](#) for the Pacific Islands. The project team further consulted the [Blue Pacific Ocean Report 2021](#) for regionally relevant indicators. It also looked at reports of workshops conducted by the Pacific Islands Forum Office of the Pacific Ocean Commissioner in preparation for their participation in the Intergovernmental Conference on BBNJ in search of indicators of gender balance/imbalance among the participants in order to inform the project's gender action plan.

#### Response 27 April 2022

The above text has been added to the gender section in the portal.

#### Response 04 May 2022

Appendix 09 Cross-sectoral- Gender Action Plan has been further strengthened and a revised version uploaded in the road map.

### 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**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly. Please demonstrate how the project will coordinate with the umbrella coordination project on private sector engagement. The coordination project has a dedicated Component 3 on innovative private sector engagement in the ABNJ.

5th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

**Agency Response**

A paragraph providing additional information on the project's private sector engagement in coordination with the GCP has been added in section 4.

**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**

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please include the appendix 12 to the Agency Project Document Covid-19 risk and opportunity matrix here so that the GEF CEO Endorsement document can be read as a standalone document.

5th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Partly. Please include the Covid-19 Opportunity Analysis that is included at the end of Appendix 12. Thank you.

16th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

**Agency Response**

The COVID-19 risk and opportunity matrix in Appendix 12 has been added to Table 10.

**Response 07 March 2022**

The Covid-19 Opportunity Analysis has been added.

**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

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly. Please address following points:

1) Please list the coordinating principles that each Common Oceans child project agrees to adhere to (which are included in the other four child project GEF CEO Endorsement documents):

1. The Project will participate in coordination meetings, at a frequency and times to be determined in consultation with the GCP Program Coordination Unit (PCU), to discuss topics of relevance to the implementation of the GCP (10626). In addition, the Project will participate in the meetings of the programmatic Global Steering Committee to discuss strategic and implementation issues related to the Program.

2. The Project will participate in efforts coordinated by the PCU to identify and implement opportunities for conducting shared activities when there is full complementarity between already planned activities between two or more child projects. This could allow for a more efficient and effective use of resources, including sharing relevant capacity building material and exercises.

3. The Project will share all reports, knowledge management and communication products produced during implementation, and will participate in the development of programmatic synthesis products by the GCP (10626) that are based on those inputs.

4. The GCP KM&C team will provide guidance to the child projects according to a programmatic KM&C strategy to be developed at the beginning of the implementation phase in consultation with all child projects. This KM&C strategy will provide recommendations on common issues such as Program branding, visibility, common boilerplates, etc.

5. The GCP M&E team will assist and guide the child projects, if requested, to provide information according to a programmatic M&E strategy, agreed by all child projects, including program level indicators, to allow a proper monitoring of the programmatic progress and an adaptive management of the Program.

6. The Project will maintain its independence as to the conduct of the technical activities described in this project document.

(2) Please elaborate on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives in the project area.



5th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

#### Agency Response

- 1) A paragraph stating that the project will adhere to the GCP coordinating principles and lists them was added in section 6.
- 2) A section on coordination with relevant initiatives in the pilot regions has been added in section 6.

#### **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

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please include the full description under section 3.6 of the Agency Project Document, which is a sufficient description of the project's consistency with national priorities.

5th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

#### Agency Response

The text under Section 7. *Consistency with National Priorities* was replaced with the full description under section 3.6 of the project document.

#### **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

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly. Please address following comments:

- 1) Please note that this section requires a KM approach that includes a clear *timeline* and *set of deliverables* (table format would be suitable).
- 2) Please clearly describe here how generated knowledge will be transferred to the umbrella coordination project for wider dissemination.

5th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

### Agency Response

1) The KM section has been revised to include a timeline and set of deliverables ? see table 12.

2) In section 8, text has been inserted describing how generated knowledge will be transferred to the GCP for wider dissemination.

### 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

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please clearly describe here how M&E will feed into the umbrella coordination project?s M&E mandate.

5th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

### Agency Response

Text describing how the project M&E will feed into the umbrella coordination project?s M&E mandate has been added in section 9.

### 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

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

### Agency Response

### Annexes

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

### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes

5th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Please present the GEF Budget Table in Annex E in the GEF Budget table template format. Please ensure the budget table is pasted in high resolution.

16th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed, but please upload terms of references to the portal.

17th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

27th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Please consider and address the following:

(1) All co-financing is "in-kind". Please consider whether the project manager and admin/financial could be charged to the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. If not, please provide a brief explanation why.

(2) All office and operational expenses should be charged to the PMC portion of the budget and not to the component. Please revise accordingly.

6th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Partially addressed. The Executing Agency is charging \$75,000 of overhead costs. GEF resources allocated to PMC cannot cover overhead costs, only activities associated with the project's execution. Please remove these costs and indicate where exactly they will be allocated.

29th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Yes

## Agency Response

### Response 07 March 2022

While the overall budget summary with GEF and non GEF breakdown per component including PMC and M&E costs were presented into the portal, the detailed budget breakdown has now been pasted and is hopefully of acceptable resolution.

### Response 16 March 2022

Revised TORs are uploaded in the portal defining more clearly the split functions of PCU staff (i.e. by managerial/financial and technical roles and responsibilities)- see revised marked up Appendix 05 in the road map.

### Response 01 April 2022

1. The co-financing is in-kind corresponding to implementing partners and EA staff support for project execution hence cannot substitute for GEF PCU/PMC costs. Generally most co-financiers do not accept paying staff costs of another project (i.e. our GEF project).
2. The PMC budget has been reshuffled to cover all office and operational expenses while adhering to the PMC threshold.

### Response 27 April 2022

The Executing Agency \$75,000 costs were reassigned under ABNJ Specialist. A new table was pasted in Annex E and a revised file ? Appendix 01 uploaded in the road map.

### **Project Results Framework**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Yes, however, please make sure that output indicators are quantifiable.

5th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Please re-upload the Project Results Framework to the portal. The table is not legible in the portal or when downloaded from the portal as a PDF.

16th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

#### Agency Response

Please see our response to the earlier related question on quantifiable indicators.

#### **Response 07 March 2022**

With the assistance of the WB IT team, the logframe has been re pasted in Annex A and an additional copy of the same uploaded in the road map.

### **GEF Secretariat comments**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

#### Agency Response

#### **Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 21st of December 2021 (cseverin): Adequately addressed.

#### Agency Response

#### **STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 21st of December 2021 (cseverin): None received.

#### Agency Response

#### **Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 21st of December 2021  
(cseverin): None received.

Agency Response  
**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 21st of December 2021  
(cseverin): None received.

Agency Response  
**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 21st of December 2021  
(cseverin): None received.

Agency Response  
**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 21st of December 2021  
(cseverin): Yes

Agency Response  
**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 21st of December 2021  
(cseverin): Yes

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

NA

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 NA

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 NA

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

21st of December 2021 (cseverin): No, please address above comments

5th of March 2022 (thenshaw): No, please address above comments. Thank you.

16th of March 2022 (thenshaw): No, please address above comment. Thank you.

27th of March 2022 (thenshaw): No, please address above comments. Thank you.

6th of April 2022 (thenshaw): No, please address above comments. Thank you.

4th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Yes.

**Review Dates**

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

**First Review**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**