

# Strengthening and Sustaining the Coastal Resource and Fisheries Management in the Leyte Gulf

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10738

**Countries**

Philippines

**Project Name**

Strengthening and Sustaining the Coastal Resource and Fisheries Management  
in the Leyte Gulf

**Agencies**

CI

**Date received by PM**

11/10/2020

**Review completed by PM**

4/20/2021

**Program Manager**

Jurgis Sapijanskas

**Focal Area**

Biodiversity

**Project Type**

MSP

## CEO Approval Request

### Part I ? Project Information

1. Focal area elements. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/6/2021- All cleared, thank you.

JS 5/5/2021

Thank you for the revisions, please address these remaining comments:

1-The Budget version in the portal entry (annex E) is not readable. Please correct so that it is readable and fits within margins. One option would be to reduce the number of columns in the portal entry by aggregating the budget at the component level, instead of the outcome level, while keeping the detailed version in the attached Excel file.

2- While the section describing the PMU has been updated in the uploaded word project document with a PMU now limited to 3 staff (Senior Site Implementation Officer, Finance and Administration Officer, and Compliance Officer), it is not the case in the portal entry. Please update the description of the PMU in the portal and align the names and labels of project position personnel in the budget (in particular the use of "staff" vs "in-house consultants") with the description of the PMU.

3- It is well noted that the project has uploaded the gender mainstreaming plan, which includes a gender analysis. Please provide summary information in the section on gender in the portal on key findings of the gender analysis and key elements of the gender mainstreaming plan, clearly indicating there that the gender mainstreaming plan includes a gender analysis.

JS 1/26/21

Thank you for the revisions and responses in this review sheet.

All cleared.

JS 11/19/2020

The project appears well aligned with BD 1-1 and BD-2-7.

1- Please provide the associated Project Document that is in a form as submitted to the Agency's internal approving authorities, or confirm that the CEO approval request as submitted in the portal is used for the Agency's internal processes. Some of the comments in this review might have already been addressed on the Project Document.

2- As stated in the GEF-7 biodiversity focal area strategy, "new protected areas established with GEF support must be globally significant, as defined by the Key Biodiversity Area (KBA) standard". The CEO approval request states that the MPA to be created under the project covers Guiuan-Salcedo Key Biodiversity Area (KBA 137) and its adjacent areas. The CEO approval request provides a solid justification for covering surrounding areas adjacent to the Guiuan-Salcedo Key Biodiversity Area. However, the "Guiuan-Salcedo Key Biodiversity Area" does not appear to be registered in the WDKBA (<http://www.keybiodiversityareas.org/>). Please confirm (i) that the "KBA 137" area fulfills the global KBA standard and that (ii) the project will go through the process of registration in the WDKBA of the relevant area(s) the project will work in (on the latter, GEFSEC can facilitate the connection with the KBA Partnership as needed).

3- COVID-19: We note the elaboration on some COVID-related risks to project roll-out in the risk section of the CEO approval request. However, please note that the GEF expects all new PIFs and CEO Endorsements to demonstrate a strategy or action framework for the COVID-19 pandemic. This should include an analysis of emergent "risks" and "opportunities" relative to specific context for the project. Please refer to "Project Design and Review Considerations in Response to the COVID-19 Crisis and the Mitigation of Future Pandemics" (<https://www.thegef.org/documents/project-design-and-review-considerations-response-covid-19-crisis-and-mitigation-future>) and elaborate accordingly in relevant sections of the PIF. Please notably elaborate on risks and mitigation measures beyond those related to stakeholder engagement (e.g. availability of co-finance given the already low level of co-finance in the project), and consider elaborating on the project's contribution to mitigate COVID's impact on targeted beneficiaries and, more generally, to a "green recovery".

## Agency Response

CI-GEF 05/05/2021:

- 1) New budget image uploaded in the portal. Budget annex also uploaded.
- 2) The portal is now updated to reflect the same information that is in the word document. In addition, information was added to discern staff from in-house consultants and the budget has been revised to reflect the positions
- 3) Summary of gender analysis included in the portal.

CI-GEF Agency response 01/25/2021

- 1) 1-step document attached. CI-GEF has utilized this format for all our of one-step submissions.
- 2) Rare confirms that Guiuan-Salcedo Key Biodiversity Area (KBA 137) fulfills the global KBA standards. After consulting with the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), the agency supports the plan of registering KBA 137 into the WDKBA. However, DENR is not familiar with the process of registration.

The project will follow guidance and process as outlined here:

<http://www.keybiodiversityareas.org/working-with-kbas/proposing-updating>.As required, the Project will also work with the GEF SEC to support/advance the registration process. We can confirm that KBA 137 will be registered in the database within the project cycle. We have added an additional output ? Output 2.1.3: Process to register KBA 137 in the WDKBA facilitated in alignment and collaboration with DENR.

- 3) The following language has been added to the Risk Table: *During the PPG period, COVID-19 has become a significant emergent risk to the communities in which the project will work. Small scale fishers, considered the poorest sector in the society, were severely affected by the impacts of COVID-19, particularly on imposed lockdowns that prohibited them from fishing, thus, hampered their only source of livelihood. With the collapse in the trade of high-value species connected to national and international markets, fishers and traders had to adjust quickly to catch and sell species for the domestic supply through local markets. This places unknown new pressures on existing coral reef and coastal systems as more fishers target similar species.*

*This project will help build on the existing efforts for coastal fishing reform ?prioritizing access to and use of coastal fisheries for local communities; ecosystem protection - to establish fully protected reserves to replenish and sustain local fisheries and protect critical habitat; and economic recovery through building household financial resilience that would put COVID recovery on the path of green recovery.*

2. Project description summary. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/19/2021 - All cleared, thank you.

JS 4/16/2021 - Thank for the revision to PMC, which ensure proportionality.

1- However, the budget annexed to the submission is not consistent with table B in the portal, the PMC and components' costs are slightly different (PMC is \$163,637 in the xls budget and \$163,123 in Table B, component 1 is \$342,245 in the xls vs 343,155 in table B, etc.). Please revise to ensure consistency.

2- Please also revise the expected implementation start:

**Expected Implementation Start**  
3/1/2021

**Expected Implementation Start**  
3/1/2021

JS 1/26/21

All below comments cleared, thank you.

A-However, please ensure upon resubmission that, in accordance with Council decision GEF/C.39.9, there is "proportionality" between the PMC covered by co-financing amounts and the PMC covered by the GEF funding, which is not currently the case.

JS 11/19/2020

1 - A long text has been pasted seemingly by mistake in the "project objective". Please correct the portal entry.

2- Output 2.3.4 : the METT is not an appropriate way to guide management on an annual basis. The METT has been designed to be a simple and rapid site assessment system to report progress on management effectiveness and should not replace more thorough methods of assessment for the purposes of adaptive management. Besides, outputs 2.3.1 and 2.3.4 seem to overlap. Please revise.

3- The project's contribution to financial sustainability of the MPAs it will work on seems limited to a reference to "financial sustainability plans" lost within the description of output 2.3.4 (see comment on 2.3.4 above) and fisher household contribution under outcome 3.1, which is not adequate. As the sustainability of the project's outcomes over time will depend on it, please strengthen the project's contribution to MPA financial sustainability.

## Agency Response

CI-GEF Response 04/19/2021:

Implementation Start Dates and End Dates updated

Annex H that was submitted had formatting errors that resulted in a discrepancy in the numbers. The excel file has been re-checked against the MSP document and they match.

CI-GEF Response 04/16/2021:

We confirm that there is now proportionality between PMC and co-financing amounts.

CI-GEF Agency response 01/25/2021

1) Objective updated

2) Output 2.3.1 is about the formation and legal establishment of management bodies, while Output 2.3.4 is when management bodies review MEAT and fisheries management assessments annually and use them for management planning.

To better articulate the difference between the two, the outputs have been updated:  
Output 2.3.1: Gender-inclusive legal and functional management bodies that are strengthened/established and have capacity and processes for effective and adaptive management of the protected area.

Output 2.3.4: Gender inclusive management bodies at the municipal level are reviewing MEAT and fisheries management assessments annually, taking into account gender considerations, and using them as inputs to management planning.

The following text has also been added to the description of the outputs (Proposed alternative scenario)

Management effectiveness as an indicator for Output 2.3.4 will be measured as baseline and at the end of the project through the METT, in accordance with GEF guidelines. However, local governments in the Philippines are more familiar with the locally

developed MEAT, which is also the basis of several incentive programs. Aside from the METT assessment, Rare will also support partners in conducting MEAT assessments for MPAs, along with its own FishMARK tool for measuring fisheries management in LGUs, on an annual basis, which partners can continue to administer themselves as part of their adaptive management planning cycle. The results of all these assessments will be shared with the partners, allowing them a more multi-faceted perspective.

3. Description of financial sustainability updated to read as follows. See Para 114 in the portal or **Para 122** in attached document.

Discussions regarding MPA budget allocations will take place when the annual management planning is discussed. The aim is to integrate funding for MPAs in the management plans and annual budgets of the partner LGUs. Locally-managed MPAs usually fall under the jurisdiction of local governments and are co-managed by the community. In LGUs where stakeholders see the importance of MPAs, targeted budget allocations are often made. This project will build support among the community and local decision makers to ensure funding for the MPAs are included in the annual investment plans.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**4. Co-financing. Are the confirmed amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/16/2021 - All cleared, thank you.

JS 1/26/21

1- Please upload co-financing letters as separate documents and link them to the table C in the portal entry (column "evidence").

2 - Cleared.

3- Thank you for the clarification and revisions in the attached document. However, the two points ("2. Grant-funding is time bound [...]" and "3. In addition, [...] Rare has secured grant funding [...]") still appear as separate in the portal entry. Please revise the text in the portal entry.

JS 11/19/2020

1-Please provide supporting evidence for the co-financing. No corresponding documents appear to have been uploaded with the submission. As per guidelines GEF/C.59/Inf.03, at CEO Endorsement/Approval Stage, supporting evidence should:

(a) confirm the information provided by the Agency, including the name of the entity that provides the Co-Financing, the type of Co-Financing provided, the amount of Co-Financing, and the time frame over which the Co-Financing will be provided;

(b) confirm that the Co-Financing identified supports the implementation of the GEF-financed project or program for which GEF financing is sought, and the achievement of its objective(s); and

(c) be presented in English, where feasible, or be accompanied by an English translation of the original.

2- Please clarify in the text related to LGU co-finance below table C that this text is not related to co-financing reported in the table but that you are expecting additional co-funding to materialize during the course of the project from LGU.

3. Please clarify if points 2 ("Grant-funding is time bound [...]") and 3 ("In addition, [...] Rare has secured grant funding [...]") under table C refer to the same co-financing line (Rare grant of \$127,621 marked as investment mobilized), which is the only one marked as grant. If so, please clarify why these are two separate points. If not, please clarify to which lines each point corresponds.

## Agency Response

CI-GEF Response 04/16/2021:

Co-financing letters are now separate attachments.

Portal text updated.

CI-GEF Agency response 01/25/2021

1) Co-financing letters included in the 1-step document attached. Letters follow requirements.

2) Yes, this is correct. We anticipate additional co-financing from the LGUs to materialize during the course of the project.

3) The language has been corrected. This was referring to the same funding.

**5. GEF resource availability. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 11/19/2020

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**STAR allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 11/19/2020

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 11/19/2020

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response  
**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response  
**6. Project Preparation Grant. If PPG is requested in Table E.1, has its advanced programming and utilized been accounted for in Annex C of the document?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
JS 11/23/2020

Yes, Cleared.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
JS 4/19/2021- Cleared.

JS 4/16/21- The project is still tagged for non grant instruments. Please correct.

E. Non Grant Instrument	
NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement	
Includes Non grant instruments?	Includes reflow to GEF?
Yes	No

JS 1/26/21

The removal of the tag on "Non grant instruments" in table E of the CEO approval request does not seem to have been done in the portal entry. Please correct.

JS 11/23/2020

Please remove the tag on "Non grant instruments" in table E of the CEO approval request, as this project is a standard GEF grant request.

## Agency Response

CI-GEF Response 04/19/2021:

NGI box unchecked

**8. Core Indicators. Are the targeted core indicators in Table E calculated using the methodology in the prescribed guidelines? (GEF/C.54/Infxxx)**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/16/2021 - All cleared, thank you.

JS 1/26/21

1- cleared.

2- Well noted for the registration as part of the project. However, the WDPA ID was not added in the portal entry for Guiuan. Please correct.

3- Well noted that baseline METT will be determined within the first 6 months of the project for all MPAs in the project. However, as requested below, please provide at a minimum the baseline METT score and target score at midterm and completion for at least the MPA in LGU Guiuan with the next resubmission.

JS 11/23/2020

1- Please ensure there is one line per MPA in core indicator 2.2.

2- Of the MPAs reported under core indicator 2.2, it seems only WDPA ID 555583082 is registered in the WDPA. Please add the corresponding WDPA ID in the correct line in the table. Please confirm that, during the course of the project, all the others MPA the project will contribute to will be registered in the WDPA and the WDPA ID 555583082 will be corrected as needed (e.g. inconsistent surface area).

3- Please note that baseline METT scores are required at CEO approval stage for all MPAs under core indicator 2. Given the explanation provided, the COVID situation and the number of small MPAs involved, please (i) provide at a minimum the baseline METT score for the MPAs in LGU Guiuan, which represent 94% of MPAs? surface area the project will work on, (ii) confirm that baseline METT will be determined within the first 6 months of the project for all MPAs in the project.

## Agency Response

CI-GEF Response 04/16/2021:

WDPA ID and METT score added for Guiuan

CI-GEF Agency response 01/25/2021:

- 1) One line per MPA is included in the core indicator section of the portal (at least from the agency view).
- 2) Of all the MPAs in the project site, only WDPA ID 555583082 is registered. Rare, in collaboration with DENR, will work on registering the other MPAs in the WDPA database and provide the corresponding WDPA ID after registration.
- 3) Rare can confirm that baseline METT will be determined within the first 6 months of the project for all MPAs in the project.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 1/26/21

Cleared.

JS 11/23/2020

- 1-Please clarify why "international waters" are tagged and consider untagging.
- 2-Please consider to what extent the project contributes to climate change adaptation (MPA design, financial resilience) and thus tagging an intermediate level on the corresponding Rio Marker.

Agency Response

CI-GEF Agency response 01/25/2021:

- 1) IW selected in error.
- 2) As per the recommendation, the following have also been selected:
  - ? Level 2: climate change

? Level 3: climate adaptation

? Level 4: climate resilience; community-based adaptation

## **Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Project Description. Is there sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 11/23/2020

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 11/23/2020

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**3. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there more clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 1/28/2021 Cleared.

JS 11/23/2020

1-Please see comment box I.2 of this review sheet.

2- Thank you for the ToC diagram. However, this diagram is rather a graphical representation of the LogFrame and the accompanying narrative appears to be missing. What is most notably missing is a description of the causal pathways by which

interventions are expected to have the desired effect, underlying assumptions and justification that these causal pathways are necessary and sufficient. Please refer to STAP's guidance <https://www.stagef.org/theory-change-primer>.

## Agency Response

CI-GEF Agency response 01/25/2021:

- 1) 1-step document attached
- 2) The ToC has been updated to include the causal pathways and a description of the ToC is included right below the figure.

*The project's overall objective is to improve the management of coastal fisheries and conserve globally significant biodiversity in the Leyte Gulf through a combination of local government-led marine spatial planning, community mobilization leading to lasting behavior change, and policy reform, and capacity development. This is not an easy task, given the serious global environmental problems that the Gulf is currently facing. Current financing of MPA management is insufficient, considering the threats of land-based and marine-based human activities that cause irreversible damage to coral reef resources. Although various efforts have been put in place, including combined interventions by the government, civil society, and local communities, only a few have proven sustainable in addressing the various and interrelated barriers to the Gulf's ecosystem. A clear pathway to community-based management for sustainable coastal fisheries is necessary to address these problems.*

*The project offers the opportunity to play a catalytic role in the sustainable management of small-scale fisheries in one of the world's most important marine biodiversity areas. Through GEF's incremental support, this project will improve the incentives and capacities needed for the sustainable management of coastal fisheries and shift current unsustainable practices to more sustainable fisheries practices that will generate significant global environmental benefits. When fishers and the communities they belong to work with their LGUs to co-manage their coastal resources, there is equitable regulation of fishing efforts, communities can execute against authorities, are engaged and compliant with sustainable behaviors, and households are provided with access to financial services and social protection; this will lead to a more abundant marine life and healthier coastal habitats.*

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
JS 11/23/2020

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 11/23/2020

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 11/23/2020

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**7. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 1/26/21 All cleared.

JS 11/23/2020

1- Please revise this section to have clearly distinct elaborations on "innovation", "sustainability" and "potential for scaling up".

2- On innovation, the project qualifies what "innovations employed by this project" would bring but does not actually explain what are these innovations. Please correct.

3- On sustainability, the strengths of the participatory and geographically-focused and financial resiliency approach are clear and adequately articulated. However, please address the issue of financial sustainability of the MPAs and managed access areas.

Agency Response

CI-GEF Agency response 01/25/2021:

Innovation sustainability and potential scaling up sections updated.

**8. Project Map and Coordinates. Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 11/23/2020

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**10. Stakeholders. Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 11/23/2020

Yes, the attached stakeholder engagement plan is adequate. Cleared.

Agency Response

**11. Gender equality and women's empowerment. Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 11/23/2020

An adequate gender mainstreaming plan, which includes a gender analysis, is provided.

The project includes gender-responsive activities, indicators and expected results.

Cleared.

Agency Response

**12. Private sector engagement. If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 11/23/2020

There is some elaboration on private sector engagement. Private sector is included in the stakeholder engagement plan albeit at a very coarse level.

Cleared.

Agency Response

**13. Risk. Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 1/26/21

All cleared.

JS 11/23/2020

1-Please provide an in-depth climate risk analysis. The current elaboration, at CEO approval stage, does not meet the requirements of the PIF stage climate risk screening.

Please refer to STAP guidance

(<https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Climate%20Risk%20Screening%20web%20posting.pdf>) and additional guidance

(<https://www.stapgef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF%20AGENCY%20RETREAT%20Mar-Apr%202020.pdf>) on the matter.

2- Please see comment on COVID-related risks in the first comment box of this review sheet.

### Agency Response

CI-GEF Agency response 01/25/2021:

1) Please see safeguard screening form attached that includes detailed information on climate screening. Please see specifically pages 22-25.

2) COVID-19 section of risk table updated.

**14. Coordination. Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/16/2021 - Cleared, thank you. Terms of reference are provided as Annex M in the attached pdf version of the CEO approval request.

JS 2/10/2021

While this point was previously cleared, the review of the terms of reference (ToR) for project staff included in this resubmission allowed for a review of the budget which shows that the PMU, which was already quite extensive for an MSP, seems actually larger. The main text states that the PMU has 5 staff when the budget has 10 staff charged across all outcomes. The ToR also show that at least the SENIOR FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, the LEAD, FINANCE AND GRANTS are only performing overall project management duties and should be charged solely on PMC and be considered part of the PMU, which is not currently the case. Also, a Marine Governance and Monitoring Manager is supposed to be part of the PMU but is charged only on components, not at all on PMC, and no terms of reference are provided. Finally, a Logistics Coordinator is supposed to be part of the PMU but the budget only has a consultant on logistics (site logistics facilitator).

Please :

1- ensure the description of the PMU in the main text is consistent the budget and annexed terms of reference for staff charged both on PMC and components.

2- Streamline the PMU and justify its size. Please notably clarify the distinction between staff who will perform actual project management, that is the PMU, and those that will only contribute to the execution of specific parts of the project.

JS 11/23/2020

Yes, cleared.

#### Agency Response

CI-GEF Response 04/16/2021:

The PMU has been revised and it now includes only staff performing both technical inputs and capacity building, which is charged under components, and project management activities which is charged to PMC. Per the GEF requirements CI has included the Terms of Reference when staff are charging to both components and PMC. The text, TORs and budget have been revised accordingly to assure consistency.

CI agrees with the reduction in the PMU size to only include the Senior Implementation Officer, the Financial Administrative Officer, and the Compliance Officer. These are staff that are performing both technical inputs/execution functions and project management related activities. Other staff and in-house consultants in the budget are performing technical delivery of the project.

**15. Consistency with national priorities. Has the project described the consistency of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 11/23/2020

Yes, cleared.

#### Agency Response

**16. Knowledge management. Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 1/28/2021 - Thank you, cleared.

JS 11/23/2020

Current elaboration does not outline either a timeline or a budget. Please correct and be more specific about the knowledge outputs to be shared with stakeholders.

#### Agency Response

CI-GEF Agency response 01/25/2021:

KM section updated to include timeline and budget. Text: *Rare will conduct quarterly meetings with site partners and other relevant key stakeholders to document insights and harness lessons learned during project implementation. Twice within the project cycle, Rare will also convene a Gulf-wide Learning Exchange Summit to discuss and share best practices among partner municipalities that other neighboring areas can replicate. Knowledge outputs, such as learning tools and materials, will be shared with all participants after every training event to encourage continuous learning. As included in the submitted budget, the amount allocated for these knowledge management activities is \$46,850, (approximately 3% of the total project budget).*

Knowledge outputs were also included in the project timeline (Annex I of attached 1-step document)

**17. Monitoring and Evaluation. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
JS 11/23/2020

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**18. Benefits. Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
JS 11/23/2020

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
JS 4/16/2021- All cleared, thank you

We note that the three staff that compose the PMU (Senior Site Implementation Officer, Finance and Administration Officer and Compliance Officer) are charged to both PMC

and components but that PMC budget is already used in full (10% of GEF project funding and 21% of co-financed project funding go to PMC) and adequate ToRs are provided.

JS 2/10/2021

Thank you for the terms of reference.

1-Please see comment box II.14 of this review sheet in relation to the budget annex and the annexed terms of reference and revise the budget and terms of reference accordingly. To better discriminate among staff and consultant, please consider using GEF budget template's suggested expenditure categories "international consultants", "local consultants", "Salary and benefits / Staff costs".

2- Please explain why office rent, which represents almost a quarter of GEF financing of the PMC, is not covered by co-financing.

JS 11/23/2020

1- Budget: Please note that since project staff is charged to both PMC and project components (i.e. not only to PMC), clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective components are required at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval. Please provide corresponding terms of reference.

Agency Response

CI-GEF Response 04/16/2021:

Budget template updated

Rent is part of other operating costs, which is an allowable cost per GEF policies. The budget has been restructured to allocate the operations/rent costs based on level of effort on the delivery of technical inputs and project management activities and thus, not covered under co-financing.

CI-GEF Agency response 01/25/2021:

TORs are included in the 1-step document attached. See Annex M.

**20. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS):**

**Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 11/23/2020

Yes, cleared.

The project is rated low risk. A safeguard screening analysis is provided, with attached accountability and grievance mechanism, stakeholder engagement plan, gender mainstreaming plan and framework for natural resource access restriction.

Agency Response  
**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/16/2021 - Cleared.

JS 1/28/2021

All cleared but please note comments on core indicators and the need to have a baseline METT score and target at the CEO approval stage for a least the largest MPA.

JS 11/23/2020

1-Please explain why the baseline of several indicators has not been established during PPG (e.g. 1.1.2, 1.2.1, 1.2.2).

2-Please correct the the typo on the target of Output Indicator 1.2.1.3 (1,000 instead of 100).

Agency Response  
CI-GEF Response 04/16/2021:

METT score for Guiuan included.

CI-GEF Agency response 01/25/2021:

1) Baseline figures for several of the outputs in the Results Framework are not yet available. Our plan is to collect these at the start of the project, in line with Rare's approach to working with local partners. Data collection, analysis and feedback are key part of the project's partner engagement and capacity building strategy. Once partners

agree to work with the project, one of the first steps is to collect baseline information on a range of relevant metrics: status of resources, socio-economic conditions, fishing practices, management practices, etc. Rare does this together with the partners, and uses the data as a jump off point for goal setting and planning moving forward with plans and interventions. To do this too early, and with a long lag time before follow-up, while waiting for a proposal to be approved, creates premature expectations in the community, which makes it more difficult to re-engage once the project is underway. In our experience, it has been much more productive when the local government partner and community see baseline data collection as part of the full program of activities that they will undertake, with the post-assessments as a way to validate the actions that they undertook during the project.

2) Typo corrected

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CI-GEF Response 04/16/2021:

METT score included for Guiuan

**Council comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**STAP comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**Part III ? Country and Agency Endorsements**

**1. Country endorsements. Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 11/19/2020

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**1. RECOMMENDATION.**

**Is CEO endorsement/approval recommended?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**JS 5/6/2021 - Yes, this project is recommended for CEO approval.**

JS 5/5/2021 - Please address the few remaining comments in the first comment box (PMU description, budget, gender).

JS 4/16/2021 - Please address the very few remaining details above and resubmit.

JS 2/10/2021 - Not at this stage. Please address comments above and resubmit.

JS 11/25/2020- Not at this stage. Please address comments above and resubmit.

**Review Dates**

	<b>1SMSP CEO Approval</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>11/25/2020</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>2/10/2021</b>	

**1SMSP CEO  
Approval**

**Response to Secretariat  
comments**

<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/16/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/19/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/5/2021</b>	

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**