

# Build back a blue and stronger Mediterranean

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10685

**Countries**

Regional (Lebanon, Montenegro, Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia)

**Project Name**

Build back a blue and stronger Mediterranean

**Agencies**

CI

**Date received by PM**

9/28/2020

**Review completed by PM**

10/29/2020

**Program Manager**

Christian Severin

**Focal Area**

International Waters

**Project Type**

FSP

## PIF

### Part I – Project Information

#### Focal area elements

**1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

**Indicative project/program description summary**

**2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): No, please reformulate the output indicators so that the focus is on output indicators. Setting up the Fund is not the main delivery, the main delivery here is the 20 MPA created, the 612.000 Ha and the 35685 ton fisheries moved from unsustainable fisheries to sustainable.

For component 2, please reformulate, it is hard to understand what the component will be delivering. e.g. output 2.1.1 includes a wordy description, without clearly outlining what will be delivered.

For component 3, please provide easier quantifiable indicators

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): Partly, the project RF should only report on the results of the project financing. According to the LOEs uploaded Turkey is not part of the project. Albania is also missing a proper LOE to be uploaded.

Apart from that the output indicators are okay at this point, but it is expected that at CEO endorsement they are much sharper. Eg on output indicator of "*Evolution of MPAs managers capacities*" is simply too loose and nearly impossible to measure if it will have been achieved.

Further, if more countries have joined compared to what is noted on front page, please make sure that there is coherency between countries listed (after the REGIONAL) tag on the front page. Currently that list only includes four countries. Moreover, please make sure the list of countries on front page and throughout the document corresponds to the correctly signed LOEs uploaded.

27th of October 2020 (cseverin): Partly addressed. However, please work towards getting Albania to join.

1) Please ensure that the cofinanced amount going towards project management is equivalent to the the overall GEF/cofinancing ratio.

29th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed.

30th of October 2020 (cseverin): No, please ensure:

1) that the project title is the same in the portal, as used in the LOE. This is currently not the case.

2) that a submission date is added on the front page, this is currently missing.

30th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed.

#### Agency Response

CI-GEF response 10/30/2020:

We removed, "though the Mediterranean Network of Effective and Sustainable MPAs" from the title

We included the submission date

CI-GEF response 10/15/2020

We have included indicators and targets for all outputs..

Output 1.1.1 has been removed – the remaining output focuses on the 20 MPA created, the 612.000 Ha and the 35685 ton fisheries moved from unsustainable fisheries to sustainable.

Component 2 and its content have been revised to clearly state what the project will be intending to achieve

Indicators under component 3 have been revised – easier quantifiable indicators have been added

All revisions made to the Results matrix (Table B) have been reflected in the PIF narrative as well as in the ToC.

**CI-GEF response 10/23/2020:**

Turkey and Albania removed from the project. At CEO endorsement, output indicators will be sharpened. Regional and country tags have been updated.

#### **Co-financing**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

30th of October 2020 (cseverin): No, please address following point:

“Beneficiaries” is defined as individuals or communities. Based on the description in the proposal this does not fit the category for The MedFund or “MedPAN” that are financed by different donors (NGO?). Please use “CSO” or “Other”. This also applies to co-financing from “Fondation Prince Albert” that should be classified as “other”.

30th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 10/30/2020"

Co-financing table updated. MedFund, MedPan and Prince Albert Foundation changed to other.

**GEF Resource Availability**

**4. 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes, however, please make sure LOEs and amount requested are aligned. ,That is currently not the case.

Multiple places the submission mentions activities planned in countries that have not endorsed the project. This is not possible. Please make sure that there is coherency between countries LOEs and countries mentioned in the PIF.

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

#### Agency Response

CI-GEF response 10/15/2020:

6 countries have now endorsed the project : Albania, Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia; Lebanon and Montenegro. The PIF only mentions these countries. The GEF grant amount has been reduced to \$5,000,000 plus agency fees and fees. This is the lowest amount on the LOEs.

#### **The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

#### Agency Response

**The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

#### Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

**Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

**Project Preparation Grant**

**5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

**Core indicators**

**6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Please add Mediterranean Sea under core indicator 7

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

27th of October 2020 (cseverin): Please adjust core sub indicator 7.3 and 7.4. Even though this is a follow up investment, it seems rather high to already be reporting a full 4 on both sub indicators.

29th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

CI-GEF response 10/28/2020:

Core indicator 7.3 was included incorrectly. 7.4 has been adjusted to 3

CI-GEF Response 10/15/2020

The Mediterranean Sea has been added under core indicator 7

**Project/Program taxonomy**

**7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?**



Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): No, Please include Marine Protected Areas, Marine and coastal protected areas

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

CI-GEF response 10/15/2020

Marine Protected Areas, and Marine and coastal protected areas added in Table G,

## **Part II – Project Justification**

### **1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

### **2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Partly. Baseline is what the project will be building on, not its cofinancing. A large part of the baseline section text, seems to be associated to the project's co-financing.

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

CI-GEF response 10/15/2020:

The baseline scenario has been completed and clarified. Justification has been added to Section 2.a. Section 2.b has been simplified. Detailed description of co-financing projects is moved to page 36-39 after Table 1

**3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Partly,

1) footnote 45, indicates that countries that have not endorsed the project will be supported. Please read project submission thoroughly and ensure that ONLY countries that have endorsed the project will be receiving funding.

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed.

Agency Response

CI-GEF response 10/15/2020:

6 countries endorsed the project : Albania, Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia; Lebanon and Montenegro

GEF funding will support MPAs ONLY in the these 6 countries: Albania, Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia; Lebanon and Montenegro

MPAs in Turkey or in other Mediterranean countries will be supported by co-financing

**4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin):Yes

Agency Response

**5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin):Yes

Agency Response

**6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin):Partly, please add LME name under core indicator 7. This is mentioned in the text provided under heading in section, but not in the core indicator table.

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

CI-GEF response 10/15/2020:

The Mediterranean Sea has been added under core indicator 7 in the core indicator table

**7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin):Yes

Agency Response

**Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

**Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

**Stakeholders**

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): No, please elaborate on which stakeholders that have been engaged to date.

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

CI-GEF response 10/15/2020:

A table has been added with stakeholders engaged at the PIF preparation stage

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

**Private Sector Engagement**

**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Partly.

1) Please include a more thorough analysis of the short, medium and long term impacts of COVID 19.

2) Please include a climate risk screening. Please see STAP guidance on climate risk screening

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

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

CI-GEF response 10/15/2020:

A detailed analysis of short, medium and long term impacts of COVID 19 have been added

A climate risk screening has been developed and attached.

**Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): No, the section only includes mentioning of global and regional strategies and policies, but omit to mention national strategies and policies that the project will align with. Please provide such information for the four participating countries.

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

CI-GEF response 10/15/2020:

National policies and strategies have been included (pages 61-63) – The MedPAN and MedFund mandate is to support the implementation of national and regional policies and strategies

#### **Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

#### **Part III – 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): Partly,

1) The Albania letter has been signed by the GEF council member, not the operational focal point. Please make sure LOE has been signed by correct person.

2) please make sure there is coherency between GEF grant amounts listed in the LOEs and what is being listed in the LOEs.

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): No. the Albanian LOE is still not uploaded in a revised format, signed by the OFP. Please address this urgently, either by removing Albania from the project or uploading a new LOE

27th of October 2020 (cseverin): it is understood that Albania has been removed in this submission, but project propoments will continue to work towards including Albania in the submission. If this process is successful, please adjust submission accordingly at time of CEO Endorsement.

30th of October 2020 (cseverin): No, please address following points:

1) The LOE from Albania is still uploaded, please confirm that the reason for the LOE to be present is the clear intend to include Albania and that a LOE signed by the OFP is being pursued during PPG.

2) Please remove the LoE from Zambia that is in the section 'Documents'.

30th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed as well as possible, as the agency was not able to delete the Zambian LOE

### Agency Response

CI-GEF response 10/30/2020:

We will include the LOE signed by the Operational Focal Point of Albania during the PPG phase. We recognize that the LOE was signed by the PFP.



We mistakenly uploaded an incorrect LOE but we are unable to delete anything from the portal. We also tried to remove the LOE signed by the Albanian PFP with no success.

CI-GEF response 10/15/2020:

6 countries have now endorsed the project : Albania, Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia; Lebanon and Montenegro. The PIF only mentions these countries. The GEF grant amount has been reduced to \$5,000,000 plus agency fees and fees. This is the lowest amount on the LOEs.

CI-GEF response 10/23/2020:

Albania was removed from the project due to the LOE signed by the PFP and not the OFP. It is expected that the LOE will be included during the PPG phase.

#### **Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects**

**Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9th of October 2020 (cseverin): No, Please address above comments

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): No please address comments urgently and resubmit ASAP

27th of October 2020 (cseverin): No, please address comments

29th of October 2020 (cseverin): No, please address comments and resubmit soonest.

29th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes, PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

30th of October 2020 (cseverin): No, please address comments and revert soonest

30th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes, PIF is recommended for Technical Clearance

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**Review Dates**

**PIF Review**

**Agency Response**

<b>First Review</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

**Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**

The Mediterranean Sea is one of the "hotspots" of global biodiversity. Although it represents less than 1% of the surface of the world's oceans, the Mediterranean Large Marine Ecosystem is home to nearly 10% of the world's marine biodiversity and has a high level of endemism. It contains remarkable diversity and is a vital breeding area for many charismatic, endangered and commercially important pelagic species. Unfortunately, an overall intensification of the degradation of marine and coastal environments in the Mediterranean has been observed over the past decades. The Mediterranean Sea is one large water ecosystem with high connectivity, having sustainable and effectively management MPAs in non-European countries will not only provide socio-ecological and fisheries benefits in the MPAs themselves and their direct boundaries, but will also contribute to the overall large ecosystem health.

This investment will be furthering the efforts of a GEF financed intervention that effectively established and operationalized a sustainable financing mechanism for Mediterranean MPAs, namely the MedFund. The MedFund's mission will 1) Solicit public and private actors to and 2) Contribute to the long-term financing of MPA activities. The MedFund is also a Mediterranean cooperation platform gathering together civil society, Mediterranean States, regional organizations, foundations and institutions.

The project will secure the long-term effective management of existing MPAs in non-EU countries in the Mediterranean Sea, providing a global and integrated support to the management of Mediterranean MPAs. This integrated support will strengthen the management effectiveness of Mediterranean MPAs by securing access to sustainable financing solutions for MPA core management costs while providing technical, strategic, organizational and institutional support.