

# Mediterranean Sea Basin Environment and Climate Regional Support Project

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

9686

**Countries**

Regional (Algeria, Albania, Libya, Morocco, Montenegro, Tunisia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Egypt, Lebanon)

**Project Name**

Mediterranean Sea Basin Environment and Climate Regional Support Project

**Agenices**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

3/29/2019

**Review completed by PM**

11/6/2019

**Program Manager**

Steffen Hansen

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

**PIF** ☐

**CEO Endorsement** ☐

**Project Design and Financing**

**1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

SH (4.15.19): Yes

**Response to Secretariat comments** NA

**2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?**

## **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

SH (4.15.19):

There seems to be an issue with the way the information was copy pasted from the GEF-6 request for project endorsement/approval word-template and into the portal entry-fields. Concretely, the A2-A8 section headings, which feature in the word-template, were also copy pasted into the portal entry-fields. This means that the portal submission features duplicate headings throughout the document. Please correct this mistake by copy pasting only the relevant text into portal entry-fields.

In addition to the above point, please address the below points:

### **1. populate the “Other Executing Partner(s)” and “Executing Partner Type” sections.**

SH (7-11-19): Addressed

### **2. Extra care should be taken to ensure that the PMT and other key features of the project becomes operational early on during program execution – including making available training sessions as necessary for key staff. Please explain how this goal will be met?**

SH (7-11-19): Addressed

### **3. Annex A: Projects Results Framework: please check that the correct Results Framework is featured in the portal submission? Currently it looks as if it is the CP 2.2 RF.**

SH (7-11-19):

(a) Thanks for adding the correct RF. Please specify what is meant by awareness raising tools? Are the tools different types of communication products or are they new tools that will be applied by the program stakeholders in different settings?

(b) In addition to or as part of the Med Program bulletin, please consider producing a regular Med Program Newsletter. The GEF/WB Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program newsletter is a example of how a Program Newsletter can be structured.

(c) please consider incorporating the the Replication Atlas's into the RF as a target.

SH (9.23.19): addressed

**4. In the submission, please elaborate more on the feasibility of the KM platform (including visualization tools) evolving into a standardized tool to be applied across future work streams of the Contracting Parties of the Barcelona Convention? Please consider if this should be a goal within the lifespan of this project and if specific text can be added in relevant sections referencing the need for consultations with relevant stakeholders during the further development, operationalization and costing of the KM platform?**

SH (7-11-19): Addressed

**5. Please specify if the CP 4.1 includes an engagement strategy which specifically targets increased collaborative effort across the private sector space? if not then please make suggestions and incorporate text specifying how CP 4.1. can advance this goal.**

SH (7-11-19): Thanks for adding additional information. As part of the project inception meeting please consider concrete ways in which the project communication strategy can facilitate private sector involvement/uptake of results.

**6. The A.3 Stakeholders section mentions national and regional organizations representing e.g. manufacturers/ industrialists, banks and insurances. In the submission, please elaborate on the specific roles of such private sector players within the framework of the Program and their potential connection to CP 4.1? Also, please insert text in the the "INNOVATION, SUSTAINABILITY AND POTENTIAL FOR SCALING UP" section speaking to the involvement of such private sector actors from a sustainability angle.**

SH (7-11-19): Addressed

**7. With reference to the topic of sharing knowledge and building capacity: At the portfolio level, the MedPCU will capacitate child project teams with knowledge and training (could be face-to-face, virtual meetings, Communities of Practice, Expert visits, Study Tours, manuals, among others). Please explain if GEF funds are primarily targeted country stakeholders and if executing partners will primarily draw on own budgets?**

SH (7-11-19): Addressed

**8. Please include as an annex to CP 4.1 an overview of the differences in the expected Program level Outcomes between PFD council approval stage and CEO endorsement stage.**

SH (7-11-19): Addressed

**9. This comments concerns the division of funds across the entire program:**

**While the total programme envelope has remained the same between council and CEO END stage, the funding matched against specific Objectives/Programs has changed. Please explain? E.g. at council stage spending against IW-3 Program 5 was set at \$10.5 M, while at CEO END stage the amount is set at \$5.5 M.**

SH (7-11-19): Addressed

SH (11.25.19):

10. The PRODOC list of countries includes Algeria, while the portal submission Part I list of countries does not. Considering that Algeria forms part of the project and has committed co-finance (see portal submission Part I table C), please consider sending a request to GEF (via email) specifying if the Portal Submission Part I list of countries should be updated to include Algeria.

o 11. Please check all relevant text sections in the PRODOC and portal submissions to make sure that countries are referenced, as appropriate, throughout the submissions.

o 12. The PRODOC Section E should contain the # of direct project beneficiaries expected at CEO Endorsement. This number is provided in the portal Table E Core Indicator table. In addition, please note that PRODOC Annex B (Core Indicator Worksheet) lists approx. 68,000,000 direct project beneficiaries. Please correct this number so that it reflects the # already provided in the portal Table E Core Indicator table.

13. Currently the Environmental, Social and Economic Review Note (ESERN) forms part of the Annex titled “Figures Tables and Text Boxes”. Please create a separate annex for the ESERN.

SH (11.26.19): addressed.

## **Response to Secretariat comments**

**UNEP (09.06.19)**

The section headings for sections A2-A8 have been removed from the portal

1) Executing Partner type updated in the portal

2) The Recruitment of the Project Management Team will start upon resubmission of the project. ToRs for the components of the MedPCU are currently being finalized with a view to initiate the soonest the classification (creating) of the Project Posts. The posts will be advertised as soon as the funds will be available to have a full team in place no more than 5 months after the GEF CEO endorsement. Trainings to the members of the MedPCU will be provided as standard procedure for UNEP to ensure a smooth execution of the child projects.

3) The correct Result Framework has been included in the portal

4) The strategy proposed by the CP4.1 is to develop the platform to ensure that the execution of the whole programme would benefit from a support tool centralizing and elaborating all the information/results/data produced. These will be analysed to assess their impacts toward achieving the MedProgramme's objectives, as well as those of the Barcelona Convention. This is an innovative and ambitious approach for the Mediterranean which may evolve into a strategic tool for the Convention. The Secretariat will use the MedProgramme as a test case to learn lessons. In case the platform would prove to be a useful tool to the Programme and its countries; a proposal will be made to integrate it in the operation of the Convention beyond the life span of the MedProgramme. This process will be initiated during the execution of the MedProgramme and will have to follow several steps over which the Contracting Parties will assess the platform in terms of: 1) its value added for the work of the Convention; 2) the practical implications linked to its support; and 3) eventually will decide if use it systematically as a tool of Barcelona Convention. This decision is ultimately taken by the countries during an official meeting of the Convention (i.e. a Conference of the Contracting Parties), or any other decision-making meeting where the countries are represented by nominated officials. Text has been added at *page 27* of the GEF CEO ER to explain this process.

5) The private sector, as well as other important actors, will be engaged systematically by all the Child Projects of the MedProgramme focusing on specific themes such as IWRM, NEXUS, Hg - POPs, investments, etc.

CP4.1 aims to providing support to the entire Programme to materialize greater environmental impact than the single projects. This function will be also deployed for the involvement of the private sector and other relevant actors. In this sense an important tools/support provided by CP4.1 are the MedProgramme Annual Stocktaking Meeting. During these events the private sector, as well as other strategic actors such as financial institutions, media, etc will be invited to: 1) taking vision and better understanding the results, the products and the impacts delivered by the MedProgramme; and 2) discussing and defining opportunities to further develop in a medium-long term the strategic lines support by the Programme.

Moreover, CP4.1 fully builds on the setup provided by the Barcelona Convention, thus its execution is fully embedded into the activities of UNEP/MAP. This allows the Programme to contribute to the successful implementation of the principles the Convention, as well as to benefit from the ongoing regional and national processes. One of the them is the Mediterranean a Strategy for Sustainable Development 2016-2025 (MSSD). The MSSD provide a complete and already adopted (by the Contracting parties), strategy that foreseen enhancing the involvement of the private sector. The MedProgramme will work in synergy with the processes associated to the MSSD benefitting from its results as well as supporting specific activities related to the involvement of the private sector or any other strategic actors relevant to the objectives of the Programme. Text has been added at *page 38* of the GEF CEO ER to explain this set-up.

6) Text added at *page 36* under section A.3 Stakeholder and at *page 38* under section INNOVATION, SUSTAINABILITY AND POTENTIAL FOR SCALING UP to describe the role of the private sector and its potential contribution to the MedProgramme in a medium and long terms

7) GEF funds will mainly target the stakeholders from the countries. Trainings, workshops, KM sessions and Gender mainstreaming will be provided by the executing partners teams to the relevant stakeholders from the beneficiary countries. This will be done both at national and regional level.

8) A brand-new **ANNEX S** showing the differences in the expected Program level Outcomes between PFD council approval stage and CEO endorsement stage, has been included.

9) The total spending against IW-3 Program 5 approved by the GEF Council is at \$10.5 M. This figure has been maintained. The breakdown is the following:

CP1.2 (5,000,000) – UN Environment

CP4.1 (500,000) – UN Environment

CP1.3 (5,000,000) – EBRD

Total: 10,500,000

Please note that the allocation for all child projects has been cross checked to ensure full alignment with that approved by the GEF Council at PFD stage. For ease of reference a table has been attached at the end of the current document showing the MedProgramme's allocation of funds for each GEF-6 Program.

### **19 September 2019**

**UNEP response of comments for (7-11-19) for Point no.3.** Annex A: Projects Results Framework: please check that the correct Results Framework is featured in the portal submission? Currently it looks as if it is the CP 2.2 RF.

**3 a) On the Awareness raising tools:** Child project 4.1 does not aim to develop new awareness raising tools but rather to apply a wide range of existing awareness raising products and methodologies to “raise/attract” the focus of attention of a wide range of stakeholders in the region on the MedProgramme, its activities and, more importantly, on its short-medium and long terms (positive) impacts. The awareness raising products and methodologies that will be implemented by Child Project 4.1 are extensively described from page 29 and page 42 of the GEF CEO Endorsement Request. Few examples are: 1) raising regional and global awareness on the Programme and its objectives and accomplishments through the use of effective and modern communication tools; 2) renowned personalities from different realms (such as art, sports, entertainment or fashion) engaged to serve as ambassadors for the Programme and raise awareness about the main environmental challenges (and solutions) in the coastal areas of the Mediterranean; and 3) use the MedProgramme and its results to promote the broader adoption and replication of the successful policies, practices and technologies implemented under the Child Projects.

**3 b)** Text on the **MedProgramme Newsletter** has been added at page 32 of the GEF CEO ER.

**3 c)** An Outcome indicator 1.4 for the Outcome 1 of the Child Project has been added in the LogFrame to consider the **National Replication Atlases** produced during the MedProgramme execution.

**Response for comment #5: Please specify if the CP 4.1 includes an engagement strategy which specifically targets increased collaborative effort across the private sector space? if not then please make suggestions and incorporate text specifying how CP 4.1. can advance this goal.**

It is agreed that as part of the project inception meeting concrete ways to facilitate **private sector involvement/uptake of results** will be considered during the preparation of the project communication strategy in the context of the MedProgramme Knowledge Management Strategy.



**Text added at page 36 of the GEF CEO ER.**

**UNEP(26/11/2019)**

**Comments addressed.**

**3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

SH (4.15.19): Yes. Also, the KM strategy includes specific activities that will support the work of project managers and executing partners by providing project management tools and training to key regional stakeholders

SH (10-04-19): Please provide justification for the increased PMC.

SH (11.06.19): addressed

**Response to Secretariat comments**

**Response to comment of SH(10-04-19)**

Additional information and tables are provided in section A.6 of the GEF CEO ER. Please refer to table 9 in the GEF CEO ER showing that PMC has been kept within 5% across the all MedProgramme.

**4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

SH (4.15.19): Yes, however, STAP made important comments at PFD PIF council approval stage. Please incorporate the below consideration more elaborately into the risk section:

"The entire Programme design should provide for sufficient flexibility and appropriate adaptive management strategies to counteract political instability and continuously changing circumstances of the countries in the Mediterranean region."

SH (7-11-19): Addressed

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

**UNEP (09.06.19)**

The adaptive management strategy at the MedProgramme level relies on one major tool, the Annual Stocktaking Meetings, part of CP 4.1 (output 2.2). Through these major meetings all issues of concern related to changes in political will or instability in the recipient countries will become manifest and allow for timely adaptive management responses at both the specific Child Project and at the Program levels. This critical function of the ASM will be played in advance of the Project Steering Committee to prepare working documents and decisions for the deliberation of the countries.

A new formulation of output 2.2 as well as text describing this important function of the ASMs has been added at **page 33-34** of the GEF CEO ER.

**5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** SH (4.15.19): Yes

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

NA

19 September 2019

UNEP response of comments for (7-11-19)

### **Additional comments**

*The co-financing committed by the countries for the Child Project 4.1 is fully related to the Knowledge Management Strategy. The co-financing will be fully delivered during the lifespan of the project. The MedPCU together with UNEP will closely monitoring this co-financing in cooperation with the countries.*

**6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**(4.15.19):** Note that indicator 7.1 references two shared water ecosystems. Both these ecosystems are named Mediterranean Sea and given a score of 1 and 3, respectively. Please explain why two different systems were selected and the difference in rating?

Indicator 11: Please populate this indicator and with a reference to the expected stakeholders targeted by the CP4.1. It is understood that the # can only be a guesstimate at this stage.

Please indicate why there are no core indicators for chemicals in this project.

**SH (7-11-19):** Regarding indicator 11. Apologies for not having been clear the first time around. At CEO Endorsement stage please only include the # of people that are expected to attend training and/or use the KM platform etc. At mid-term stage of the project it should be easier to identify the geographical extent of the project interventions and provide a # for the people that benefit from the positive environmental impacts of the MedProgramme.

SH(9.23.19): addressed

**Response to Secretariat comments**

**UNEP (09.06.19)**

Indicators 7 is set to 1 (Mediterranean LME)

7.1, 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4 all refer to the same LME

We kindly request GEFSec to delete the row which is circled below as we are not able to delete it from our side

## Indicator 7.1 Level of Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Program (TDA/SAP) formulation and implementation (scale of 1 to 4; see Guidance) ⓘ

Shared Water Ecosystem	Rating (Expected at PIF)	Rating (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Rating (Achieved at MTR)	Rating (Achieved at TE)
Mediterranean Sea		4		
Mediterranean Sea		1		

A # guesstimate has been provided. These figures refer to the Mediterranean 2017 Quality Status Report (QSR). According to the report more than a third part of the inhabitant of the Mediterranean Countries live in coastal administrative entities totalling less than 12 % of the surface area of the Mediterranean countries. The population of the coastal regions grew from about 100 million in 1980 to 150 million in 2005. By applying these criteria, the estimated coastal population of the 9 beneficiary countries CP4.1 is 68,383,157, out of which approx. 49% are male and 51% female.

Kindly note that the figures included in indicators 11 does not refers to the # of person that would attend trainings and/or using the KM platform etc. but rather to the # of persons that would potentially benefit from the positive environmental impacts of the MedProgramme, i.e. as mentioned above the coastal population of the entire GEF eligible countries of the Mediterranean LME.

About CW Core Indicators on POPs and Hg: The following text has been added at page 4 of the GEF CEO ER and in a footnote to the Core Indicator No9 in the GEF7 Core Indicator Worksheet: “As a cross-cutting project the Regional Support Project – CP4.1 will not directly result in reductions of POPs or Hg, which will be achieved under the chemicals and waste Child Project 1.1. However, the Regional Support project will indirectly support the achievement of those targets and allow for scaling up beyond the targets in CP 1.1. In terms of the disposal of POPs and mercury, the GIS-based tool to be deployed under this Child Project 4.1 for recording national inventories and assessing and visualizing the environmental impact of the inventoried wastes will directly facilitate decision making and

*operational planning for the field work to remove the wastes, thereby ensuring that the target of 2000 tons of PCBs and POPs are removed with maximum efficiency. The exchange of best practices planned under the Regional Support Project will also directly result in the scaling up and expansion of the demonstration activities on new POPs and Hg which are planned for only 3 countries under CP 1.1 (target under Indicator 9.4 is '3 country pilot demonstration projects on alternatives to new POPs in manufacturing'). The knowledge sharing activities included under the CP 4.1 will allow all the project countries (up to 8 total) to be informed and access the tools to also implement these practices."*

### **19 September 2019**

UNEP response of comments for (7-11-19)

**Regarding indicator 11:** The GEF7 Core Indicator Worksheet has been update indicating a # of people equal to 2,200 (50% female – 50% male) at MTE stage. This figure is based on an estimation of 200 persons per (11) GEF eligible countries. We assume that these people will use the KM tools and platform, will work with the gender mainstreaming strategy and will engaged in the meetings, trainings and Annual Stocktaking Meeting of the Child Project. The # of people at TEs stage will be provide when the project will go through the MTE.

**7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** NA

**Response to Secretariat comments** NA

**8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** SH (4.15.19): Yes

**Response to Secretariat comments** NA

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

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** SH (4.15.19): Yes

**Response to Secretariat comments** NA

**10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** SH (4.15.19): Yes. Note that a menu of indicators (both quantitative and qualitative) will be developed by the MedPCU in order to monitor knowledge-related activities. Once indicators are discussed and approved during the inception phase of the MedProgramme, related targets will be developed to measure the achievement of the objectives.

**Response to Secretariat comments** NA

**Agency Responses**

**11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:**

**GEFSEC**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** SH (4.15.19): Yes

**Response to Secretariat comments** NA

**STAP**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

SH (4.15.19): No. ANNEX B should contain responses to PFD reviews (incl comments from Council and STAP at PFD WP inclusion stage). Please include in annex B the different responses to comments from STAP.

SH (7-11-19): Addressed

### **Response to Secretariat comments UNEP (09.06.19)**

A new version of Annex B has been added to the submission package.

The annex includes a table with the comments made by the STAP and the feedbacks based on how the MedProgramme's Child Projects have been prepared. Kindly note that the comments of the STAP do not refer only to CP4.1 but they are answered in the ANNEX B of this project which is the cross cutting supporting project for the entire Programme. This principle has been mentioned in the new version of the ANNEX B.

### **GEF Council**

#### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

SH (4.15.19): No. ANNEX B should contain responses to PFD reviews (e.g. Responses to Comments from Council and STAP at PFD WP inclusion stage). Please include in annex B the different responses to comments from the GEF council.

SH (7-11-19): Addressed

### **Response to Secretariat comments UNEP (09.06.19)**

A new version of Annex B has been added to the submission package.

Kindly note that no specific comments and the activities, outputs and outcome of Child Project 2.1 were made by the GEF Council at PFD stage.

## **Convention Secretariat**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** SH (4.15.19): NA

**Response to Secretariat comments** NA  
**Recommendation**

### **12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

SH (4.15.19): please address comments and resubmit.

SH (7-11-19): Please address comments and resubmit.

SH (10-04-19): Please provide justification for the increased PMC and resubmit.

SH (11.17.19): With reference to the conversation between GEFSEC and UNEP, please attach a document in the portal titled PRODOC which is used internally for decision purposes at UNEP.

SH (11.25.19): Please address comments in review box 2 and resubmit.

SH (11.26.19): The project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.

By inception, please update the PRODOC with co-financing contributions from all beneficiary countries. Please include in the PIR submissions all updated co-finance numbers, while making sure that all co-financing is duly reflected in the portal by project mid-term.



## Response to Secretariat comments

UNEP response to SH (10-04-19): Justification and additional information and tables provide in the section A.6 of the GEF CEO ER

### UNEP (11.17.19)

UNEP Project document now uploaded.

UNEP(26/11/2019)

Comments Addressed.

### Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

### CEO Recommendation

### Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The eight projects of the MedProgramme are expected to deliver a set of complementary results embracing three categories of priorities identified by the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis for the Mediterranean Sea which are translated into three components of the programme: i) Reduction of Land-Based Pollution in Priority Coastal Hotspots and measuring progress to impacts; ii) Enhancing Sustainability and Climate Resilience in the Coastal Zone; and iii) Protecting Marine Biodiversity.

The fourth component of the programme - Knowledge Management and Programme Coordination - is comprised of the “Mediterranean Sea LME Environment and Climate Regional Support Project” which plays a key role within the MedProgramme as it “implements mechanisms for Programme-wide learning and dissemination of knowledge, monitoring the Programme’s progress to impacts, and fostering synergistic interactions among the program Projects”. This project will function as a trait d’union (a common link) among all program Projects by providing overall coordination of the programme portfolio, resource-saving services, a robust system to managing knowledge effectively and a sound action plan for gender mainstreaming.

It is expected that, thanks to the support and synergetic action provided by this project, the MedProgramme’s results will be “more than the sum of its components”.

The project will develop its support function through three main lines of action:

(i) Knowledge Management and Dissemination;

(ii) Coordination and Monitoring;

(iii) Gender Mainstreaming;