

Mediterranean Coastal Zones Climate Resilience Water Security and Habitat Protection

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

9687

Countries

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

Project Name

Mediterranean Coastal Zones Climate Resilience Water Security and Habitat Protection

Agenices

UNEP

Date received by PM

11/2/2018

Review completed by PM

11/6/2019

Program Manager

Steffen Hansen

Focal Area

International Waters

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 (19-4-19):

1) Note that the co-finance contribution is many magnitudes higher than the one indicated in the PFD. It is important that such numbers are not inflated and hence that the initiatives, projects, investments, strategies ongoing (or recently closed) at the national and regional levels are described and with reference to the value added to the current project. This information does not feature under the 2b baseline scenarios and hence can be included in the section 4) INCREMENTAL COST REASONING, EXPECTED CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE BASELINE AND CO-FINANCING, AND GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS.

SH (25-7-19): addressed

2) Please include text explaining that Algeria has joined the program.

SH (25-7-19): addressed

Response to Secretariat comments

UNEP (30-5-19)

1) text has been added at page 101 in the section 4) INCREMENTAL COST REASONING, EXPECTED CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE BASELINE AND CO-FINANCING, AND GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS to explain how the co-financing pledges made by the countries and execution partner is directly and/or indirectly contributing to the objective of the child project 2.1 and more in general to the whole MedProgramme.

2) text has been added at page 9 to explain that Algeria has been added to the Programme following receipt of the Letter of Endorsement on 16th November 2017.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Shansen (27-12-18): Please note that the CEO endorsement portal submission includes the captions from figures 1-36, but the actual figures do not feature in the portal Endorsement submission. While these figures are indeed included in the supporting document titled “[Request for CEO Endorsement request and Annexes_2018November02](#)”, please also include them in the portal submission. Also, several tables and boxes are missing as part of the formal portal submission and should be included. Once GEF receives the resubmission containing this info the fully fledged CEO end review will be sent.

Shansen (19.4.19): addressed.

Further to the above, in the resubmission please consider the below comment:

The PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK mentions 12,500,000 of landscapes and seascapes under improved management. However, the Core Indicators 4 and 5 each mention 12,500,000 hectares, which equals a total of 25,000,000 hectares under improved management delivered by the project. Please correct the Core Indicators so that they reflect the number of hectares stated in the Results Framework. Finally, It seems that the supporting document titled “[Annex T_GEF7 Core Indicator Worksheet2018November02](#)” contains different information than the portal indicator 7. Please check if indicator 7 is filled out correctly and make the necessary changes.

Shansen (19-4-19): Thanks for the response. Indicator 5 captures the area of marine habitat under improved management to benefit biodiversity and/or for which management plans have been prepared and endorsed and are under implementation. Please explain if the project will deliver management plans for marine habitats? If yes then parts of the 12,500,000 should be shifted towards indicator 5.

SH (25-7-19): addressed. Thanks for the explanation.

SH (19-4-19):

- in the portal entry fields, please populate the "Executing Partner Type".

SH (25-7-19): addressed

- Both Rio Markers have values "0" for adaptation and mitigation on the portal. Please explain the logic behind the selection of these values and consider changing the CCA RIO indicator value away from "0". Reason being that climate adaptation and resilience is a major part the project objectives.

SH (25-7-19): addressed

- Please populate the indicator 11: It is important to provide at a minimum a guesstimate #.

SH (25-7-19): addressed. As relevant please update indicator 11 at project inception, mid-term and termination.

- The sustainability section has no mention of strategic private sector engagement or creation of capacity at the level of water associations or other water users. While National Dialogues are envisioned, the engagement of private sector, water associations etc. likely will require a more targeted approach. Overall, if project activities are to be embedded within the context of ongoing native governance processes, then the project will need to develop a targeted approach towards involving these stakeholders and as an integral element of the long-term sustainability plan. Please update the sustainability section considering the above inputs. Finally, please consider ways in which these points can be reflected clearly across relevant project outputs.

SH (25-7-19): addressed

In addition to the above, please add language in the project document speaking to the need to pay special attention to the above stakeholders as the targeted stakeholders' involvement plan is developed at project inception.

SH (25-7-19): addressed

- Output 2.3: National Assessments of Submarine Groundwater Discharges and of Marine-Freshwater Interactions: While this activity will help highlight the complex interactions between land and water, and with links to coastal health (and appropriate management plans), it is less clear how the project will involve local

groundwater associations and other coastal resource users? While it is important that the national/local academic audience increase capacity on this issue, it is also important to facilitate substantial involvement and boosting of local capacities and knowledge within relevant water use associations/other resource stakeholders and local administrations.

SH (25-7-19): addressed

- Please explain what anticipated economic policy and compensatory tools will be used to influence the behavior of agriculture, industry/other relevant stakeholders across e.g. targeted coastal aquifers? Main objectives being to secure the long-term protection of groundwater quality/quantity.

SH (25-7-19): addressed

- Please elaborate on the structure of the anticipated/existing IMC? As needed, will the project work towards securing participation in IMCs from key line ministries, including min of Planning/Finance? Purpose being to ensure the effective long-term financial sustainability of e.g. aquifer management plans, including the monitoring of multi-purpose networks.

SH (25-7-19): addressed

- Please elaborate on the needed synergies between the envisioned PCU country representative (national focal points) and the IMCs members at the country level?

SH(25.11.19):

- The PRODOC Part I “countries” section includes Algeria, while Algeria also forms part of the PRODOC tables, figures and text sections. The portal submission Part I “countries” section does not include Algeria, however, the Algerian co-finance contribution is recorded in the portal submission table C, while the country features throughout the different text sections (baseline descriptions etc.). Provided that UNEP agrees, please send a request to GEF (via email) to update the portal submission Part I “countries” section to include Algeria.

- Please ensure alignment between the name of the annexes referenced in the Portal submission and the list of annexes provided in the PRODOC.

- PRODOC table E includes 5 freshwater basins, while the portal submission Core Indicators section points towards 1 shared water ecosystem under improved management, which is the Mediterranean Sea. Please ensure consistency across the portal and PRODOC submissions.

- 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.

- Please note that outdated co-financing numbers are mentioned throughout the text sections in the PRODOC. Please revise the PRODOC text, while also checking and updating the portal submission text sections, as relevant.

- 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 (26.11.19): addressed.

Response to Secretariat comments UNEP (12-2018)

The target is 12,500,000 ha in Indicator 4. This has been rectified

The figures, text boxes, and tables are now shown within the portal submission

UNEP (30-5-19)

2) For indicator 5

Child project 2.1 is not preparing management plans for marine habitats. For this reason, the target has been set to 12,500,000 ha of landscapes under improved practices as part of the national ICZM strategies and of the coastal plans.

3) All comments were addressed:

- Executing Partner type updated in the portal
- Both Rio Markers move away from values “0” to reflect that climate adaptation and resilience is a major part the project objectives
- An estimation of the number of beneficiaries disaggregate by gender has been used to populate indicator 11 of the GEF7 Core Indicator Worksheet CP2.1. Please note that the figures are based on a proportional criterion for coastal population applied to national statistics.

- On the Sustainability section: text has been added in the sustainability section at *page 103* to explain the importance of involving the private sector, water association and users.
- Text has been added to the formulation of *outputs 1.5, 2.1 and 2.5* to reflect the role of the private sector, water association and users
- Text has been added in the section on stakeholders at *page 106* to explain that attention will be pay to the involvement of private sector, water/coastal associations and users during inception phase of the project.
- For output 2.3 and 2.4: Text has been added under *Activity 2.3.1.* to explain that UNESCO -IHP will adopt an inclusive approach including participation from the civil society (local groundwater associations and coastal resources users). As such, citizen-science will be considered with the aim of empowering local community and boosting local capacities and knowledge transfer among the society, scientists, and administrations. Moreover, local stakeholders from the pilot aquifers will also be invited to participate in the Mediterranean Regional Conference on SGD.

In addition, *Activity 2.3.4* has been added, to specifically respond to the comment from the GEF Secretariat. The proposed new activity would aim to foster the sensitization of coastal communities and stakeholders

Under *Activity 2.4.4*, text was added to explain that emphasis will be placed on adopting an inclusive approach including partners from the industry/agriculture/other relevant stakeholders, in the identification of “regulatory measures, economic incentives and policy changes to address groundwater needs”, which are typically included in coastal aquifer management plans.

- For the IMC: Text has been added in the section “*Interministerial Coordination Mechanisms in the participating countries*” at *page 64-65* of the GEF CEO ER. The text provides information on the structure of the existing IMA in Algeria and Montenegro and specifies that efforts will be made to involve key line ministries the institutions which has responsibility of planning and finance in each country.

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 (19-4-19): Financing is adequate. Also, the "regional glue project" features a set of PMTs which likely will secure a cost efficient financial reporting structure across CPs and not least a structured uptake of results and dissemination to a wide array of regional stakeholders, including IFIs and relevant country line ministries.

Response to Secretariat comments

UNEP (30-5-19)

NA

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 (19-4-19): Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

NA

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

SH (19-4-19): Yes

SH (06-09-19): Please note that the time frame over which the co-financing is provided should be reasonable given the intended duration of the GEF project. In the portal, please provide a reasonable co-financing amount for the actual contribution to the project's objectives. Please adjust the different tables in the portal submission, as needed. Also, please note that no new co-financing letters are needed, however, please provide an explanation in the portal comments field as to how you arrived at the final portal number(s).

Shansen (05-11-19): Addressed.

Response to Secretariat comments

Response to comment of 06-09-19

The co-financing pledges of Lebanon and Morocco have been re-discussed with the respective governments. A new update figure has been provided with a precise indication for the time frame to deliver it. Figures have been updated in the portal as well as explanation here below:

In 2016, the Lebanese Parliament issued a programme on the protection of the Litani watershed, allocating hundreds of millions USD to implement a number of projects in the area. The time frame is 2017-2023; it is however foreseen that such a challenging initiative may take longer to be fully completed.

The investments allocated by Lebanon for the Law 63/2016 are highly relevant to the objective of Child Project 1.2 Mediterranean Pollution Hot Spots Investment Project – GEF ID 9717, and Child Project 2.1 Mediterranean Coastal Zone: climate resilience, water security and habitat protection – GEF ID 9687. Lebanon will finance the cleaning/depollution of the Litani River which discharges in the Mediterranean. This includes the construction of waste water networks as well as several waste water treatment plans along the southern coast of the country.

During the preparation phase of Child Project 1.2 and 2.1, Lebanon made a pledge of 204,000,000 USD for each of the two projects (i.e. total of 408,000,000 USD). As indicated in the co-financing letters these investments should materialize in the period 2019-2024. However, due to the time passed between the approval of the MedProgramme (October 2016), and the finalization of the preparation phase for Child Projects 1.2 and 2.1, the country agreed on providing an update on its commitment with the view of reporting new figures for the co-financing to be monitored during the execution of the Project.

As of 30 August 2019, also, the level of investment for the cleaning/depollution of the Litani River through the construction of waste water networks and waste water treatment plans along the southern coast of Lebanon is approx. 30 M USD. By applying the same ratio and considering the fore-mentioned challenges, the commitment of Lebanon for this set of initiative is updated to 57 M USD to be delivered during the 5 years execution period of **Child Project 2.1 – GEF ID 9687**. In addition, the government of Lebanon considered concluded the programme on *dumpsite rehabilitation on the coast of the city of Saida* and the *EMRL (Environmental Monitoring Resources in Lebanon)*. For this reason, the correspondent 26,640,000 USD are removed from the co-financing pledge of **Child Project 2.1 – GEF ID 9687**.

The Kingdom of Morocco allocated several hundred million USD to support the implementation of a set of intuitive to reduce the pollution and to promote the sustainable developed of its coastal areas. The time frame for this national process is 2019-2025, however it is foreseen that such a complicated initiative may take longer to be fully deployed.

The investments allocated by the Kingdom of Morocco are highly relevant to the objective of Child Project 2.1 Mediterranean Coastal Zone: climate resilience, water security and habitat protection – **GEF ID 9687**.

During the preparation phase of Child Project 2.1, the Kingdom of Morocco made a pledge of 176,909,600 USD in terms of in-kind co-financing. These investments should materialize in the period 2019-2025. However, due to the time passed between the approval of the MedProgramme (October 2016), and the finalization of the preparation phase for Child Project 2.1, the country agreed on providing an update on its commitment with the view of reporting a new figure for the co-financing to be monitored during the execution of the Project.

As of 30 August 2019, the level of investment of the Kingdom of Morocco to reduce pollution and to promote the sustainable development of its coastal areas is approx. 3,000,000 USD. By assessing the pipeline of investments ready to be completed during the period 2019-2025, and considering the fore-mentioned challenges, the commitment of the Kingdom of Morocco for this set of initiatives is updated to 18,000,000 USD to be delivered during the 5 years execution period of **Child Project 2.1 – GEF ID 9687** in Morocco.

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

SH (19-4-19): Yes

SH (25-7-19): As relevant please update indicator 11 at project inception, mid-term and termination stage.

SH (06-09-19): UNEP has confirmed that the project is not preparing management plans for marine habitats, but only landscapes under improved practices as part of the national ICZM strategies and of the coastal plans. Currently the RF mentions both hectares of Landscapes and Seascapes under improved management. Please edit the RF text (and make corrections other place in the Portal submission, as needed) so that it aligns with the core indicator 4.

Shansen (05-11-19): Addressed.

Response to Secretariat comments

Response to the comment of (06.09.19):

The RF has been updated to indicate only landscapes under improved management.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement SH (19.4.19): 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 (19-4-19): The coordination across the Med Sea Program, including the SCCF MSP, is well thought out and document. However, please address the comment in box 1.

SH (25-7-19): addressed

Response to Secretariat comments

UNEP (30-5-19)

Box 1 updated as per request

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 (19-4-19): Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

NA

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement SH (19-4-19): Yes

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 (19-4-19): Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

NA

STAP

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

SH (19-4-19): 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 (25-7-19): addressed. An addendum to Annex B titled "Responses to the Comments of the STAP and GEF Council to the for the Mediterranean Sea Programme (MedProgramme): Enhancing Environmental Security (GEF ID: 9607)" has been provided.

Response to Secretariat comments

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 STAP at PFD stage.

GEF Council**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

SH (19-4-19): 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 relevant comments from the GEF council.

SH (25-7-19): addressed. An addendum to Annex B titled "Responses to the Comments of the STAP and GEF Council to the for the Mediterranean Sea Programme (MedProgramme): Enhancing Environmental Security (GEF ID: 9607)" has been provided.

Response to Secretariat comments

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 NA**

Response to Secretariat comments

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Shansen (27-12-18): please address comments and resubmit.

Shansen (21-03-19): UNEP has informed GEF that the CEO End submission needs further updating before undergoing review. A new and updated submission will be sent to GEF shortly.

SH (19-4-19): please address comments and resubmit.

SH (06-09-19): Please address comments specific to the co-financing amount and the RF and resubmit.

SH (17-11-19): 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 (25.11.19): Please address the comments provided in review box 2 and resubmit.

SH (26.11.19): The project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.

Please note that by inception the PRODOC should be updated with co-financing contributions from all participating countries. Updated co-finance numbers should be reflected in PIR submissions and should be reflected in the portal by project mid-term.

Response to Secretariat comments

Comments Addressed.

UNEP(29-03-19) : CEO Endorsement Request updated for GEF review.

Comments Addressed

UNEP (30-5-19) :

CEO Endorsement Request updated for GEF review.

UNEP (17-11-19)

The UNEP Prodoc has now been attached.

UNEP (26-11-19)

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

Background: Expanded GEF IW and Chemicals efforts across the Mediterranean are not only justified by the continuing degradation of the Mediterranean coastal zone and shallow marine environments, but also urgent in view of the looming climate related threats, and of the loss of livelihoods and dramatic deterioration of social conditions along critical sections of the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean shores. The project (9687) forms part of the Med Programme (9607) and is one of seven Child Projects.

Component 1: Coastal Zone Management

This component will support the implementation of comprehensive ICZM approaches.

Component 2: Management of Coastal Aquifers and Related Ecosystems

The actions that the project will implement under Component 2 will include the further improvement of the inventory and characterization of coastal aquifers produced by the Med Partnership project.

Innovation: The project presents a number of innovations directly derived from the strong emphasis of the MedProgramme on integrated land and water approaches, and from the evolution of the coastal areas discourse now focusing more and more on expanding the concept of ICZM to include consideration of freshwater resources and dependent ecosystems, managing conflicts at the water nexus, establishing sound groundwater governance frameworks, introducing conjunctive surface and groundwater management solutions.

Sustainability: Particular attention will be put on engaging private sector, water associations etc. in targeted meeting, training and workshop. The entry point to reach and engage these stakeholders will be the ongoing national governance processes which already include representatives of these actors as illustrated in the project

baseline section. Further, the project is supportive of the implementation of the widely politically endorsed SAP-MED and related NAPs and of the ICZM Protocol to the Barcelona Convention.

Global Environmental Benefits: The project aims at reaching a total of 12,500,000 hectares of coastal landscapes under improved management by implementing comprehensive ICZM planning and approaches in four project countries, at reinforcing the capacity of at least 300 country experts and administrators in the implementation of ICZM practices and involving coastal populations in raising awareness activities. In addition, the project will conduct work on five (national) priority aquifers, which holds relevance to the overall health of the Med Sea.