

Protecting and Restoring the Ocean's natural Capital, building Resilience and supporting region-wide Investments for sustainable Blue socio-Economic development (PROCARIBE+)

Basic Information

GEF ID

10800

Countries

Regional (Colombia, Costa Rica, Panama, Bahamas, Belize, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Jamaica, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Antigua and Barbuda)

Project Title

Protecting and Restoring the Ocean's natural Capital, building Resilience and supporting region-wide Investments for sustainable Blue socio-Economic development (PROCARIBE+)

GEF Agency(ies)

UNDP

Agency ID

UNDP: 6290

GEF Focal Area(s)

International Waters

Program Manager

Christian Severin

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

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

6th of April 2021 (cseverin): Yes, the project is fully aligned with the GEF7 IW strategy.

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 6th of April 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address below comments:

1) Please make it clearer what will be delivered through this investment. The results framework and the general mentions some deliverables, but it is not very specific.

2) For this amount of proposed financing, the deliverables are simply too few and not ambitious enough. E.g. the project proposed to do one

plan in one country (2.1.5b). Please increase level of ambition. On the other hand when point 1 above is addressed, it may be clear to the reader that the project will be delivering substantially. But in its present format, it looks like this third phase will simply continue to support capacity building, and that is NOT enough.

3) Considering this project will continue delivering on the regional SAP that was signed of on by 27 countries, and formulate and implement a regional ocean plan, it is worrisome that key countries are missing from the submission and that a total of 9 eligible countries have not endorsed in investment. Please work diligently to provide the remaining LOEs. IF this is not possible, it will basically mean that the project objective will have to be revised, as it will then not be able to delivered an ocean plan and an updated TDA and SAP that covers the entire region.

4)SGP is mentioned in the results framework, as an important partner in the project's activities on the ground. If proof exists of this partnership, please include as an annex.

5) Please ensure that there is consistency between the deliverables in Table B and what is listed in the Table F and annexes.

6) Please note, that the Blue Invest projects is listed (in para 67) as being financed at \$10 mio by GEF. please double, check as this amount is higher than what is known to the GEFSEC.

7) The write up includes 18 pages of baseline, before the reader get to understand what the project is proposing to work on in the different components. Please insert a much more succinct baseline summary, no more than a few pages are needed, the rest can be presented as an annex.

8) For the OCM, the GEF is expecting that many more countries participate than the 15 nations that have currently have endorsed the project.

9) Please provide a matrix/overview that outlines which nations were part of the TDA/SAP formulation, which countries have signed on to this proposed investment and which countries are missing (this can be an annex too) . Further, it would be helpful if this was accompanied by a description of what the project proponents are planning to do to get all relevant countries to join and what happens if that is not possible. Especially focusing on the NOT scenario, as that will have large impacts on what the project can accomplish, especially in relation to formulation of a region wide Ocean strategy.

10) Please produce and include a TOC for the project proposal

11) Please produce and include a climate risk screening

12) Please produce and include a detailed risk and opportunity analysis on the impacts of COVID to the proposed investment.

13) Please produce and include a results framework. It may be easier to understand what the project will deliver if a RF is included with clear quantifiable indicator wording included.

14) Please ensure better proportionality between the PMC budget to ensure that proportion of GEF financing is equal to or near to of what is the case for the entire budget. This can either be done be lowering the GEF amount or increasing the co-financing.

26th of April 2021 (cseverin): Partly addressed. Please add wording to the submission (both attached PIF and in the portal template) that the project will be working towards including further countries during PPG. These needs to be mentioned, so that it is clear to all that the

project proponents will work towards having following X, X and X countries join.

26th of April 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

22nd of April 2021 (anamarianunez):

1) Please make it clearer what will be delivered through this investment. the results framework and the general mentions some deliverables, but it is not very specific.

A more concise, shortened version of the Results Framework putting major emphasis on quantitative deliverables has now been added as Annex D (highlighted in light blue) in the PIF. The annex makes the substantial outputs expected from the investment stand out more clearly, including an extra column titled 'Metrics/Specifics', providing more precise, quantitative information for each output. Readability of whole Table B has also been improved for this purpose.

2) For this amount of proposed financing, the deliverables are simply too few and not ambitious enough. E.g. the project proposed to do one plan in one country (2.1.5b). Please increase level of ambition. On the other hand when point 1 above is addressed, it may be clear to the reader that the project will be delivering substantially. But in its present format, it looks like this third phase will simply continue to support capacity building, and that is NOT enough.

By addressing point 1 above, as requested, the wide-ranging scope and highly ambitious nature of the proposal is now better revealed than was originally the case.

3) Considering this project will continue delivering on the regional SAP that was signed of on by 27 countries, and formulate and implement a regional ocean plan, it is worrisome that key countries are missing from the submission and that a total of 9 eligible countries have not endorsed in investment. Please work diligently to provide the remaining LOEs. IF this is not possible, it will basically mean that the project objective will have to be revised, as it will then not be able to delivered an ocean plan and an updated TDA and SAP that covers the entire region.

1 additional LOE, from Antigua & Barbuda, has been added (see part I of project information and part III of Approval/endorsement highlighted in light blue) at the time of re-submission, counting now with a total of already 16 LOEs. Before re-submission the following countries were contacted (again) in the context of the continuing efforts to provide additional LOE's: Brazil, Mexico, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (SVG), Dominica, Grenada, Barbados and Haiti. It is noted that in some cases (Mexico and Barbados) there is a long internal process for issuing the LOE. Haiti has requested a brief of the project in French, as they are interested to be part of the project. In the case of SVG although they are facing the severe impacts of an ongoing Volcanic eruption, they indicated interest to present the LOE, as well as Dominica. No answers were received yet from Brazil and Grenada.

Efforts to secure the adhesion of additional countries as direct project participants will continue to be undertaken during PPG phase, with due respect for the current complex regional and national contexts and the required national processes and associated timelines. It is expected that the release of the PPG grant, and its enabling effect on further stakeholder consultation and engagement, will be supportive of this objective.

4)SGP is mentioned in the results framework, as an important partner in the project's activities on the ground. If proof exists of this partnership, please include as an annex.

A memo from the UNDP GEF SGP Global Manager has been added as Annex F (highlighted in light blue) to the PIF.

5) Please ensure that there is consistency between the deliverables in Table B and what is listed in the Table F and annexes.

Consistency between the deliverables in Table B and what is listed in Table F and annexes has now been ensured (see crosscheck highlighted in light blue in tables B and F and annexes B and D).

6) Please note, that the Blue Invest projects is listed (in para 67) as being financed at \$10 mio by GEF. please double, check as this amount is higher than what is known to the GEFSEC.

The mentioned UNDP Blue Invest initiative is not a GEF-funded initiative, and it is presumed that it was confused with the UNEP/CBD 'BlueFin' concept note requesting GEF funding. Explicit reference to the Blue Invest Initiative has been removed from the revised PIF in light of the request to reduce the overall length of Section 3; however, the possibilities of synergies and collaboration will still be explored during the PPG phase.

7) The write up includes 18 pages of baseline, before the reader get to understand what the project is proposing to work on in the different components. Please insert a much more succinct baseline summary, no more than a few pages are needed, the rest can be presented as an annex.

A much more succinct baseline summary has been produced, with more detailed information having been moved to Annex G, and/or available through links to relevant online resources.

8) For the OCM, the GEF is expecting that many more countries participate than the 15 nations that have currently have endorsed the project.

The GEF's expectation is valid and shared by the 31 States and Territories and 7 IGO's that formally adopted the February 2021 CLME+ Project Steering Committee Meeting (PSC) Decision through which the content of the [OCM MOU](#) was approved. As per the PSC Decisions, the OCM will be open to participation by a total of 44 different States and Territories, and 11 IGOs. Under its Article 37 the MOU stipulates that the OCM becomes operational upon signature by a minimum of 17 States or Territories and 6 IGOs.

The content of the MOU is the result of over 2 years of intense and highly participatory negotiations (made possible through the CLME+ GEF Project Grant) with the countries and regional organizations from the CLME+ region. The above target was collectively set and considered to be: *"very ambitious, but both necessary and sufficient for the initiation of meaningful operations of the OCM"*. Setting a higher target to initiate the operations of the OCM however was deemed to be not desirable, as: (1) processes and timelines for formalizing adhesion to international agreements and initiatives are not equal for all countries and organizations; all international initiatives generally go through a process of gradually increasing levels of adhesion (in many cases, spanning several years); (2) a higher target for initiating the Mechanism would likely lead to unnecessary and undesirable delays in the delivery of its benefits and added value for the region.

It is also important to note that, at the time of original PIF submission, a total of **22 States and Territories and 6 IGOs eligible for participation in the OCM** (i.e. well above the agreed upon threshold for its operationalization) were already part of the PROCARIBE+ Proposal: 16 countries had provided LOE's, and 2 non-GEF eligible countries, namely the Netherlands and the USA, representing an additional 5 Overseas Territories, as well as 6 IGO's, were also already confirmed project participants under the original proposal (see indicative co-financing).

It is also worth to mention that the provision of LOEs for PROCARIBE+ and the signing of the MOU establishing the OCM, are 2 different processes. Prompt mobilization and operationalization of the PROCARIBE+ PPG and full grant however will be beneficial and supportive/essential for the prompt operationalization of the OCM mechanism, and for fast-tracking its incremental membership.

9) Please provide a matrix/overview that outlines which nations were part of the TDA/SAP formulation, which countries have signed on to this proposed investment and which countries are missing (this can be an annex too) . Further, it would be helpful if this was accompanied by a description of what the project proponents are planning to do to get all relevant countries to join and what happens if that is not possible. Especially focusing on the NOT scenario, as that will have large impacts on what the project can accomplish, especially in relation to formulation of a region wide Ocean strategy.

A. A. B. C. D. E. F. G. H. I. J. K. L. M. N. O. P. Q. R. S. T. U. V. W. X. Y. Z. AA. AB. AC. AD. AE. AF. AG. AH. AI. AJ. AK. AL. AM. AN. AO. AP. AQ. AR. AS. AT. AU. AV. AW. AX. AY. AZ. BA. BB. BC. BD. BE. BF. BG. BH. BI. BJ. BK. BL. BM. BN. BO. BP. BQ. BR. BS. BT. BU. BV. BW. BX. BY. BZ. CA. CB. CC. CD. CE. CF. CG. CH. CI. CJ. CK. CL. CM. CN. CO. CP. CQ. CR. CS. CT. CU. CV. CW. CX. CY. CZ. DA. DB. DC. DD. DE. DF. DG. DH. DI. DJ. DK. DL. DM. DN. DO. DP. DQ. DR. DS. DT. DU. DV. DW. DX. DY. DZ. EA. EB. EC. ED. EE. EF. EG. EH. EI. EJ. EK. EL. EM. EN. EO. EP. EQ. ER. ES. ET. EU. EV. EW. EX. EY. EZ. FA. FB. FC. FD. FE. FF. FG. FH. FI. FJ. FK. FL. FM. FN. FO. FP. FQ. FR. FS. FT. FU. FV. FW. FX. FY. FZ. GA. GB. GC. GD. GE. GF. GG. GH. GI. GJ. GK. GL. GM. GN. GO. GP. GQ. GR. GS. GT. GU. GV. GW. GX. GY. GZ. HA. HB. HC. HD. HE. HF. HG. HH. HI. HJ. HK. HL. HM. HN. HO. HP. HQ. HR. HS. HT. HU. HV. HW. HX. HY. HZ. IA. IB. IC. ID. IE. IF. IG. IH. II. IJ. IK. IL. IM. IN. IO. IP. IQ. IR. IS. IT. IU. IV. IW. IX. IY. IZ. JA. JB. JC. JD. JE. JF. JG. JH. JI. JJ. JK. JL. JM. JN. JO. JP. JQ. JR. JS. JT. JU. JV. JW. JX. JY. JZ. KA. KB. KC. KD. KE. KF. KG. KH. KI. KJ. KK. KL. KM. KN. KO. KP. KQ. KR. KS. KT. KU. KV. KW. KX. KY. KZ. LA. LB. LC. LD. LE. LF. LG. LH. LI. LJ. LK. LL. LM. LN. LO. LP. LQ. LR. LS. LT. LU. LV. LW. LX. LY. LZ. MA. MB. MC. MD. ME. MF. MG. MH. MI. MJ. MK. ML. MN. MO. MP. MQ. MR. MS. MT. MU. MV. MW. MX. MY. MZ. NA. NB. NC. ND. NE. NF. NG. NH. NI. NJ. NK. NL. NM. NO. NP. NQ. NR. NS. NT. NU. NV. NW. NX. NY. NZ. OA. OB. OC. OD. OE. OF. OG. OH. OI. OJ. OK. OL. OM. ON. OO. OP. OQ. OR. OS. OT. OU. OV. OW. OX. OY. OZ. PA. PB. PC. PD. PE. PF. PG. PH. PI. PJ. PK. PL. PM. PN. PO. PP. PQ. PR. PS. PT. PU. PV. PW. PX. PY. PZ. QA. QB. QC. QD. QE. QF. QG. QH. QI. QJ. QK. QL. QM. QN. QO. QP. QQ. QR. QS. QT. QU. QV. QW. QX. QY. QZ. RA. RB. RC. RD. RE. RF. RG. RH. RI. RJ. RK. RL. RM. RN. RO. RP. RQ. RR. RS. RT. RU. RV. RW. RX. RY. RZ. SA. SB. SC. SD. SE. SF. SG. SH. SI. SJ. SK. SL. SM. SN. SO. SP. SQ. SR. SS. ST. SU. SV. SW. SX. SY. SZ. TA. TB. TC. TD. TE. TF. TG. TH. TI. TJ. TK. TL. TM. TN. TO. TP. TQ. TR. TS. TT. TU. TV. TW. TX. TY. TZ. UA. UB. UC. UD. UE. UF. UG. UH. UI. UJ. UK. UL. UM. UN. UO. UP. UQ. UR. US. UT. UU. UV. UW. UX. UY. UZ. VA. VB. VC. VD. VE. VF. VG. VH. VI. VJ. VK. VL. VM. VN. VO. VP. VQ. VR. VS. VT. VU. VW. VX. VY. VZ. WA. WB. WC. WD. WE. WF. WG. WH. WI. WJ. WK. WL. WM. WN. WO. WP. WQ. WR. WS. WT. WU. WV. WW. WX. WY. WZ. XA. XB. XC. XD. XE. XF. XG. XH. XI. XJ. XK. XL. XM. XN. XO. XP. XQ. XR. XS. XT. XU. XV. XW. XX. XY. XZ. YA. YB. YC. YD. YE. YF. YG. YH. YI. YJ. YK. YL. YM. YN. YO. YP. YQ. YR. YS. YT. YU. YV. YW. YX. YY. YZ. ZA. ZB. ZC. ZD. ZE. ZF. ZG. ZH. ZI. ZJ. ZK. ZL. ZM. ZN. ZO. ZP. ZQ. ZR. ZS. ZT. ZU. ZV. ZW. ZX. ZY. ZZ.

A matrix showing participation by States and Territories along the CLME / CLME+ / PROCARIBE+ continuum is now added as Annex E (highlighted in light blue) to the PIF. From the matrix, it can be seen how formal adherence to the aforementioned initiatives by means of GEF OFP LOE's and ProDoc/SAP signatures etc. has typically been gradual and progressive over time, whereas the engagement in the projects of key IGO's with a permanent region-wide membership has been a success formula that has allowed to fast-track full engagement of all States and Territories from the region.

Important remarks, and engagement strategy:

It must be noted that **many of the project outputs do not demand participation by all GEF-eligible countries for their successful delivery**: on the contrary, the size of the requested GEF grant would by no means be sufficient to deliver each of the outputs in all countries (see the quantitative targets in the Results Framework).

Where project outputs and outcomes do require or stand to benefit from the participation of all States and Territories, such can be achieved via not one but several avenues providing practical options for both direct and indirect participation. Successful delivery of such outputs is thus by no means jeopardized by the absence of a number of LOE's from GEF eligible countries at the time of PIF submission.

Similar approaches were successfully applied during both the CLME and CLME+ Projects. An important avenue for the engagement of all States and Territories (both GEF and non-GEF eligible) has been the **active participation in project activities of key IGO's with an oceans mandate, and with broad regional membership**. Proof of the success of this formula is that States and Territories that did not provide LOEs for the CLME and CLME+ PIFs, nor signed the corresponding UNDP Project Documents, did endorse the CLME+ SAP (e.g. Nicaragua, Cuba, Montserrat, France,...) and/or did formally approve IGO Work Programmes (e.g. The Netherlands, UK Overseas Territories,...) through which practical implementation was given to key aspects of the SAP.

Currently, the membership of the CLME+ Interim Coordination Mechanism - the predecessor of the OCM - consists of 8 IGO's. It is trusted that through the confirmed participation in PROCARIBE+ of key IGO's such as but not limited to UNEP CEP, IOCARIBE of the IOC of UNESCO and FAO-WECAFC, the Project will be able to effectively reach all 44 States and Territories, including those not eligible for financial support from the GEF.

It is further to be noted that **for the negotiations and formulation of this new regional Ocean Action Programme, the Project will strive to engage not only all countries, but also key non-governmental stakeholders**. Combined, the OCM and the **wider-ranging, multi-stakeholder ocean partnership(s)**, to be operationalized early on in project implementation under Component 1, are expected to provide a valuable platform for this purpose.

As such, and **whereas the GEF Agency considers the mobilization within a very short time frame of LOEs from 16 countries to be an outstanding achievement, the confirmed engagement of 6 regional IGO's in the Project can be seen as equally important for the successful delivery of the next iteration of the SAP.**

10) Please produce and include a TOC for the project proposal

A ToC has been produced and is now included in the PIF under section 3 (highlighted in light blue).

11) Please produce and include a climate risk screening

A Climate Risk Screening has been produced and is now included as Annex H (highlighted in light blue) to the PIF.

12) Please produce and include a detailed risk and opportunity analysis on the impacts of COVID to the proposed investment.

A detailed risk and opportunity analysis on the impacts of COVID has been produced and is now included as Annex I (highlighted in light blue) to the PIF.

13) Please produce and include a results framework. It may be easier to understand what the project will deliver if a RF is included with clear quantifiable indicator wording included.

Table B of the PIF provides a detailed Results Framework. For most of the Outputs, the Results Framework already explicitly mentions specific, quantitative targets, including a number of GEF core indicators.

Additionally, a short, simplified Results Framework clearly reflecting/quantifying key expected deliverables has been produced and is now included as Annex D to the PIF.

14) Please ensure better proportionality between the PMC budget to ensure that proportion of GEF financing is equal to or near to of what is the case for the entire budget. This can either be done by lowering the GEF amount or increasing the co-financing

The proportionality between the PMC budget and PMC co-financing has been adjusted as requested, see the correspondent part in Table B highlighted in light blue.

26th of April (anamarianunez):

See Footnote 8 added under Section 2 "Baseline Scenario", paragraph 21 highlighted in yellow. Under PIF Annex E, note 2 was added, highlighted in yellow.

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 6th of April 2021 (cseverin):Partly, please adjust following tagging of co-financing sources:

- 1) For co-financing from donor countries (USA, Netherlands, European space Agency) please use "donor Agency" as the source
- 2) For co-financing from FAO, UNEP, and UNESCO please use "donor Agency" as the source
- 3) For co-financing from UNDP, please use "GEF Agency" as the source

26th of April 2021 (cseverin): addressed

Agency Response

22nd of April 2021 (anamarianunez):

1) For co-financing from donor countries (USA, Netherlands, European space Agency) please use “donor Agency” as the source

The requested change has been done. See the correspondent part in Table C, highlighted in light blue.

2) For co-financing from FAO, UNEP, and UNESCO please use “donor Agency” as the source

The requested change has been done. See the correspondent part in Table C, highlighted in light blue.

3) For co-financing from UNDP, please use “GEF Agency” as the source

The requested change has been done. See the correspondent part in Table C, highlighted in light blue.

Additionally, indicative co-financing received from the Government of Colombia has now also been incorporated. See the correspondent part in table C, highlighted in light blue.

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 6th of April 2021 (cseverin): Yes, especially if ALL eligible countries endorse the project.

Agency Response

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 6th of April 2021 (cseverin):Yes, the slight increase has been approved by the GPU manager

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6th of April 2021 (cseverin): No, please make sure that core indicators listed throughout the project are the same. Further please:

- 1) Make sure to include the LMEs under core indicator 7
- 2) Please include tons of fish moved to more sustainable levels the proper place in indicator 8

26th of April 2021 (cseverin): addressed

Agency Response

22nd of April 2021 (anamarianunez):

- 1) LMEs included under core indicator 7 in the GEF portal.
- 2) Tons of fish moved to more sustainable levels have been placed correctly in indicator 8 at the GEF portal.

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 6th of April 2021 (cseverin):Yes

Agency Response

art 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

6th of April 2021 (cseverin): Yes indeed, but in too much detail. Please work towards presenting this in a more consolidated fashion compared to the 7 pages that is currently used.

26th of April 2021 (cseverin): addressed

Agency Response

22nd of April 2021 (anamarianunez):

A much more consolidated version of the global environmental problem has been produced, as requested. See the correspondent section in the PIF.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of April 2021 (cseverin): Yes, but the baseline scenario is not clearly defined. Please work towards presenting this in a more consolidated fashion compared to the 7 pages that is currently used.

6th of April 2021 (cseverin): Yes, but too detailed. Please consider to consolidate and include the detailed baseline as an annex

26th of April 2021 (cseverin): addressed

Agency Response

22nd of April 2021 (anitamarianunez):

A more consolidated version of the baseline scenario has been produced, as requested. A list with a limited selection of baseline is still included as Annex G (highlighted in light blue) to the PIF.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6th of April 2021 (cseverin): YES, the project description (alternative scenario) is 13 pages long. Please carefully assess if this can be consolidated and sharpened to make it easier for the reader to understand what the investment will be delivering. On top it would be needed to provide a shorter concise write up earlier in the document that allows the reader to understand what will be delivered, in quantifiable terms.

26th of April 2021 (cseverin): addressed.

Agency Response

22nd of April 2021 (anamarianunez):

A careful assessment has been made as to what level of details from the original version of the alternative scenario could be removed without substantially reducing clarity of, and rationale for the project interventions. It has been possible to shorten the scenario description up to some extent, but it is perceived that keeping some level of details is still beneficial.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6th of April 2021 (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

6th of April 2021 (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

6th of April 2021 (cseverin):Yes, but please provide a results framework for the investment. That would make it easier for the reader to understand what will be delivered.

26th of April 2021 (cseverin): Addressed. However it is noted that the GEF is listed as the Global Environment Fund. Which is not correct.

Agency Response

22nd of April 2021 (anamarianunez):

As indicated in previous points, readability of the Table B Results Framework has been improved, and shortened version of the results framework has been added as Annex D in the PIF.

26th of April 2021 (anamarianunez): The GEF is now correctly listed as Global Environment Facility in the Acronyms Table at the end of Annex D highlighted in yellow.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6th of April 2021 (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

1. 6th of April 2021 (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

6th of April 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please describe any consultations conducted with civil society, private sector and IPLC, as indicated in the section on Stakeholders. In addition, please provide a stakeholder analysis that includes a list of stakeholders in the project area, identifying their interests and potential role in the project as well as the means of engagement.

26th of April 2021 (cseverin): Addressed.

27th of April 2021 (cseverin):the Stakeholder Engagement strategy description still does not describe consultations conducted with Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, Civil Society Organizations and Private Sector Entities. Please describe the process of consultations conducted with these stakeholders during project identification prior to the PIF submission in more detail than what is currently presented in the table. If no consultations has taken place, please uncheck the marks saying that there were any consultations with them. If engagements have not been undertaken in a more direct way than described in the PIF, but are planned to be undertaken, please include a description that let the reader understand why such engagements have not been taking place and by when such stakeholder engagement will be taking place.

- 29th of April 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

22nd of April 2021 (anamarianunez):

A detailed stakeholder analysis for the Caribbean and North Brazil Shelf LME's CLME+ Project ([available on the CLME+ Hub](#)) was conducted at the onset of the project in 2015. This analysis continues to be relevant to date, in light of the fact that PROCARIBE+ seeks to give continuity to the key outcomes and outputs from CLME+. Additional inventories (in particular, an inventory of civil society groups and (small grants) donors and trust funds (available to the GEF Agency as an Access database), and on [\(private sector\) investors](#)) were conducted in the context of CLME+ work on the "People Managing Oceans" Civil Society version of the Strategic Action Programme, and in the context of the preparatory work on private sector engagement. These analyses will be re-visited and fine-tuned as needed during the PROCARIBE+ PPG (with the support of the PPG grant), and further updated/expanded, as deemed necessary, during project inception and implementation.

A table has been added to the PIF under Section 2 (highlighted in light blue). Stakeholders, identifying the key stakeholder groups per project component/output, as well as the anticipated means of engagement.

A [stakeholder consultation on gender mainstreaming in Caribbean fisheries](#) was conducted in May 2020. Consultations with Civil Society were conducted in the context of the preparations of the "People Managing Oceans" Civil Society-version of the regional Strategic Action Programme, whose implementation will be supported through PROCARIBE+ Component 3. Likewise, and in support of private sector/investor engagement in Component 3, reference is made to the CLME+ Project "[Baseline Inventory of Existing and Potential Sustainable Blue Finance Investors to Support the CLME+ Vision](#)" (February 2021). OSPESCA as well as the Fisheries Departments of its member states have regularly engaged with relevant private sector and IPLC actors (spiny lobster, traceability, Component 3).

The GEF Agency and the CLME+ PCU have liaised/engaged with several non-governmental stakeholders (mentioned in the PIF under Section 2 highlighted in light blue) in the context of the preparations of the PROCARIBE+ PIF, through direct communications (email exchanges and teleconferences)

exchanges and teleconferences).

28th of April 2021 (anamarianunez): A more detailed description, as requested, has been included in the PIF under the correspondent section, highlighted in green.

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

6th of April 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please provide a stronger description on measures to ensure gender responsive consultations project design/development. Further, it is noted that a more detailed plan needs to be included at time of CEO endorsement.

26th of april 2021 (cseverin): Addressed.

Agency Response

22nd of April (anamarianunez):

The description on measures to ensure gender responsiveness of the investment has been expanded under Section 3 of the PIF (highlighted in light blue). In order to ensure that gender-responsive consultations take place during the project design/development stage, and in order to fine-tune the project's gender approach, a dedicated gender expert will be engaged for this purpose during the PPG phase.

The second part of the comment/request is duly noted and a more detailed plan will be provided at the time of submission for CEO endorsement

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6th of April 2021 (cseverin): Yes, however it is noted that a more detailed plan be included at time of CEO endorsement.

Agency Response

22nd of April 2021 (anamarianunez): The comment/request is duly noted and a more detailed plan will be provided at the time of submission for CEO endorsement

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

6th of April 2021 (cseverin):Yes, the proposal includes a risk matrix. However, please produce and include a risk and opportunity analysis of how the current COVID pandemic and a post COVID Pandemic situation will impact the project and its implementation.

26th of April 2021 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

22nd of April 2021 (anamarianunez): A risk and opportunity analysis indicating how the COVID pandemic and post-pandemic situation will impact the project has been produced, and is added to the PIF as Annex I (highlighted in light blue).

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

6th of April 2021 (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

6th of April 2021 (cseverin):Yes. Again it is really important for the project to be able to deliver that as many states that were part fo the agreeing to the regional TDA, SAP and regional coordination mechanism participates in the project.

26th of April 2021 (cseverin): Thank you for inserting wording alluding the process that is ongoing to get as many caribbean sea nations to participate.

Agency Response

22nd of April 2021 (anamarianunez):

The GEF Agency is very confident that the already confirmed levels of direct participation (i.e. through LOEs and through co-financing indications from non-GEF eligible States, representing several Overseas Territories: together representing a total of 23 States and Territories to date) as well as the indirect and direct engagements (as Member States of the 6 ICGs that already confirmed participation: all 44 States

to date) as well as the indirect and direct engagements (as member States of the 6 IGOS that already committed participation. all 44 States and Territories from the region) is an important enabling factor for the successful delivery on the project results framework, and the associated regional and national strategies and plans.

Notwithstanding this, and as indicated before, the adhesion of additional countries as direct project participants will continue to be pursued, with due respect for the current complex regional context, required national processes and associated timelines. It is expected that the release of the PPG grant, and its enabling effect on further stakeholder consultation and engagement, will be supportive of this objective.

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

6th of April 2021 (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

6th of April 2021 (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

6th of April 2021 (cseverin): 15 LOEs have been uploaded. Two of these have been signed by the wrong GEF OFP (Belize and Guatemala). Further, it is anticipated the many more Caribbean and N.Brazilian Shelf countries will join the investment. Please continue to work on getting more countries to join the project.

26th of April: Compared to the list of country SAP signatures, the project is missing some key country LOEs. Please continue to work on obtaining these, so that they can either be uploaded prior to WP formulation or alternatively during PPG. Please include wording to that effect.

Thanks for revised LOE from Guatemala and FYI GEF database on Belize is being updated.

26th of April 2021 (cseverin): Addressed, the submission now includes wording that indicates that the last remaining countries that endorsed the SAP is being pursued towards joining this investment, at the latest during PPG.

Agency Response

22nd of April 2021 (anamarianunez):

The LOE from Guatemala has been re-issued, now with the signature of the GEF OFP (the letter is included as attachment to the whole package and change registered in Part III of the PIF correspondent to the Approval/endorsement highlighted in light blue). The Belize LOE features the correct GEF OFP signature; a communication confirming the GEF OFP was sent to UNDP with cc to the GEF Sec on 14th April 2021.

One additional LOE has been added at the time of re-submission, bringing the total number of GEF-eligible countries who have provided an LOE to date to 16. It is indeed correct to anticipate that additional countries will provide LOEs, and work will continue during PPG and Project Inception Phase towards facilitating such, but also towards enabling the engagement of other (potentially) valuable inter-governmental and non-governmental stakeholders.

It is important to point out that the marine space of the CLME+ region is not only shared by GEF-eligible, but also by non-GEF eligible States and Dependent Territories. France, the Netherlands and the USA have already pre-confirmed their engagement in BPOCABIP+ (see

and dependent territories. France, the Netherlands and the USA have already pre-committed their engagement in PROCARIBET (see indicative co-financing in the PIF), increasing the number of direct participating States and Territories from a total of 22 (at the time of original submission) to a total of 23, by re-submission on April 22.

Please further note that participation by all States and Territories from the region will also be enabled through the regional IGO's. Use of the latter formula was key to the success of the CLME and CLME+ Projects. At the time of PIF (re-)submission, 6 regional IGO's with an oceans-related mandate had already submitted indicative co-financing for the proposal. The membership of these IGO's covers all States and Territories from the Wider Caribbean, and multiple sectors with a stake in the marine environment.

26th of April (anitamarianunez): See Footnote 8 added under Section 2 "Baseline Scenario", paragraph 21 highlighted in yellow. Under PIF Annex E, note 2 was added, highlighted in yellow.

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

EFSEC 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

6th of April 2021 (cseverin): No, please address above comments and resubmit.

26th of April 2021 (cseverin): No, please address remaining comment and resubmit ASAP

26th of April 2021 (cseverin): Yes, project is recommended for technical clearance.

27th of April 2021 (cseverin): No, Please address remaining comment and resubmit ASAP

29th of April 2021 (cseverin): Yes, project 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

/iew Dates

PIF Review Agency Response

First Review	4/23/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/26/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

The Caribbean and North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystems “CLME+ region”; covers an area of 4.4 million km² and constitute one of the most geopolitically complex and biodiversity-rich sets of LME’s in the world. The two LMEs comprise 26 independent States and 18 dependent/associated territories, of which 25 are SIDS, and showcase a dichotomy of high marine-based socio-economic potential and social-ecological vulnerability. The CLME+ region harbors richly diverse coral reef, mangrove, seagrass and pelagic ecosystems. It contains an estimated 26,000 km² of coral reefs, or 10% of the world’s total. The mangroves in the Wider Caribbean represent 20% of global mangrove coverage and finally, the region has a high seagrass coverage of 66,000 km² that together with mangroves constitute important carbon sinks. The LME’s represent a largely shared source of ecosystem goods & services and support a multitude of economic activities. The two LMEs receive the outflows from many rivers, out of which 23 are transboundary. Population of the terrestrial drainage area of these LME’s is 174 million, with 95 million living within 100 km of the coastline.

The two LMEs agreed on their first ever long-term strategy for managing the shared marine resources, through the 10-year region-wide umbrella Strategic Action Programme. The “CLME+ SAP” (2015-2024), was developed in 2013, with as associated long-term (~20 years) Vision. The SAP is to be implemented through a series of projects and initiatives, where this investment is central piece hereof. This demands strong coordination, collaboration, formulation of national policies and coordination of these in a regional context, synergies among numerous stakeholders, organizations, while being supported by a strong data/knowledge base.

The objective of this investment is to protect, restore and harness the natural coastal and marine capital of the Caribbean and North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystems to catalyze investments in a climate-resilient, sustainable post-covid Blue Economy, through strengthened regional coordination and collaboration, and wide-ranging partnerships.

The project will among others deliver: An ocean coordination mechanism, micro-finance schemes supporting implementation of regional action plans, blue economy & marine spatial plans, enhanced area-based ocean conservation covering at least 1,000,000 ha, sea food traceability investments and bringing up to 28,000 tons of spiny lobster fisheries to sustainable fisheries methods.

16 nations have already endorsed this regional investment. Endorsement from six nations that endorsed the CLME+ SAP, but have not yet provided an LOE for PROCARIBE+, will continue to be pursued during the PPG phase. These countries are Barbados, Brazil, Dominica, Grenada, Haiti, Mexico and St. Vincent and the Grenadines.